

Psychology

Advanced GCE **A2 7876**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS 3876**

Combined Mark Schemes And Report on the Units

June 2005

3876/7876/MS/R/05

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 2005

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	25
2545	Psychology and Health	39
2546	Psychology and Organisations:	47
2547	Psychology and Environment	57
2548	Psychology and Sport	69
2549	Psychology and Crime	81

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	96
2540	Core Studies 1	97
2541	Core Studies 2	100
2542	Psychological Investigations	103
2543	Psychological Research	106
2544	Psychology and Education	109
2545	Psychology and Health	111
2546	Psychology and Organisations	113
2547	Psychology and Environment	116
2548	Psychology and Sport	118
2549	Psychology and Crime	120
*	Grade Thresholds	122

Mark Scheme 2540
June 2005

GENERAL MARKING GUIDELINES

Advanced Subsidiary GCE is assessed at a standard appropriate for candidates who have completed the first half of a full Advanced GCE course i.e. between GCSE and Advanced GCE. Candidates will mainly be 17 years old writing under examination conditions. The mark scheme gives detailed guidance on the possible responses to each question.

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 which take an unusual approach not covered 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.

Where appropriate, instructions on assessing the quality of written communication in Unit 2541 will be covered in the Main Standardisation Meeting.

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 AS candidates who have completed one year 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.

NOTE: Any answer not worthy of credit receives a mark of 0.

Cognitive Psychology

- 1 Describe how the trident illusion in the paper by Deregowski was used to test for 3D perception. [2]**

2 D perceivers took less time to draw the trident/ found it easier to copy/less difficult. 3D perceivers had to lift the flap more in order to replicate as a drawing because the illusion was confusing to them. (2)

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

- 2 Explain the psychological principle behind Gardner and Gardner's use of tickling to encourage Washoe to use sign language. [2]**

Operant conditioning – Tickling was a reward for correct signing, positive reinforcement.(2)

Other appropriate answers (2)
Partially correct answer: she enjoyed it, she liked it (1)

- 3 (a) Identify two of the three groups of children in the study by Baron-Cohen, Leslie and Frith in their study on autism. [2]**

Two from:
Downs syndrome, Normal, autistic

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

- (b) Explain why the children in the three groups were different ages.**

The children were of different chronological ages to make the three groups comparable in terms of mental age and to compensate for the disabilities of the Down Syndrome and the Autistic group. Control for mental age/intelligence. To show intelligence had nothing to do with ToM.

Other appropriate answers (2)
Partially correct answer: mention of mental age/intelligence (1)

- 4 From the study on eyewitness testimony by Loftus and Palmer outline two features of the procedure that were standardised. [4]**

The film clips were the same, the questions were the same, same time lapse in second experiment etc. All gave general account of what they remembered. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)
Partially correct answer: identification without comment OR vague answer e.g. standard instructions, same lab environment. (1)

Developmental Psychology

- 5 Outline how the children's pre-existing levels of aggression were measured in the study by Bandura, Ross and Ross. [2]**

Any two details from:

Children were observed before the experiment

By their teacher and/or experimenter

At nursery

Using a checklist / scale. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer (1)

- 6 Outline one finding about the children's ability to conserve in the study by Samuel and Bryant. [2]**

One from

Number most easy to conserve – fewest errors made, next mass, next volume, fewer errors made as children get older, children do better with one question rather than two/ fixed array (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: vague answers e.g. methodology confused them. (1)

- 7 Outline two pieces of evidence used by Freud to suggest that Hans's fear of horses was symbolic of a fear of his father. [4]**

Two from:

The horse's black mouth represented the father's moustache and blinkers - glasses, 'daddy don't trot away from me', fearful of horses falling down relates to death wish for father, fear of getting bitten relates to fear of castration by father (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: identification with no explanation e.g. blinkers (1)

Reference to similarities in penis size between horse and father no marks!

Two marks for each correct answer.

Max [4]

- 8 (a) Outline one quantitative and one qualitative measure used in the study by Hodges and Tizard on ex-institutional children.**

One each from:

Quantitative measures – Rutter scales, Social Difficulty Questionnaire (or accurate description) (1)

Qualitative measures - interviews or questionnaires with parents, teachers, adolescents (1)

Other appropriate answers (1)

Partially correct: two vague answers = 1 mark eg questionnaires and interviews

(b) Outline one strength of using quantitative measures in this study. [2]

Strengths include – less interpretation involved, more objective analysis, easy to compare results, less biased with reference to study for two marks

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: strength of quantitative data not related to the study (1)

Physiological Psychology**9 Explain why the participants in the study by Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse were required to do a 'continuous performance task' before the PET scans were carried out.**

Has been shown to produce increases in relative glucose metabolic rates in the frontal, temporal and parietal lobes this could then be seen by PET scan. I.e. activates the brain To standardise brain activity, to make the brain active. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: to reduce stress/ as a trial/ to show patterns (1)

10 Describe one problem with generalising from the sample in the split brain study by Sperry.

The sample consisted of patients who had had split-brain operation to cure epilepsy and the epilepsy may alter the brain so not comparable to non-epileptic people. The sample was very small (11 patients) (2)

Point with comment for 2 marks.

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer (1)

11 Explain what the study by Schachter and Singer tells us about emotion.

The study tells us that emotion is made up of physiological arousal and cognitive labelling supported by findings from the study.

Conclusion with details from study (3 - 4)

Partially correct answer: Just findings from study **OR** conclusion with no supporting details from study. (1 – 2)

(Conclusions include: role of physiological factors, cognitive factors, and environmental/situational factors)

12 From the study by Dement and Kleitman on sleep and dreaming:**(a) Identify the two substances participants were instructed not to have on the day of the experiment.**

Caffeine and alcohol (2)

Partially correct answer (1)

No marks for cigarettes or medication

(b) Outline one problem with controlling these substances.

Participants may not have slept normally as their usual routine was altered due to withdrawal symptoms, can't be sure they have not had substances, difficult to control as other products contain caffeine e.g. chocolate and paracetamol may still be in system from day before study. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer (1)

Social Psychology

13 From the study by Tajfel on intergroup discrimination, describe one example of Ingroups - outgroups found in society.

Examples include football supporters, political parties, religious groups etc. with elaboration. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: identification with no elaboration e.g. football fans (1)

14 Explain one way the findings from the prison simulation study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo support a situational explanation of behaviour. [2]

The participants were randomly assigned to the roles of prisoner and guard and had no history of conviction or crime, yet when they were put into the prison situation their behaviour changed and they became pathological in their behaviour.

This demonstrates the power of the situation. (2)

Other appropriate answers: mention of situational vs. dispositional factors as above or feature of situation with effect on behaviour e.g. the uniforms made the guards feel powerful and exercise control over prisoners. (2)

Partially correct answer: lab experiment, demand characteristics (1)

15 From the study by Milgram on obedience:

(a) Outline one way in which the study had low ecological validity.

Shocking people (task) was unusual not an everyday occurrence, OR the location was strange to the participants, OR the experiment is a unique social situation and so people may behave differently to everyday life and be prone to demand characteristics. (2)

Must quantify with details from the study for full marks.

(b) Outline one way in which the study had high ecological validity.**Point with example from the study for 2 marks**

The situation was similar to any other with an authority figure, the participants were fully involved in the study and there was a high level of experimental realism judging by the intense reactions of the participants. Post-experimental interviews also revealed a high level of realism. The participants believed the situation, realistic machinery and procedure. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer (1)

16 (a) Outline how one ethical guideline was broken by Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin in their subway study. [2]**One from:**

Guideline with explanation from: consent, deception, protection, withdrawal, and Debriefing, psychological harm. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: identification only with no explanation (1)

16 (b) Outline one way in which ethical guidelines were upheld by Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin in the same study. [2]

Not broken; physical harm, observation, confidentiality (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: identification only no explanation. (1)

Psychological harm = no marks

Psychology of Individual differences**17 From the review by Gould describe one of the IQ tests completed by recruits.**

Alpha, Beta, spoken test – with brief description for 2 marks, or full description of test without naming test. (2)

Other appropriate answers (2)

Partially correct answer: identification only. (1)

18 Outline one problem with Hraba and Grant's use of dolls to measure racial identification and racial preference.**For two marks must explain the problem****One from:**

May not be a valid measure of racial preferences but merely familiarity with black/white dolls, dolls are not real people so may not reflect children's real life views, so lacks ecological validity

Other appropriate answers (2)

- Partially correct answer: dolls not real people with no effect explained (1)
- 19 From the study by Thigpen and Cleckley on multiple personality disorder:**
- (a) Identify two tests completed by Eve.**
- Two from:**
Psychometric test OR Memory, IQ and personality test
Projective test OR Rorschach OR drawing human figures
Appropriate answers (1)
Partially correct answer (1)
- (b) Explain why an independent tester analysed the results of the tests carried out on Eve.**
- One from:**
A well experienced expert at conducting tests, to reduce any bias from the researchers, to add scientific weight to their diagnosis of multiple personality.
Insufficient testing and analysis (2)
- Other appropriate answers (2)
Partially correct answer: Point without explanation e.g. reduce bias (1)
- 20 Rosenhan, in his study 'on being sane in insane places', refers to Type 1 errors as calling a sick person healthy and Type 2 errors as calling a healthy person sick.**
- (a) Suggest why health professionals made Type 2 errors in their diagnosis of the pseudo patients in the first experiment.**
- Consequences of failing to identify illness could be more serious so better to err on the side of caution. They have an expectation that people are ill due to context. (2)
- Other appropriate answers (2)
Partially correct answer (1)
- (b) Describe how the health professionals made Type 1 errors in the second experiment by Rosenhan.**
- Hospital staff were told to expect healthy patients and rated many genuine patients as being healthy. (2)
- Other appropriate answers (2)
Partially correct answer (1)

**Mark Scheme 2541
June 2005**

GENERAL MARKING GUIDELINES**AS Psychology Unit 2541 - Core Studies 2**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE is assessed at a standard appropriate for candidates who have completed the first half of a full Advanced GCE course i.e. between GCSE and Advanced GCE. Candidates will mainly be 17 years old writing under examination conditions. The mark scheme gives detailed guidance on the possible responses to each question.

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 which take an unusual approach not covered 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.

Where appropriate, instructions on assessing the quality of written communication in Unit 2541 will be covered in the Main Standardisation Meeting.

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 AS candidates who have completed one year 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.

Section A

1 (a) Describe how data was gathered in your chosen study. [6]

Named studies: **Dement & Kleitman/ Loftus & Palmer/ Bandura, Ross & Ross**

Emphasis is on detail of chosen core study.

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

Dement: Use of EEG to determine REM. P's wakened and asked about dream. Also estimated length of dream and length of narrative.

Loftus: study 1: watch video and estimate speed. Study 2: see broken glass or not.

Bandura: observation through one way mirror; response categories records every 5 seconds.

0 marks No answer or incorrect answer

1-2 marks One or two general statements are identified which are basic and lacking in detail. Expression is poor and use of psychological terms is rudimentary.

3-4 marks Description is accurate with increased detail. Some understanding evident. Expression and use of psychological terms is good.
*max 4 marks if there is no reference to what data is gathered.

5-6 marks 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.

Total maximum 6 marks.

(b) Briefly discuss two strengths and two weaknesses of conducting psychological studies in a laboratory with examples from your chosen study. [12]

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

Assessment includes point, example and comment

Important note: As candidates are required to **discuss**, point 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.

Most likely answer: (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Strength: manipulation of one variable and use of controls means that cause and effect are more likely.

Strength: control over many extraneous variables is possible.

Strength: lab setting should ease data collection e.g. one-way mirror, EEG.

Strength: in lab so participants must have given consent; increases ethics?

Weakness: controlling variables is reductionist - does any behaviour exist in isolation from others.

Weakness: the task performed is unlikely to be true to real life; the setting itself is low in ecological validity.

Weakness: participants know they are taking part in a study and may respond to demand characteristics.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points

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

Total maximum 12 marks.

- (c) Suggest one other way data could have been gathered for your chosen study and say how you think this might affect the results. [8]**

Answers must be specific to chosen core study.

NB candidates may offer more than one suggestion. All marked and best ONE credited.

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

How this might affect the results

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 1-2 marks | 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). |
| 3-4 marks | 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). |

2 (a) Describe how the data was gathered in your chosen study. [6]

Named studies: **Freud / Piliavin, Rodin & Piliavin / Rosenhan**

Emphasis on detail of chosen core study.

Most likely answer (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Freud: observations of Hans and conversations with Hans conducted by Hans' father and sent to Freud via letter.

Piliavin: victim either drunk/ill, black/white. Observations made in railway carriage.

Rosenhan: study 1: fake symptoms presented to psychiatrists; notes taken of behaviour on ward; study 2: fakes to present themselves in next 3 months.

0 marks No answer or incorrect answer

1-2 marks One or two general statements are identified which are basic and lacking in detail. Expression is poor and use of psychological terms is rudimentary.

3-4 marks Description is accurate with increased detail. Some understanding evident. Expression and use of psychological terms is good.
*max 4 marks if there is no reference to what data is gathered.

5-6 marks 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.

Total maximum 6 marks.

(b) Briefly discuss two strengths and two weaknesses of conducting psychological research in everyday settings with examples from your chosen study. [12]

Candidates should provide a general point related to the question. They should give an example from their chosen study to illustrate the point and they should make a comment about the point which may evaluative or implication. Assessment includes point, example and comment.

Important note: As candidates are required to **discuss**, point 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.

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

Strength: participants are in a natural environment and so should behave naturally! They do not know their behaviour is being recorded. There are no demand characteristics.

Strength: participants are subject to many influences, which are not controlled as they may be in a laboratory.

Strength: setting is real life and task/behaviour being recorded is real: ecological validity is very high.

Weakness: one variable cannot be isolated and so cause and effect less likely to be determined.

Weakness: control of extraneous variables is very difficult.

Weakness: recording of behaviour may be difficult - e.g. obstructions

Weakness: ethical problems: participants are not giving consent, they may be deceived, they do not have the right to withdraw, there may be no debrief.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points

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

Total maximum 12 marks.

(c) Suggest one other way data could have been gathered for your chosen study and say how you think this might affect the results. [8]

Answers must be specific to chosen core study.

NB candidates may offer more than one suggestion. All marked and best ONE credited.

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

How this might affect the results

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 1-2 marks | 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). |
| 3-4 marks | 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. |

Total maximum 8 marks.

3 (a) Describe the findings of each of these studies. [12]

Named studies: **Deregowski** (perception); **Gould** (IQ testing); **Tajfel** (intergroup discrimination); **Hraba & Grant** (doll choice).

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

NB make no distinction between results/findings/conclusions.

Most likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Deregowski: via anecdotal evidence (Robert Laws, Mrs Fraser, etc) and empirical evidence (Hudson) perception of pictures is learned rather than inherited. Participants could not perceive aspects known by western researchers e.g. dog/lines on paper; profile, etc. Pictures are not lingua franca.

Gould: Nation of morons is United States with MA of 13. All Immigrants score lower and darker skin colour equates with lower IQ. Assumed inherited intelligence but really learned. Also legitimate is any problem with the testing procedures.

Tajfel: boys did not show max joint profit or largest in-group profit but maximum difference, showing in-group favouritism and out-group discrimination based on minimal categorisation.

Hraba: Findings from Clark & Clark; findings from Hraba & Grant and/or differences between the two studies.

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

0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1 mark	Identification of point (e.g. a sentence) relevant to question.
2 marks	Brief description of point relevant to question but with no analysis (comment with no comprehension. OR two points relevant to question are identified.
3 marks	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.

Total maximum 12 marks.

- (b) Briefly discuss two advantages and two disadvantages of studying individual or cultural differences giving examples from any of these studies. [12]

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

Important note: As candidates are required to **discuss**, point 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.

Most likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Adv: allows us to discover that not all cultures are the same; to discover the diversity of behaviour and experience.

Adv: may allow discovery of the causes of prejudice & discrimination; to realise that our values are not the only ones possible; educates us not to make value judgements.

Adv: may allow discovery of what behaviours are learned and what behaviours are inherited.

Disadv: sample may be small or not representative. Cannot generalise- this would be ethnocentric

Disadv: cultures have different philosophies (eg competition v co-operation) and so cannot be compared.

Disadv: researchers may speak different languages; participants may misunderstand and researchers may misunderstand.

Disadv: behaviours change over time and some cultures may change more quickly than others. What is found at one point in time may change rapidly.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points

0 marks No answer or incorrect answer. 0

1 mark Any one of three [point/example/comment].

2 marks Any two of three [point/example/comment].

3 marks All three [point/example/comment].

Total maximum 12 marks.

TOTAL MARKS: [24]

4 (a) Describe how the sample was selected in each of these studies. [12]

Named studies: **Schachter & Singer** (emotion); **Raine, Buchsbaum & LaCasse** (brain scans) **Milgram** (obedience) **Haney, Banks and Zimbardo** (prison simulation).

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

NB candidates can describe any aspect of the sample (eg numbers, male/female, allocation to conditions, control groups, etc); answers do not have to be specifically how the sample was selected.

Likely answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Schachter: All male college students taking introductory psychology. 184 Pt's. Receive 2 points on final exam for every hour they participate. Allocated randomly to one of for conditions: epi inf, epi mis, epi ign, & placebo.

Milgram: 40 males, aged 20-50 respondents to a newspaper ad. Represented various occupations. Paid \$4.50 No control group.

Raine: 41 (39 m 2 f) participants most pleading NGRI. All with 'problems' such as schizophrenia, head injury/organic damage. Matched with controls on age, sex and 6 schizophrenics. Sample is self-selecting.

Haney: 24 (or 22) from a pool of 75 respondents to a newspaper ad. Questionnaire and interview completed to screen. All were male, white college students. Randomly allocated to guards and prisoners. Paid \$15 per day.

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

0 marks No answer or incorrect answer.

1 marks Identification of point (e.g. a sentence) relevant to question.

2 marks Brief description of point relevant to question but with no analysis (comment with no comprehension). OR two points relevant to the question are identified.

3 marks 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.

Total maximum 12 marks.

- (b) Briefly discuss two advantages and two disadvantages of using a restricted sample of participants with examples from any of these studies. [12]

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

Important note: As candidates are required to **discuss**, point 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.

Possible answers (any appropriate answer receives credit):

Adv: participants are available and willing e.g. may be students (course credits) or may be volunteers (paid) or want to prove innocence!

Adv: more likely to do unethical things without question.

Adv: may be limited numbers and type e.g. male; can be used as pilot study before generalising; can stimulate further research.

Disadv: more likely to conform/consent/show demand characteristics if they are paid/receive course credits/ will get off murder!

Disadv: cannot generalise to other groups the restricted sample does not represent.

For each point up to a maximum of FOUR points

0 marks No answer or incorrect answer.

1 mark Any one of three [point/example/comment].

2 marks Any two of three [point/example/comment].

3 marks All three [point/example/comment].

Total maximum 12 marks.

TOTAL MARKS: [24]

**Mark Scheme 2542
June 2005**

GENERAL MARKING GUIDELINES**AS Psychology Unit 2542 - Psychological Investigations**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE is assessed at a standard appropriate for candidates who have completed the first half of a full Advanced GCE course i.e. between GCSE and Advanced GCE. Candidates will mainly be 17 years old writing under examination conditions. The mark scheme gives detailed guidance on the possible responses to each question.

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 which take an unusual approach not covered 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.

Where appropriate, instructions on assessing the quality of written communication in Unit 2542 will be covered in the Main Standardisation Meeting.

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 AS candidates who have completed one year 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.

Section A**Based on Activity A: Questions, self reports and questionnaires****1. Give an example of one of your questions. (2)**

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information

1 mark – the example given is unclear or incomplete (for example the candidate offers a statement with no indication of the possible responses).

2 marks – clear and complete example of a question is given

2. Outline two of your findings (4)

2 marks awarded for each finding as follows:

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

1 mark – finding is vague or unclear

2 marks – finding is clearly outlined

3. A researcher wishes to conduct a questionnaire asking people about their experiences of crime. Outline two ethical issues that this study might raise and suggest how each of these might be overcome.

Likely issues include: invasion of privacy, confidentiality, possibility of causing distress

Likely suggestions for overcoming the problems might include: assurances of anonymity, assurances that no information will be passed to authorities, ability to offer counselling or to refer to appropriate people if distress caused, ensuring questions are not distressing, ensuring that people are fully informed about the nature of the research before agreeing to participate . Any other appropriate answer can be credited.

3 marks for each issue to be awarded as follows:

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

1 mark – the candidate has identified an appropriate issue

2 marks – the candidate has clearly outlined an appropriate issue (by discussing in the context of questionnaires on crime for example) OR the candidate has identified an appropriate issue and made some attempt at suggesting how this might be overcome OR the issue is not clearly identified (or implied) but there is a clear suggestion.

3 marks – the candidate has clearly outlined an appropriate issue and has offered a clear suggestion for how this might be overcome. For three marks, the answer should be clearly related to questioning people about their experiences of crime.

Section B**Based on Activity B: An Observation****4. Describe how your observation was conducted (4)**

Good answers will include a full explanation of how the observation was conducted. Most likely answers will include details of where and /or when the observation was conducted, for how long the observation was conducted, what was observed (the categories or coding scheme used), who was observed and any details of debriefing etc.

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information

1 mark – very little detail has been given and replication would not be possible.

2 marks – some aspects of the observation have been described but there are crucial omissions and replication would not be possible.

3 marks – most aspects of the observation have been described but it would be difficult to replicate this.

4 marks – the observation has been fully described and replication would be possible.

5. Outline two weaknesses in the way that you conducted your observation. (4)

2 marks for each weakness.

Likely answers include: problems with categories or coding, (lack of) inter-rater reliability, problems associated with location, time or sample , ethical issues.

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information

1 mark – the weakness has been identified but has not been outlined in the context of the candidate's own observation or the answer lacks clarity

2 marks – the weakness is clearly described and outlined in the context of the candidate's own observation.

6. Suggest how each of these weaknesses might be overcome. (6)

Likely answers include: clarifying or changing categories, clarifying instructions, using more than one rater, observing for longer, in different locations, bigger sample etc

3 marks for each suggestion

0 marks – the candidate has not provided any creditworthy information

1 mark – very brief or general answer given with no detail and not made relevant to the candidate's own observation

2 marks – appropriate suggestion given with increasing detail but may still be largely general

3 marks – appropriate suggestion given which is well justified and made relevant to the candidate's own observation

Section C

Based on Activity C: Collection of data to investigate the difference between two conditions.

7. Name and describe the sampling method that you used to select your sample(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 but in general terms OR the candidate has described a sampling method in the context of their own investigation but this has not been named or has been incorrectly named.

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)

8. Describe the sample that you used for this investigation (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 or the candidate has given more than two pieces of information but there are crucial omissions.

3 marks – the candidate has given at least three pieces of information about the sample and this constitutes a full description.

9. 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) Candidates may also answer this question in relation to the specific characteristics of their sample, for example, all male or all students.

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 explained but not related to their own investigation.

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

**Mark Scheme 2544
June 2005**

1 a) Describe one behaviourist application to learning in schools. [6]

Candidates are required to focus on *applications* of behaviourism. Thus, answers which contain material referring entirely to behaviourist research or theory, with no educational application, can only achieve a maximum of 4 out of 6 (i.e. middle band). Where an answer contains behaviourist research or theory but proceeds to describe a behaviourist application to education, the answer may be marked out of the full range of marks.

Where candidates offer distinctly more than one behaviourist application, all applications should be marked with the best response receiving credit.

Weaker responses will be brief, lack detail, lack understanding of how the application may link to behaviourist principles.

Stronger responses will have more detail, clarity and demonstrate an understanding of how the applications relate to behaviourist principles

Likely answers:

Use of positive and negative reinforcement *e.g. in terms of correcting disruptive behaviour in schools. Examples may be specific methods e.g. use of star charts, time-out, loss of privilege/break time etc.*

Shaping *e.g. in terms of disruptive behaviour or in terms of teaching a skill, where rewards are given the closer the behaviour resembles the target behaviour.*

Token Economy *answers may refer generally to how token economies may be employed in schools, or based upon a case study e.g. Wells Park School.*

Premack Principle *i.e. where favoured activities may be used to reinforce less favoured activities. This is often the principle behind "Golden Time".*

Programmed learning *i.e. linear and branching.*

Systematic Desensitisation *i.e. as a treatment for school phobia where the sufferer is trained to associate relaxation with gradually introduced school-type stimuli.*

Social Learning Theory – *use of role models to promote "good behaviour" or aspirations.*

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe one behaviourist application. 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 behaviourist application 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 behaviourist application 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) Discuss the differences between behaviourist applications and cognitive or humanistic applications to learning. [10]

This answer is likely to take the form of explanations of the differences between the two perspectives' applications. Stronger responses may proceed to evaluate such differences in terms of their effectiveness in educational contexts, ethical or moral considerations, or implications for such applications.

Some answers may explain differences between the perspectives and then proceed to explain differences between applications. Such answers may be marked out of the full range of marks. It is possible that some candidates may simply describe a cognitive or humanist application to education with no attempt to either implicitly or explicitly draw out differences to behaviourist applications. Such answers will receive no credit.

Likely points of contrast/differences may refer to:

- Basic assumptions e.g. behaviourist applications treat people mechanistically (blank slate) or (black boxism) whereas:
 - cognitive applications view people as advanced information processors and thus focus more upon mental processes
 - Humanist applications view people as whole entities and embrace emotional aspects, phenomenology etc.
- Teaching and learning styles. Behaviourist applications tend to be teacher centred. Whereas:
 - While some cognitive applications are also teacher centred e.g. Ausubel expository learning, but many are more child-centred e.g. Bruner's discovery learning, Piaget's active-self-discovery, Vygotsky's scaffolding.
 - Humanist applications are very student centred.
- Individual Differences: behaviourist applications on the whole can be argued to ignore individual differences in learners, whereas Vygotsky's concept of scaffolding and ZPD implies individual tailoring for each learner. Humanism's phenomenological emphasis implies that teachers must always consider a classroom experience from that of each individual student.
- Effectiveness/Ethics/implications of applications

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to contrast behaviourist applications with cognitive and/or humanistic applications. 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 of difference are discussed in an appropriate way to the issue of applications. 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 discusses differences between behaviourist applications with other applications. 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)

2a) Describe one special educational need. [6]

Candidates are required to describe one special educational need. It is likely that this will take the form of describing the chosen SEN in terms of its symptoms, diagnostic criteria or techniques, prevalence or effects in the classroom. Some candidates may also refer to treatments and/or causes of the SEN.

Weaker responses are likely to be anecdotal or vague.

Stronger responses are likely to be more detailed and thorough and demonstrate an understanding of a SEN from a psychological point of view.

Likely answers:

- 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 coping with school routines, impact of limited language skills; more common in boys than girls. Prevalence approximately 1/1000. Affects 2-4 times as many boys than girls.
- 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

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe one SEN. 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 SEN 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 SEN. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total marks AO1 = 6

2b) Discuss the effectiveness of strategies for educating children with special needs. [10]

Candidates are required to consider how effective strategies for children with SEN are in the classroom. It is likely that candidates will consider the effectiveness of a number of strategies or interventions in turn. This may be for one or more specific SENs. Alternatively, candidates may try to evaluate more generic strategies such as inclusion versus segregation techniques.

Stronger responses will demonstrate good question focus, providing detailed discussion of the effectiveness of strategies for educating children with SEN. It is likely that stronger candidates will be able to consider both advantages and disadvantages of strategies 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 strategies may be minimal or superficial.

Likely content:

- 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.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies for educating children with special needs. 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 strategies for educating children with special needs. 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 strategies for educating children with special needs. 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 the design and layout of educational environments. (10)

It is expected that candidates will describe a number of research studies which address factors which influence performance or mood in educational settings. Factors which such studies are likely to deal with include noise, lighting, seating arrangement, décor, and temperature.

Stronger responses will be characterised by an ability to describe the studies accurately and in detail, as well as selecting studies which cover a range of the factors mentioned above. Students will, where appropriate, demonstrate knowledge of procedures, results and conclusions of such research.

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

Likely content:

Seating arrangement (e.g. Wheldall 1981 who found that rows increased on-task behaviour; Rosenfield 1985 who found that clusters increased on-task behaviour, rather than rows or circles.

Lighting (e.g. Cave 1998 or Riggio 1990)

Walls (e.g. Creekmore: Acquisition Wall, Dynamic Wall and Maintenance Wall)

Temperature (e.g. Pepler: compared test scores in Oregon schools with Temperature Control and those without and found more variability in the latter; Auliciems who compared test and IQ scores in British Schools in naturally varying temperatures. Found optimum scores attained at just below comfort level.)

Noise (e.g. Cohen et al who compared schools on and off LA flight path; Bronzaft, longitudinal study of the effects of noisy train track on reading age. Maxwell and Evans study of sound absorbent panels; Zentall's study of effects of rock music on hyperactive and autistic children)

Soft classroom (Sommer and Olsen 1980 changed furnishings and layout of lecture room in California).

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 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 and 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]

3b) Evaluate what psychologists have learned about the design and layout of educational environments. (16)

Candidates are required to evaluate research into the design and layout of educational environments.

Stronger responses will employ a range of evaluative issues effectively to analyse the evidence. 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:

- Ethics of research; some research may have exposed participants to a small degree of harm. However, in most cases, research on children is considered ethical providing that consent by teacher or guardian has been obtained.
- Ecological Validity of studies. Most research in this topic area is conducted in the classroom, and so has good ecological validity in this sense. However, some research may have employed a non-naturalistic task to measure the DV, lowering e.v.
- Any methodological problems of studies e.g. controls, validity, observer effects etc; some research (e.g. Wheldall and Rosenfield) involve observers sitting in on classrooms, which may create changes in the behaviour of the students.
- Practical implications; implications for teachers, implications for learners.

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]

3c) Suggest a classroom design for your psychology lesson that would have a positive effect on learning. Give reasons for your answer. (8)

Stronger responses will be characterised by a detailed suggestion, confidently linked to psychological research. The proposed design of the classroom will be linked to the activity of teaching and learning psychology.

Weaker responses will be more superficial, lacking detail as well as reference to psychological research.

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

Likely examples:

- Changing seating layout
- Walls; improving colour or posters etc
- Temperature control/air conditioning
- Noise abatement procedures etc.

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)

4a) Describe what psychologists have discovered about learning and teaching styles. [10]

It is expected that candidates will describe a number of classifications of learning and teaching styles. Candidates may also describe research investigating individual differences in learning styles such as gender or cultural differences.

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.

Likely content:

- Baumrind's 3 styles of teaching (re: Lewin's style of leadership)
- Curry's Onion Model (3 layers: Instructional Preference, Informational Processing Style, Cognitive Personality Style; inner layers more stable)
- Myers-Briggs (judger-perceiver; extrovert-introvert; sensor-intuit; thinker-feeler)
- Kolb's learning Style inventory
- Auditory, Visual or Kinaesthetic (/Practical) learning styles.
- Entwistle's Approaches to Studying Inventory (4 orientations: Meaning; Reproducing; Achieving; Non-academic)
- Honey & Mumford questionnaire
- Grasha's six learning styles (independent, dependent, competitive, collaborative, avoidant, participant)
- Formal Vs Informal teaching style (e.g. Bennett 1976)
- High Initiative-Low Initiative (Fontana 1995) Teaching Styles
- Behaviourist – traditional/teacher centred/didactic
- Humanistic – informal/student-centred/co-operative learning/discovery learning
- Severiens and ten Dam – gender differences on the ASI (females higher on reproduction; males higher on non-academic)

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 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 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

4b) Evaluate what psychologists have discovered about learning and teaching styles. [16]

Candidates are required to evaluate research into learning and teaching styles.

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 relevant evaluative points can receive credit including:

- Implications of learning styles for teachers e.g. imposition of greater work load
- Implications of teaching styles for students e.g. improved effectiveness, labelling (positive or negative)
- Any methodological issues regarding collection of data e.g. problems of inventories, forced choice, self report, likert scales etc.
- Determinism – some classifications of learning style suggest a pre-determined outcome for the learner. Others allow more flexibility.

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

4c) Suggest a learning style or study skill that could be applied to one topic area of your psychology course. Give reasons for your answer. [8]

It is envisaged that students will select a learning style that could be used when learning a part of the Psychology specification. For example, Practical Learners would benefit from practically experiencing core studies e.g. take part in a mini replication of Loftus and Palmer; competitive learners might benefit from competitive quizzes e.g. Weakest Link for an area of Psychology.

Stronger responses will be characterised by a detailed suggestion, confidently linked to psychological research, with an explanation of why such a learning style could work for this area.

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

Any suitable suggestions will be accepted.

Possible answers may be:

- Discovery learning
- Co-operative learning
- Receptive learning
- Specific cognitive strategies e.g. mnemonics

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	1a) or 2a)	1b) or 2b)	3a) or 4a)	3b) or 4b)	3c) or 4c)	Total
Assessment Criteria						
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)

Section D

Based on Activity D: Collection of data involving two independent measures and analysed using a test of correlation.

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 one variable (e.g. there will be no relationship between hours of sleep and the results)

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. a. Outline the conclusion that you reached in relation to the null hypothesis. (2)

Answers that make no reference to the null hypothesis will be awarded no marks.

Candidates should state a conclusion in relation to the null hypothesis. E.g. The null hypothesis, that there is no correlation between number of hours of television watched and the number of hours of homework completed was accepted and the (research) hypothesis rejected. We found no relationship between these two variables.

0 marks – the candidate has provided no creditworthy information.

1 mark – clear statement of acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis with no conclusion or attempt at stating whether null hypothesis was accepted or rejected with some attempt at a conclusion.

2 marks – clear statement of acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis with a clear statement of the conclusion

b. Explain how you reached this conclusion. (3)

Answers that make no reference to inferential statistical analysis will be awarded 0 marks.

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 – Reference is made to statistical analysis and the results are given although this answer lacks some clarity and is unlikely to mention significance levels / probability

3 marks –Reference is made to statistical analysis, the results are given and these are explained in terms of significance levels / probability. Understanding is clear.

12. A researcher conducted a study to see if there was a correlation between the average number of hours of television watched daily and teacher ratings of aggressive play in children. The scattergram displays the results. Outline two conclusions that can be drawn from this scattergram. (4)

Likely answers include: identifying a positive correlation between the two measures, or stating that as one increases so does the other, identifying participants who do not fit this pattern (e.g. high TV score / low aggressiveness score). Candidates may also offer any other conclusions that can be drawn from this graph such as average scores. It is not acceptable to offer comments on the validity or reliability of such scores.

2 marks for each conclusion

1 mark – conclusion is vague or not clearly stated

2 marks – conclusion is clearly stated with appropriate terminology

**Mark Scheme 2545
June 2005**

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) Outline one study on how practitioners interact with their patients. [6]

Most likely answers will choose a study on interpersonal skills or practitioner style or on diagnosis. Better answers will identify the study, what was done and what was found. Anecdotal answers that do not identify a study or comment on general issue will receive a maximum of 2 marks.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1 - 2 marks	The answer attempts to describe one study of patient-practitioner interaction. 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 of patient-practitioner interaction 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 of patient-practitioner interaction from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

(b) Discuss the problems patients have when they communicate with health workers. [10]

Most likely answers focus on communication issues such as sending and receiving messages, memory for technical messages, the process of diagnosis, etc. They may also mention methodological issues. The best answers will have a clear focus on the question throughout.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1 - 4 marks	The answer attempts to evaluate the problems that patients have when they communicate with health workers. 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 problems that patients have when they communicate with health workers. 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 the problems that patients have when they communicate with health workers. 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 control or manage pain.

[6]

There is a wide range of possible responses. Weaker answers may well just suggest some actions that might be taken to reduce pain, such as aspirin or deep breathing etc. Better answers will identify the psychological component of the technique and will focus on the idea of managing pain.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer
1 - 2 marks	The answer attempts to describe one technique to control or manage pain. 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 technique to control or manage pain 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 technique to control or manage pain from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

(b) Evaluate how psychologists measure the effectiveness of pain management programmes. [10]

The difficulties include the problems of self-reports, the effect of placebo, the issue of action research, etc. Weaker answers will look at the difficulties of measuring pain, and the stronger answers will consider the measurement of effectiveness.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1 - 4 marks	The answer attempts to evaluate how psychologists measure the effectiveness of pain management 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 measurement issues are raised and applied in an appropriate way to the ways that psychologists can measure the effectiveness of pain management 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 ways that psychologists measure the effectiveness of pain management 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.

Indicative content

3 Describe attempts to promote good health. [10]

Candidates may select a from a wide range of possible material in answer to this question. The most likely, and the most credit worthy responses will outline examples of empirical work on health promotion such as the three communities study. Candidates can also obtain some credit by looking at some general principles and describing ways to improve self-efficacy or locus of control for example. They might also look at information programmes and describe the Yale model of communication for example, or consider fear appeals.

The evaluation points are likely to include the problems of creating messages for a wide range of people, resistance to health messages, ethnocentric bias, the problems in measuring the effectiveness of programmes, individual differences in response, the difficulties in measuring health and its improvement, the lack of placebos and other controls.

It is likely that most candidates will be able to identify one technique to encourage people to eat a healthier diet, but weaker ones will find it difficult to provide an explanation for the likely success (or otherwise) of their suggestion..

4 Describe what psychologists have discovered about the causes and measurement of stress. [10]

Candidates can select from a wide range of material for this question. The answer does not need to have an even balance between causes and measurements, but candidates can not obtain the highest marks for evidence and understanding if they have concentrated on just one component. The most likely answers will give examples of empirical work on stress, though candidates that review theoretical and structural ideas can also obtain credit.

The evaluation points are likely to depend on the material selected in part(a), and may include the problems of measurement, the difficulties in defining stress, the contextual nature of stress (e.g. crowding is fun at a Robbie concert but not in a tube train). Issues of ethnocentrism, reactivity and usefulness of the research might also be constructively used.

It is likely that most candidates will be able to identify one technique to deal with the stress of going to the dentist, but weaker ones will find it difficult to provide an appropriate rationale that makes reference to theory and deals with the specific request in the question.

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 marks 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)

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 (b)

APPLICATION [A01/A02]

- 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 [A01/A02]

- 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 [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
June 2005**

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 study that demonstrates the effect of temporal conditions on workers. [6] [AO1]**

Most likely answers will identify the effects of shift work (Wedderburn), changes to the working week (Riggio) and Flexi-time (Dipboye et al). Better response will indicate how the temporal effect was measured.

Marks	Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe what is meant by temporal conditions. 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 the effects of temporal conditions 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 one temporal condition from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks: [6]

- (b) Discuss the difficulties in carrying out studies into the effect of temporal conditions on workers. [10] [AO2]**

Most likely difficulties will relate to the ecological validity of research, the effect of artificiality and observer effects.

Marks	Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to evaluate the difficulties of the research process. 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 difficulties of the research process places them into a psychological perspective. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer shows 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 difficulties of the research process. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks: [10]

- 2 (a) Using your psychological knowledge, describe one technique to improve communication in organisations. [6] [AO1]

Most likely answers will identify one stage in the communication process, encoding, transmission, reception, decoding and feedback. Stronger candidates will link their suggestion to the stages either side of the one they select.

Marks	Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe communication in organisations. 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 communication in organisations 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 communication in organisations from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks: [6]

- (b) Discuss the usefulness of carrying out studies on communication in organisations. [10] [AO2]

Most likely answers will consider issues from one of the stages of the communication process or include difficulties distinguishing between informal and formal communication. Also issues of non-control of variables, absence of control groups and individual differences.

Marks	Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to evaluate the usefulness in investigating communications. 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 usefulness in investigating communication in organisations. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer shows 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 usefulness investigating communication in an organisation. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks: [10]

Part (a) - AO1

3 (a) Describe what psychologists have learnt about job satisfaction. [10]

Candidates are likely to begin by identifying satisfaction as a reduction of stress or increased motivation. Candidates may refer to the effect of the following on job satisfaction: personality type - Type A and B, job task and working conditions with reference to quality of working life issues and motivational theories of Maslow, McClelland, Vroom. Candidates may also refer to methods of measuring job satisfaction such as JDS and JDI.

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 learnt about job satisfaction. [16]**

Most likely evaluation points will include, individual differences, problems of self report, demand characteristics and usefulness of the findings. Could include issues of suitable measurement scales to provide reliable and valid results taking into account response sets and sampling.

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) Using your psychological knowledge suggest one technique to improve the job satisfaction of employees on a farm selecting carrots into different sizes. Give reasons for your answer. [8]**

Better suggestions are likely to include details of job enrichment programmes and job re-design. Weaker candidates may give examples but not provide a suitable rationale linked to the above.

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)

4 (a) Describe what psychologists have learned about Human Resource practices.**[10]**

It is expected that most candidates will refer to job analysis techniques - interviews, observation and questionnaire. Better candidates will refer to known techniques such as functional job Analysis, Position Analysis Questionnaire and Critical Incident Technique.

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 learned about Human Resource practices. [16]**

Difficulties are likely to be associated with the problem of measuring performance. The reliability and validity of rating scales, relationships between appraiser and appraisee, effect of individual differences, bias and agreement on the process.

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) You are a psychologist advising a mobile phone company. Suggest one psychological technique to reward staff for achieving their sales targets. [8]**

It is likely that the candidates will select techniques that offer intrinsic or extrinsic rewards. Better candidates may develop the debate between a simple behaviourist model of reward and that of taking higher human needs into account.

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)

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

Mark Scheme 2547
June 2005

General advice to Assistant Examiners on the procedures to be used

- 1 The schedule of dates for the marking of this paper is of paramount importance. It is vital that you meet these requirements. If you experience problems then you must contact your Team Leader without delay.
- 2 Please ensure that you use the final version of the Mark Scheme which will be available at the end of the Examiner's Standardisation meeting. You are advised to destroy all draft versions.
- 3 An element of professional judgement is required in the marking of any written paper, and candidates may not use the exact words which appear in the detailed sheets which follow. If the Psychology is correct and also answers the question then the mark(s) should normally be credited. If you are in doubt about the validity of any answer then contact your Team Leader for guidance.
- 4 Mark in red. A tick (✓) should be used, at the appropriate point, for each answer judged worthy of credit.
- 5 Strike through all blank spaces and/or pages in order to give a clear indication that the whole of the script has been considered.
- 6 The mark total for each question should normally be ringed at the bottom right hand side.
- 7 In cases where candidates give multiple answers, mark the first answer(s) up to the total number required. In specific cases where this simple rule cannot be applied, the exact procedure to be used will be given in detail at the Examiners' Standardisation meeting.
- 8 Some questions may have a 'Level of Response' mark scheme.

1 (a) Outline research into one effect of urban living on behaviour [6]

Markscheme guidelines apply in that any relevant study or theory may be considered. For example, effect of urban living on health (e.g. Dohrenwend and Dohrenwend (1972) mental illness, Torrey and Bowler (1990) schizophrenia; Soderberg et al (1994) HIV – risky behaviour in cities. Effects of urban living on social behaviour e.g. Newman and McCauley (1977) eye contact; Milgram (1977) altruistic behaviour.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe a study which looks at the effect of urban living on behaviour. 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 on the effect of urban living on behaviour 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 on the effect of urban living on behaviour from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

(b) Discuss the difficulties of investigating the effect of urban living on behaviour. [10]

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. There is 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. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks [10]

2 (a) Describe *one* study investigating a technological catastrophe. [6]

Any study, which considers a technological catastrophe, may be used. For example, Buffalo Creek flood in West Virginia in 1972, Three Mile Island nuclear power accident in 1979; Bromet et al. (2000) Children of Chernobyl

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe a study on a technological catastrophe. 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 the question 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 on technological catastrophe from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks [6]

(b) Discuss the ethics of investigating technological catastrophes. [10]

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. There is 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. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks: [10]

Part (a) - AO1

3 (a) Describe psychological evidence on noise as an environmental stressor.

[10]

Candidates may begin with definitions and suggest sources of noise as a stressor. Negative effects of noise on **performance** may look at effects during or after exposure - e.g. studies looking at schoolchildren in noisy environments - Cohen, Glass and Singer 1973) high rise apartment over noise highway and also Cohen, Glass and Singer (1986) school near international airport, or Bronzaft and McCarthy (1975) reading skills of children in noisy environment; Belojevic et al (2001) mental arithmetic under noisy conditions

Social behaviour: there are many field studies or lab studies, e.g. Geen and O'Neal (1969) noise and aggression (electric shocks); Donnerstein and Wilson (1976) electric shocks; Matthews and Canon (1975) both a lab and a field study on helping behaviour; Page (1977) 3 studies, dropped books, building site, request for change; Sherrod and Downs (1974) types of sound/perceived control – asked for assistance in form filling. **Health:** Ng (2000) effect of building construction noise on residents health e.g. Eggertsen et al (1987) hypertension; Woodson (1986) smokers and noise; Cherek (1985) smokers, Cohen et al (1969) increased blood pressure in schoolchildren in noise environment.

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**3 (b) Evaluate psychological evidence on noise as an environmental stressor [16]**

Note: Any evaluative point can receive credit

*E.g. Ethics
Implications
How psychological gain their evidence
Individual differences
Cultural differences
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

- 3 (c) Suggest how your Head teacher could use music positively in your school/college. Using your knowledge of psychology, outline what she could say to the Governors to convince them it is a good idea. [8]

Mark scheme guidelines apply in that any reasonable suggestion is acceptable

Any evidence relating to the positive use of sound may be used. For example, Mozart effect can be used in relation to concentration, revision, pre-exam, etc.; also other studies can be adapted to educational situation e.g. reducing anxiety (use of music for medical or dental problems to reduce anxiety- Standley 1995); calming effect (calming music improved cows milk yield – Adrian North); reducing frustration (when holding on telephone Ramos 1993, North 1999); reducing stress (reduction of stress in surgery – Allen 2001)

Application (AO1/AO2)

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

4 (a) Describe what psychologists have found out about density and crowding

[10]

*Candidates may begin by differentiating between density and crowding (density – objective measure, referring to the number of people in a given space; crowding – subjective measure, referring to the psychological experience of density which will vary according to individual and social factors). Candidates may cite animals studies, e.g. Dubos (1965) lemmings; Christian (1960) Sika deer; Calhoun (1962) rats, as well as human studies looking at effects on health, performance and social behaviour. For example, effects on **health** – Lundberg (1976) –stress from crowding on commuter train, Evan (1979) increased blood pressure; effects on **performance** – Karlin (1979) crowding and effects on student grades, Saegert et al (1975) crowding and performance on drawing cognitive maps, Bruins and Barber (2000) physical and mental tasks in crowded supermarket; effects on **social behaviour** – Baum and Valins (1977) high density in the dorm, Bickman (1973) prosocial behaviour; Machleit et al (2000) crowded shops*

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 what psychologists have found out about density and crowding [16]

Note: any evaluative point can receive credit, e.g.

Implications

How psychologists gain their evidence

Individual differences

Laboratory vs. real life studies

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) Your local zoo is concerned about the crowding of its animals. Using your psychological knowledge of either animal or human studies, suggest how you can reduce the effects of crowding. Give reasons for your answer. [8]

Markscheme guidelines apply in that any reasonable suggestion is acceptable. For example, the work of Calhoun (1962) laboratory rats, or Christian (1955) Sika deer, Channing (2001) hens in different social densities; or human studies eg Baum and Valins (1977) subdivide living spaces; Savinar (1975) greater ceiling height; Mandel et al (1980) brightness leading to perception of less crowding.

Application (AO1/AO2)

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 0 marks | No suggestion(s) made OR suggestion(s) is made which is inappropriate to the assessment request. |
| 1-2 marks | Appropriate suggestion(s) is made but is based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence. |
| 3-4 marks | Suggestion(s) is made that is appropriate to the assessment request and is based on appropriate psychological evidence. The suggestion(s) 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. |
| 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
June 2005

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) Outline one model of self-confidence used by sports psychologists. [6]

The question can be responded to using sports specific models or other models from more traditional psychology, which may be used by sports psychologists. Most likely responses include Vealey's Sport Confidence model or Bandura's Theory of Self Efficacy. Other models, such as Harter's Competence Motivation Theory, are also acceptable, as are models that improve self-confidence, such as cognitive self-talk models.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to outline one model of self-confidence used by sport psychologists. 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 model of self-confidence used by sport psychologists, 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 model of self confidence used by Sport Psychologists from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks: [6]

(b) Compare models of self-confidence used by sports psychologists. [10]

The evaluation requires similarities and/or contrasts ie only similarities or only contrasts are acceptable, as are examples of both. Likely evaluation issues are usefulness to sport (comparing sports specific models to the application of non sports specific models) or validity.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to compare models of self-confidence used by sports psychologist. 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 compare models of self-confidence used by sports psychologists. There is 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 compare models of self-confidence used by Sports Psychologists. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks: [10]

2 (a) Briefly outline research that investigates home advantage in sport. [6]

*The question asks for **research** so theories, studies or concepts are all acceptable. Research that considers how strong home advantage actually is, or when it is a disadvantage, is equally acceptable. Why it is an advantage, or its relation to audience characteristics, are further possible approaches.*

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to briefly outline research which investigates home advantage in sport. 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 briefly outlines research that investigates home advantage 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 clearly but briefly outlines 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]

- (b) Discuss the limitations of research which investigates home advantage in sport. [10]

Any evaluation issues which are relevant are acceptable and they must address the limitations part of the question. Hence, methodological limitations are most likely. Another possibility regards the ethnocentric nature of so much of the research from the US (note the term home court advantage, for example).

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to discuss the limitations of research which investigates home advantage in sport. 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 home advantage in sport. There is 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 discuss the limitations of research into home advantage in sport. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total Marks: [10]

Section B

3 (a) Outline what psychologists have learned about personality and sport. [10]

Candidates may look at attempts to define personality, the variety of what different researchers understand by the term 'personality', different attempts to measure personality, the theoretical approaches to personality or its effect on sport performance, comparing the athlete to the non-athlete or whether different personalities are best suited to different sports, or even positions within a sports team, for example.

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 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]

(b) Evaluate what psychologists have learned about personality and sport. [16]

Note – any evaluative point may receive credit eg:

*validity
reliability of measures
nature / nurture
generalisability
ethnocentrism*

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: [16]

- (c) You are the team coach for a chosen sport. How would you respond to a player who suggested to you that they were playing in the wrong position? Give reasons for your answer. [8]

Suitable answers will include the use of personality measures (eg to ascertain personality in relation to player position), the use of behavioural techniques, or responding to different personality types.

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 suggest 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]

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

4 (a) Describe what psychologists have discovered about attitudes to exercise and sport. [10]

Candidates may look at attributions, links between exercise and physical health, exercise and mental health and mood states, participation in exercise and sport, burnout and withdrawal.

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]

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

- (b) Evaluate what psychologists have discovered about attitudes to exercise and sport.** **[16]**

Note – any evaluative point may receive credit eg:

*validity
reliability
methodological issues (eg limited sample)
different perspectives
ethical concerns*

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]

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

- (c) What advice would you give to an athlete who seemed to be suffering 'burnout', to help them to avoid withdrawal from the sport? Give reasons for your answer. [8]

Various suggestions are acceptable, better answers should deal with the relationship between burnout and withdrawal. It should be evident that candidates are familiar with the terminology, and apply it practically.

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]

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

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

**Mark Scheme 2549
June 2005**

Section A

1 (a) Describe one approach to crime prevention. [6]

Answers may describe environmental crime prevention, or the range of primary, secondary or tertiary crime prevention approaches. The primary, secondary or tertiary approaches may be supported by illustrative evidence about the effectiveness of such measures for example Sure Start programmes, JLB, ARB in Northants, restorative justice. Environmental crime prevention may include evidence including Newman and Feldman. The best answers will be clearly related to an approach and the evidence will be accurate, detailed and informed.

Answers which describe punishments or treatments cannot be credited unless part of an argument on prevention..

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to describe approaches to crime prevention. 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 approaches to crime prevention 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 approaches to crime prevention from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks [6]

Assess the effectiveness of crime prevention measures.**[10]**

Answers can focus on the inability to show a causal link between some prevention measures and any reduction of crime especially with measures such as Sure Start. Restorative justice programmes may be evaluated in light of matched evaluations conducted by providers, environmental prevention can be evaluated by research or practical measures. The best answers will remain clearly focussed on effectiveness and will cover a range of points with detail and understanding. Weaker answers which are not targeted on effectiveness can only attract a maximum of 4 marks. Usefulness can be considered part of effectiveness. **The usual general evaluation issues can apply.**

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to evaluate effectiveness of crime prevention. 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 issues are raised and applied in an appropriate way to the issue of effectiveness of crime prevention. 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 crime prevention measures. 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) Outline how procedures and techniques are used in the courtroom to persuade the jury. [6]

A range of answers are acceptable. Most likely answers will include Pennington and Hastie (1993); Pennington and Hastie (1988); Aronson et al (1997). Primacy and recency effects, rhetorical strategies and the Yale Model of Persuasion may also appear. **Pre-trial bias is not considered relevant to this question. Manipulating appearance as a technique is allowed as is use of screens in the courtroom. Asch study could be made relevant as could Loftus and Palmer. Credit depth or breadth (procedures and/or techniques). Attractiveness could be relevant if clearly expressed as a deliberate tactic to persuade the jury.**

The best answers will be able to describe the research with reference to method used, sample, results and application to the courtroom. Weaker answers may describe the research without application to the question or with little detail.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-2 marks	The answer attempts to outline how procedures and techniques are used in the courtroom to persuade the jury. 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 procedures and techniques are used in the courtroom to persuade the jury 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 how procedures and techniques are used in the courtroom to persuade the jury from a psychological perspective. The answer is detailed, well organised and the candidate clearly understands what they have written.

Total Marks [6]

Evaluate the usefulness of research into persuasion in the courtroom.

[10]

Answers may include evidence relating to the use of mock and shadow juries, the consequences of decision making, samples. Generalising of research from other areas of psychology to the courtroom. The best answers will remain focussed on usefulness. Weaker answers will drift into other issues. With no explicit reference to usefulness the maximum mark should be 4.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks	The answer attempts to evaluate the usefulness of research into persuasion in the courtroom. 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 issues are raised and applied in an appropriate way to the issue of usefulness of research into persuasion in the courtroom. 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 usefulness of research into persuasion techniques in the courtroom. 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]

Part (a) – AO1

3 (a) Describe what psychologists have found out about the processes and factors affecting witness testimony. [10]

A wide range of evidence is likely to be presented. The answer should focus not just on an accurate presentation of the research, but also on how this relates to processes and factors that relate to witness testimony, i.e. to make explicit the findings of the research. Loftus and Palmer is likely to feature heavily, as is Loftus et al (1987) research on weapon focus; Buckholt et al (1975) and Thomson (1995). Any appropriate evidence can be credited.

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 the processes and factors affecting witness testimony. [16]

Reliability of eye witness testimony is most likely to appear; other evaluation issues can be methodology, ethics, ecological validity, sampling.

*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) You are a police officer and you have been given some clear eyewitness accounts of the appearance of a suspect. Explain how you could use an identikit or an identity parade to help identify the suspect. Give reasons for your answer.
[8]

*Answers could include seeing suspects in a parade one at a time, rather than all together with no indication of how many suspects are going to appear (Cutler and Penrod); not being shown any pictures of suspects beforehand (Bruce, 1988); the use of foils (Ainsworth, 2000). Use of computer blended images for identikit pictures (Bruce, 1988); use of sketches of suspect by witnesses rather than photofit pictures (Davies et al, 1978). The best answers will have a clear link to psychological research. Weaker answers with no psychological references can attract a **maximum** of 2+2. Distinction needs to be made between a candidate who merely chooses one of the options and one who justifies the choice clearly.*

Application (AO1/AO2)

- 0 marks No explanations given OR suggestions are made which are inappropriate to the assessment request.
- 1-2 marks An appropriate explanation is given but it is based on anecdotal or peripherally relevant psychological evidence.
- 3-4 marks An explanation is given 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)

- 4 (a) **Describe what psychologists have found out about offender profiling.** [10]

Probable answers will include both the US and the UK approaches. CATCHEM database and other data bases. Research into effectiveness of profiling, e.g. Copson (1995), Jackson et al (1997) etc can also be credited. A case study may also be credited, but must include details that relate to what psychologists have found out about offender profiling rather than upon the details of the case where not relevant. The best answers will have good detail and cover several points. Weakest answers will show a sketchy understanding of profiling and may refer to media fictitious creations.

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 offender profiling. [16]

Effectiveness, usefulness, reliability, sample, validity, generalisation, competing perspectives and other appropriate evaluation issues may be credited.

*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) **The police are investigating a series of unusual murders. Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest why they should call in an offender profiler.** [8]

Suggestions can focus on perceived effectiveness of offender profiling referring to research such as Copson, the nature of the crime lending itself to one approach (organised/disorganised/top down/bottom up), the use of offender profiling as one of the tools used by police to solve crime.

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)

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

Report on the Units

June 2005

Chief Examiner's Report

And now, the end is near, and so I write my final Chief Examiner's report. I have enjoyed being involved with this specification from the original design to being Chief Examiner for the last 12 years. I like to think that it has provided a framework for stimulating and challenging lessons for students. I have certainly been impressed with the work that students have produced under the guidance of their teachers.

I would like to thank the community of OCR psychology teachers for the way they have responded so positively to our attempts to create an interesting course, and for the constructive way and friendly way you have dealt with me and the other examiners. I hope you've found the course a positive experience for you and your students and that you continue to enjoy it in the future.

With regard to the more important matter of the examinations this summer, the following report considers each of the papers in turn. All of the papers have settled in and students commonly know what to expect and respond appropriately. One issue that attracted some attention was the design of 2540 (Core Studies 1). Some questions appeared on the back page after a space at the bottom of the preceding questions. A number of candidates appear not to have followed the rubric to TURN OVER and so could not get any marks for the last section of the paper. There are two schools of thought here. One says that students should be more observant and realise that they have not finished the paper. If you look at the paper it states clearly that there are 20 questions in the rubric and it also clearly states 'turn over' in large font at the bottom of page three. The other school of thought says that there is no value in putting extra hurdles in the way of students. OCR's own research on sources of difficulty in questions suggests there is a distinction to be made between appropriate and inappropriate sources of difficulty. There is obviously no intention to assess whether candidates can follow rubric instructions. Therefore, although the Awarding Committee decided that no form of remedial action was appropriate for candidates who appear to have failed to follow this clear and appropriate paper rubric, it did request that future question papers are reviewed to consider whether any further action is required.

Encouraging evaluation skills in students is never easy because they want the answers rather than being told to think and come to their own conclusions. There is a general issue about the way that some students present evaluation issues and then do not show any understanding of them. It was pleasing to see some newer ideas being introduced this year such as 'obligation effects' (Birtchnell, 2004). The obligation effect is often found with questionnaires. When participants are asked to answer a large number of questions, they often feel obliged to fill in the questionnaire even if they may not have any views on the topic being asked. As a result, the researchers record a lot of inauthentic responses. On the topic of new issues there is also an observation from examiners of the Mrs Doubtfire Effect which is the tendency for students to refer to female psychologists (and monkeys) as 'he'.

Finally, the specification depends on the engagement it has with its teachers and you are encouraged to keep in contact with the Board with comments and suggestions. In case you are not aware of it, there is an e-list of OCR teachers to join at <http://community.ocr.org.uk/list/listinfo/psychology-a>. We would also point you in direction of the Association for the Teaching of Psychology (ATP) who can be contacted through their website (www.theatp.org/).

2540: Core Studies 1

General comments

The paper elicited a range of responses from candidates, with answers being awarded the full spectrum of marks, suggesting that the paper provided good differentiation between candidates. Some candidates showed both excellent content knowledge and good understanding of psychological concepts and methodologies, whilst others showed little understanding of either Psychology or the core studies.

Some candidates lost marks by not following the instructions in the question to 'identify', 'outline' or 'explain', the latter requests requiring some exemplification for full marks. It is therefore vital that students are made aware of the need to expand on their answers depending on the question request and of the importance of reading the question carefully and answering the actual question asked. It is also important to note that reference to the original studies is necessary for teachers of this specification to gain accurate details about the core studies.

Though a relatively small proportion of the total entry, a number of candidates failed to answer all 20 questions and answered only up to question 16. Students must be made aware of the fact that there will always be 20 questions; one for each of the core studies. All other candidates were able to finish the paper in the time allowed. This was a very pleasing paper to mark as it allowed candidates who had prepared well to show their knowledge and understanding of the studies at all levels of ability.

Comments on individual questions

Question 1

Answered well, although some candidates got confused between the trident illusion and the spear in the Hudson picture of the antelope and hunter. Good answers described the procedure and why 3D perceivers found the trident harder to replicate.

Question 2

This question was answered well by the majority of candidates who were able to explain the concept of rewards or reinforcement or conditioning.

Question 3

Nearly all candidates correctly identified the normal, autistic or Downs Syndrome groups of children.

Question 4

This question required an explanation of how two features were standardised. Most candidates could identify two standardised features but some failed to explain how they were standardised. Good answers referred to features being the same for all participants, showing a good understanding of standardised procedures.

Question 5

Generally answered well, although some candidates were confused and referred to the second stage of the experiment where children were left to play with the toys. Good answers made reference to the nursery teacher or experimenter using a 5-point scale to observe the children at nursery in order to measure pre-existing levels of aggression to match the groups.

Question 6

Answers referred to both findings and conclusions from Samuel and Bryant; both were awarded appropriate marks.

Question 7

Good answers referred to similarities in appearance, including the glasses and blinkers and the moustache and the black around the horse's mouth. Some candidates referred to other details from the study rather than answering the question directly.

Question 8

- (a) Many students were able to give specific examples of qualitative and quantitative data, including the Rutter scale. Weaker answers were unable to distinguish between the two types of data collected.
- (b) Answered well, although some candidates gave a general strength of quantitative data, without relating the strength to the study by Hodges and Tizard, as was requested in the question.

Question 9

The majority of candidates were able to explain why the CPT was done prior to the PET scan, most referring to the standardising of brain activity, overcoming the effects of anxiety, increasing the metabolic activity in preparation for the PET scan.

Question 10

Full mark answers referred to the fact that the split-brain patients had epilepsy and therefore were not representative of a wider population, as their brain functioning may be different; others mentioned the side effects of the split-brain surgery. Weaker answers merely stated that the sample was too small without expanding! these were awarded partial marks.

Question 11

The full range of marks (1-4) was awarded for this question. Good answers referred to the different components of emotion and related conclusions to the study itself. Weaker answers referred to the findings of the study without explaining what they show about emotion.

Question 12

- (a) Most students referred to caffeine and alcohol as the substances participants were instructed not to have on the day of the experiment. Others referred to substances not referred to in the study, including cheese.
- (b) This question was answered well with reference to these substances being in other products, having to rely on the word of the participant or the fact that these substances can stay in the body for a long period of time.

Question 13

Examples of in/out groups were identified well, although some candidates failed to 'describe' their example for the two marks. Some candidates just gave the findings from the Tajfel study so obviously misreading the question.

Question 14

Good answers referred to the fact that the participants were screened prior to the study and any reactions were therefore due to the prison situation rather than their disposition. Others referred only to the reactions of the prisoners and guards and so were awarded partial marks.

Question 15

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to suggest one way in which the study was low in ecological validity in more detail than merely the fact it was a laboratory study.
- (b) This question was also answered well with some reference to experimental realism giving details of how the participants were led to believe the situation was real.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

Question 16

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify one ethical guideline which was broken but for full marks they were required to outline how it was broken.
- (b) This was answered well by some who referred to the fact that participants could withdraw to another carriage, were only observed in a public place, were not physically harmed and others referred to the confidentiality of participants' names. However, others were unsure and stated inaccuracies such as the participants being debriefed or no stress being caused.

Question 17

The majority of candidates could identify one of the IQ tests used by Gould and were able to describe the type of test.

Question 18

Most candidates understood the problems of using dolls to measure racial identification and racial preference and were able to articulate these well. Weaker answers just stated that dolls are not real people, without explaining why this is a problem.

Question 19

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify two tests completed by Eve from IQ, memory, and projective/ink blot. Wrong answers included hypnosis.
- (b) Again, a well answered question with the majority of candidates able to recognise that an independent tester would reduce bias on the part of the researchers who were involved and, therefore, potentially biased.

Question 20

- (a) Very well answered with many thoughtful explanations about why the health professionals labelled the pseudo patients as being mentally ill, including the context the patients were in, reasons for erring on the side of caution etc.
- (b) Again, candidates performed well on this question explaining the details of how legitimate patients were rated as being pseudo patients in the second study. Some candidates misread this question as 'why' the health professionals made Type 1 errors rather than 'how' and lost marks as a result. This reinforces the need for candidates to read the questions carefully, especially in this case where the question stem contained information to help them answer the question.

2541: Core Studies 2

General comments

This year, the marks achieved by candidates covered the entire mark range and this is no different from any other year. What is also the same is that whilst many candidates get the mark they deserve, there are those who show detailed knowledge and understanding and should score high marks, but do not because of faulty examination technique. From the view of the examiner, who wants the candidate to score high marks, there is nothing more frustrating than the able candidate who has poor technique.

Questions 1 and 2 part (a) are generally well-answered by most candidates. Questions 3 and 4 part (a) are also well answered, even though candidates must write about all four studies. The marks to Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 part (b) cover the entire range of marks with candidates either following the requirements of the mark scheme closely or not at all. To a great extent, this is centre-based. Questions 1 and 2 part (c) are initially well answered, but many candidates fail to address the second part of the question directly.

It is important to note that part (b) for all four questions has assessment based on range, with marks being allocated for the number of points made by a candidate rather than the quality or depth of an answer. Reference to the mark scheme will clarify this point.

The mark scheme for part (b) allocates marks to answers for three components:

- a general strength (or weakness), relevant to the topic area;
- specific example from the chosen study (if question 1 or 2) or any of the four studies (if question 3 or 4);
- a comment about either the example or strength/weakness.

Many candidates applied these aspects of the mark scheme with variable success. Least successful was the approach which achieved no marks because candidates provided insufficient detail. For example, some wrote "one strength is control, an example of this is Dement and validity is high". This scores no marks because there is no explanation and certainly no discussion as the question asks. A second type of answer which was a little more successful was where candidates write that "one weakness is low ecological validity", a relevant example is then provided and then "this means that the study does not apply to real life". This type of answer scores no marks initially for the weakness, perhaps one mark for the relevant example and then one mark not for comment but because the weakness is now explained, the first and third parts of the answer combining together to give a general strength or weakness. Candidates adopting this strategy thus scored no marks for the comment component. The most successful strategy is to provide a brief explanation of what the strength or weakness is, to provide a relevant example that relates to the strength/weakness and to consider an extension comment which may be evaluation or implication or other comment of the point being made. It is also worth noting that the strengths or weaknesses must be relevant to the topic area and not generalised points which could apply to any question.

Question part (c) requires candidates to suggest an alternative way of gathering data and to consider the effect this change may have on the result. Most candidates were able to suggest an alternative successfully and scored high marks. However, the second part of the question, the effect on results, was a different matter altogether. Many candidates considered the *implications* of the change, that they would be more ecologically valid, for example, but they tended not to consider the actual result. For example, if the Loftus and Palmer study did involve participants viewing a real car crash, then the effect on the results may be that participants remember more detail as the event is real or it may be that participants remember less because they become emotionally involved. Both of these answers consider the actual effect on the results.

Comments on individual questions

Section A: Questions 1 and 2

For question 1, candidates chose from one of three core studies, those of Dement and Kleitman, Loftus and Palmer, and Bandura, Ross and Ross. Although the Loftus and Palmer 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: Freud, Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin, and Rosenhan. Preference here was distinctly in favour of Freud.

Question part (a): pleasingly very few candidates scored 0, 1 or 2 marks, with most descriptions scoring higher. For top marks, candidates did have to describe how data were actually gathered, rather than just a description of the procedure of the study. Some candidates needed to be mindful of examination strategy and write an amount equivalent to the 6 marks allocated to this question part.

Question part (b) required candidates to discuss two strengths and two weaknesses. Many candidates scored maximum marks with ease, producing answers which showed full understanding and excellent knowledge of psychological terms and concepts. Others appeared not to have prepared for the examination at all and struggled to score any marks.

For question 1 (laboratory studies), the more common strengths and weaknesses included:

- control over extraneous variables;
- the laboratory setting providing for precise measurement of the dependent variable;
- that controlling variables may make the study reductionist;
- that the laboratory setting and/or task is not true to real life.

For question 2, (everyday settings) the more common strengths and weaknesses included:

- Participants are in a natural environment and so should behave naturally! They do not know their behaviour is being recorded. There are no demand characteristics.
- The setting is real life and the task/behaviour being recorded is real: ecological validity is very high.
- Control of extraneous variables may be very difficult.
- One variable cannot be isolated and so cause and effect less likely to be determined.

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.

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 4 on 'restricted samples' appeared to be the easier of the two questions available, candidates who chose it soon realised it was equivalent to question 3 in level of difficulty. In fact, the two questions were probably chosen equally. Choosing question 3 part (a) required them to describe the findings of each of the studies, whereas for question 4 identification of aspects of the sample (such as whether they were paid, etc) was sufficient to score marks.

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

For question 3 (individual/cultural differences), the more common strengths and weaknesses included:

- It allows us to discover that not all cultures are the same; to discover the diversity of behaviour and experience.
- It may allow discovery of the causes of prejudice and discrimination; to realise that our values are not the only ones possible; educates us not to make value judgements.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

- Different cultures have different philosophies (eg. competition vs. co-operation) and so cannot be compared.
- Researchers may speak different languages; participants may misunderstand and researchers may misunderstand.

For question 4 (restricted samples), the more common strengths and weaknesses included:

- Participants are available and willing. For example, they may be students (course credits) or may be volunteers (paid) or want to prove innocence!
- Volunteers may be more likely to do unethical things without question.
- Participants may be more likely to conform/consent/show demand characteristics if they are paid/receive course credits/ will get off murder!
- We cannot generalise to other groups the restricted sample does not represent.

2542: Psychological Investigations

General Comments.

The standard of scripts this session was high with the majority of candidates being able to describe and evaluate their data-collecting activities, as well as identify strengths and weaknesses. Several examiners commented on the high quality of responses to questions such as question 3, 6 and 9 in comparison to previous sessions.

However, despite an overall increase in candidates' performance, it is still evident that candidates who are encouraged to conduct independent activities (or at least where candidates are encouraged to contribute to the design of the activity) show a far better understanding of the methodological issues raised by their activities than those candidates who appear to have conducted activities designed solely by the teacher.

It is also evident that the length of candidates' answers has an expected relationship to their marks. Candidates who explain their answers in detail were far more likely to score full marks and centres should encourage candidates to write full answers to questions and to ensure that they use the full time allocation for this paper. In a similar fashion, candidates who relate their answers directly to their own activities (or whichever context is asked for in the question) will score more marks than candidates who give more general responses with no reference or relevance to their own activities.

Finally, several examiners commented on the lack of psychological context of many activities. Whilst a questionnaire on any topic, or a correlation between any two variables, will teach candidates about research methods, centres are strongly encouraged to conduct clearly psychological research.

Ethical Issues

This year showed a marked increase in the number of centres conducting unethical research. In serious cases, centres will be contacted individually to inform them of OCR's concerns but it is worth reminding centres that the Ethical Guidelines issued by OCR for the conduct of the Practical Report in Unit 2543 also apply to this unit. In particular, candidates should not be asking their participants for personal information or for any information that might be considered 'sensitive'. This would prohibit for example, the use of GCSE or IQ scores, asking people to rate their self-esteem or feelings about their body, and would certainly prohibit questionnaires asking people about their sexual preferences, sexual experiences, attitudes to drugs, alcohol, abortion and so on. Finally, several centres are allowing candidates to conduct experimental research with participants under the age of 16 and this is strictly prohibited by OCR.

Comments on individual questions

Section A: Questions, self-reports and questionnaires

1. Most candidates scored full marks for this question with marks only being lost by those candidates who offered an incomplete example; for example, a statement rather than a question with no indication of what the question actually was or how participants should respond to the statement.
2. Again, most candidates answered this correctly with the only problems arising when candidates simply gave a numerical result; for example, '60% of participants said yes' with no further detail or clarification.
3. This question achieved good differentiation between candidates. Stronger candidates described two ethical issues clearly and discussed them in the context of the question

(crime) as well as offering appropriate suggestions for dealing with these issues. Candidates offering two very general issues with no reference to research on crime were unable to score more than four marks. A significant minority of weaker candidates discussed non-ethical issues such as social desirability and these answers were obviously not credited.

Section B: An Observation

4. This question achieved good differentiation between candidates. For four marks, candidates needed to provide enough detail to allow replication of the observation. A significant proportion of candidates failed to give any information at all about what behaviours they were actually observing. As in previous sessions, highly complex observations were often difficult for candidates to describe clearly and centres are reminded that these activities need not be complex ones.
5. There were some very good answers to this question (and question 6) and centres are obviously preparing candidates well for this question. However, weaker candidates simply gave very general weaknesses without any reference to their observation and some answered question 6 in their answer and then had to repeat themselves. Candidates could be encouraged to read the three questions in a section before they start writing.
6. As with question 5, there were often very general suggestions offered with no reference to the candidate's own observation and these failed to achieve full marks. Even when the suggestions were more specific, candidates often failed to explain or justify their suggestions or did not make it clear why the suggestion would overcome the weakness. Although centres are clearly preparing candidates for this type of question, candidates should also be encouraged to write detailed answers to questions worth 6 marks. A common misunderstanding shown by candidates was that simply having another observer does not guarantee inter-rater reliability.

Section C: Comparison of two conditions

7. The sampling method described was almost always opportunity sampling and, although candidates clearly understand this, they often failed to describe this in the context of their own investigation. The word 'random' is still overused by candidates and causes a great deal of confusion (for example, many candidates state that they used an opportunity sample where they selected people randomly from the common room). Examiners also saw confusion over the term 'self-selecting' this session, with candidates from several centres believing that this means that the researcher selects the participants.
8. Almost all candidates scored three marks here.
9. There was a wide range of responses to this question with many very general responses failing to achieve full marks. As with other six-mark questions, candidates need to be encouraged to write more detailed responses and to relate their responses to their own investigations.

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'. A larger minority wrote 'no positive correlation' or 'no negative correlation'. More worryingly, the activities conducted by some candidates were not actually correlations, having clear IV – DV effects or including variables such as gender.

11. (a) Candidates often included material here that was more relevant to 11(b). Some candidates gave no conclusion at all and some made no reference to the null in their answer. There was evidence of poor terminology here with hypotheses frequently described as 'wrong' or 'right'.
- (b) Quite a large number of candidates made no reference to statistical analysis here while others copied out the entire calculation. Some confused critical and calculated (observed) 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 significant numbers of 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.
12. Most candidates were able to offer one conclusion and this was usually that there was a (weak) positive correlation between the number of hours of television watched and the teacher rating of aggressive play in children. Fewer candidates were able to score marks for their second conclusion, with many offering the same conclusion again. Acceptable answers included comments about anomalies in the data, average number of hours of television watched or average aggression levels or any conclusion that could be drawn from the scattergraph. Weaker candidates suggested that the graph showed that watching television did make children more aggressive and a surprising number misread the question and thought that it was the aggressive play of the teachers that was being rated.

2543 Psychological Research Report

General Comments

Generally, the standard is very similar to last year with continuing centre effects. Many centres have taken time and care in the preparation and reporting of the practical project and in the supervision of the assignment. Most centres advised their candidates to keep their work within the maximum word limits and this helped their candidates gain marks for conciseness. Some candidates were referred to The Regulations Committee under malpractice procedures for significantly exceeding the word limit. The Committee judged that they should only be marked up to the maximum of 1400 words for the practical project and 1000 words for the assignment. Declaring false word counts was deemed to be even more serious. (See 'Note from OCR' at the end of this section.)

Most investigations conformed to the ethical guidelines and proposal forms were enclosed with the reports. In centres where candidates submitted a wide variety of practical projects, which clearly reflected their interests, greater understanding of the research process was shown within the reports. In centres where candidates' choice of practical project was restricted to specific areas or to a limited number of projects, the risk of plagiarism was significantly increased and the candidates lacked ownership of their project. Within class sets, candidates were expected to investigate their own individual hypotheses with different variables or by different methods.

Assignments, in response to the three tasks in the specification, related a source, usually a newspaper article, to psychology. The vast majority of candidates found their own suitable source and identified appropriate issues. However, weaker candidates or those who received less guidance had a tendency to use AS core studies inappropriately. Candidates generally received appropriate guidance in the selection of their sources and areas to research evidence. Candidates should be encouraged to clearly number the parts of the assignment to correspond to the tasks set in the specification.

Comments on Individual Questions

The Practical Project

Reports for the practical project almost always followed the standard format and only used the first person in the discussion. Most centres were aware of requirements of the practical project and appeared to offer appropriate levels of supervision and guidance to candidates.

The abstracts were usually clear and concise.

The backgrounds were generally well written with clear concise information that led to the aim and operationalized hypotheses. However, some candidates gave very brief psychological backgrounds, while others failed to show how the background related to the aim or hypotheses. Some candidates did not operationalize their hypotheses. It should be clear from an operational hypothesis exactly what was measured.

Methodology sections were clear and judged to be replicable. Unfortunately, some candidates omit vital materials and many do not describe their sample. It is not advisable to name the centre either here or in the discussion, as this is a breach of confidentiality. There was some redundancy of effort, and a waste of words, in the repetition of controls and ethics under separate headings, especially if the points made had already been incorporated within the procedure.

The presentation of data and appropriate analysis were good. However, many candidates did not appropriately display the data or show any understanding of their findings. Pie charts are the best ways to display nominal data and bar charts of frequency distributions for ordinal

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

data. Bar charts were appropriately used to display means. The largest number of errors occurred with the inappropriate use of chi-squared tests. Candidates should be encouraged to comment on their data to show understanding beyond a simple inferential statement of significance. This is generally easier for ordinal data and should be considered when designing the investigation. Some candidates produce too many charts, repeating the same information in different formats, which only demonstrates a lack of understanding.

The discussion sections clearly discriminated between candidates who appreciated the weaknesses of their methods and the improvements that they had or could have made and those who did not. Weaker candidates tended to produce a list of headings that were not always appropriate, with only brief comments and without any justification that applied to their own project.

Presentation and communication were, for most candidates, good. References were usually supplied but many candidates did not reference the statistical tests or computer programs used for statistical analysis.

The Assignment

The sources selected were appropriate for the tasks, although as the examiner must read the whole source some were rather too long, with little evidence that they had been read in their entirety by the candidate. The specification recommends current sources no more than two pages of tabloid in length or three pages of A4 where internet sites are used. The selection of sources involving rape, torture and murder is distressing in itself but many students treated such serious issues superficially. Candidates all too frequently assumed the accused were guilty, even though the trial was still in progress, and that their actions were the result of abnormal brain activity, frustration and affectionless psychopathy, without any justification from the source.

For good candidates, the issues or assumptions were clearly identified and appropriately related to the source and psychological evidence. Weaker candidates did not always identify the issues raised clearly, or justify them, usually because the issues were not always appropriate. They also frequently attempted to link to and describe well-known but inappropriate evidence.

In the evidence section, the evidence itself was usually well described and related to the situation described in the source. While evidence gleaned from the Internet is acceptable, it must be from a reputable academic source rather anecdotal or 'pop' psychology. It is not acceptable to cut and paste evidence from any source without quotation marks and the appropriate reference. It is expected that more emphasis be placed on the detailed description of the evidence than on describing its relationship to the source.

In the application section, the best suggestions were specific and pragmatic, supported by psychological theory or empirical research and related to the situation in the source. Weaker candidates offered vague suggestions without support or appropriate links to the situation in the source. Evaluation or critical comment relating to the suggestion clearly demonstrated understanding.

The presentation and communication could have been improved in that a significant number of candidates failed to number the tasks in line with the specification, which made the application of the mark scheme more difficult for examiners. Candidates should be reminded that this is a psychological assignment and be encouraged to use appropriate terminology. The reference section was frequently neglected with candidates failing to make it clear where accreditations in the text were to be found. Full references are required, not just an outline bibliography.

Note from OCR:

It is principally the responsibility of the teacher supervising candidates to ensure that all appropriate regulations, including adherence to word limits, are met.

It is important to note that a completed signed Centre Authentication Form (CCS160) **MUST** accompany a centre's 2543 scripts when they are sent to the examiner. This confirms that the candidates' work was conducted under the required conditions as laid down by the specification.

A teacher supervising the preparation of Unit 2543 should return to the candidate any piece of work which breaks the word limit. Appropriate editing should take place before the work is submitted.

2544 Psychology and Education

General Comments

Overall, the scripts showed the full range of quality. The knowledge and understanding demonstrated were marginally better than the previous June series, as indicated by the slight increase in the paper's mean mark. However, there are very strong centre effects. Some centres have clearly prepared candidates very well, with candidates demonstrating confident knowledge and understanding as well as assured evaluation; some other centres demonstrated sparse evidence of candidates having spent an academic year preparing for this A2 examination. There are still a surprising number of centres which appear not to prepare candidates in the expected examination style for Section B part (b) questions. Evaluating the evidence by issue certainly targets the mark scheme more effectively in questions 3(b) and 4(b), generally resulting in better marks. But, to qualify this, it is worth noting that adhering doggedly to a formula of three evaluative issues and comparing and contrasting two, three or four studies for each is no automatic guarantee of good marks, unless the evaluative issues have pertinence to the subject matter.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

(a) The question required candidates to describe a behaviourist application to education. Pleasingly, compared with previous series' questions on the Perspectives part of the specification, a greater proportion of candidates provided educational applications clearly rooted within a behaviourist framework. Common content included classroom management techniques, token economies, programmed learning or case studies of particular schools operating overt behaviourist techniques such as Wells Park School. Weaker candidates failed to relate behaviourist theory to any application or, in some cases, provided cognitive or humanist applications.

(b) Stronger responses contrasted behaviourist applications with cognitive or humanist applications in a well-structured approach. Most frequently, comparisons were drawn between behaviourism and humanism. Students frequently compared practical applications (such as contrasting methods of teaching and school or classroom management, often using concrete examples from Wells Park School versus Summerhill), or implications for students experiencing behaviourist or humanist/cognitive teaching and learning strategies. Most students seemed to understand the fundamental points of contrast. Weaker candidates failed to organise ideas effectively, elaborate points of contrast or sometimes failed to draw any explicit differences, merely providing two freestanding descriptions of two perspectives and their applications.

Question 2

(a) This was a reasonably well-attempted question. Typically, students tended to choose Autism, ADHD, giftedness or dyslexia. Stronger candidates provided informed descriptions of symptoms, diagnostic criteria or causes. Sometimes, there was a lack of detail or understanding. In some cases, students' understanding of autism did not demonstrably extend beyond the Sally-Anne test.

(b) Many candidates successfully discussed the effectiveness of general strategies for educating children with Special Educational Needs, such as the pros and cons of integration versus segregation; or acceleration versus enrichment. A number of candidates focused their discussion on more specific strategies such as Alpha to Omega, or particular software packages. Weaker answers lacked the necessary elaboration. The weakest candidates offered little by way of evaluation or discussion and simply described a series of strategies. It is worth reminding candidates that all part (b) questions on A2 units target AO2 (evaluation and analysis) rather than AO1 (knowledge and understanding).

Question 3

(a) This question was often well answered. Better answers provided detailed accounts of a range of research conducted on classroom design and layout, such as studies on the effects of noise, lighting, temperature and seating arrangement. Some students did not describe studies with adequate accuracy or detail. A significant number of candidates provided merely the outcomes or findings of such studies providing no description of empirical evidence. Still more disappointing was the number of candidates who only provided anecdotal or common-sense answers.

(b) Very mixed responses to this question. Stronger answers tended to consist of well-chosen evaluative issues used to appraise the empirical evidence. More pertinent issues include validity, ecological validity, ethics, implications and generalisability. Less effective issues included nature-nurture and ethnocentrism. More convincing answers genuinely evaluated empirical research described in part (a), whereas weaker answers gave rather glib or self-evident evaluations along the lines of "x study has poor ecological validity because it was done in a laboratory" with little further elaboration, detail or insight. As an A2 unit, candidates are required to provide more detailed evaluation and analysis.

(c) On the whole, this question produced sound answers with students providing many ideas for the design of a classroom, backing up suggestions with relevant psychological research. However, genuine engagement with the design for a *psychology* classroom was sometimes limited or implicit.

Question 4

(a) Again, this was generally well answered with better responses consisting of description of a range of teaching and learning styles, as well as research on individual differences of learning styles. Weaker answers tended to become list-like, failing to demonstrate understanding of the material.

(b) The pattern of response here was similar to that of 3(b), with well-prepared candidates choosing three or so evaluative issues and comparing and contrasting three or so studies for each. Again, the choice of evaluative issues was crucial with more pertinent issues including implications, validity and reliability of measurements, reductionism and determinism. Less relevant or successful evaluative issues tended to include ecological validity and individual differences. It is worth noting that models of different learning styles (such as ASI or Grasha) *do* attempt to provide some account of individual differences amongst learners through encouraging learners and teachers alike and recognise that not all students learn most effectively in the same manner, admittedly with a varying degree of success.

(c) Again, reasonably well answered though some (proportionately less than 3(c)) failed to relate to a psychology topic.

2545 Psychology and Health

General Comments

Papers cannot get much more accessible than this. Candidates had a lot of material to draw on. They were able to see what the questions were asking for and they were able to show what they knew, understood and could do. The only down-side of this was that a number of them showed that they knew and understood very little and could do even less. There were a surprising number of candidates who did not get beyond anecdotal evidence in their answers, and a sizable minority who were unable to comment appropriately on their evidence. Many candidates drew on popular news stories for their evidence and some of the examiners reported developing a strong dislike for Jamie Oliver who obtained more citations than any psychologist. Who said advertising has no power to influence people?

This report has commented before on the way that some candidates fail to respond to questions but there is no shame in underlining the point again. Given how straightforward the questions were, it is remarkable that many candidates answered their own private questions instead of the ones on the paper. We can all speculate on the reasons for this and what we can do about it, but the bottom line is that a candidate cannot get good marks if they do not directly address the question.

Comments on the Individual Questions

Question 1

Part (a) was an opportunity to describe one study. That is one study, not two or even three or four studies. The question cannot be clearer. Most candidates were able to attempt this and many produced decent descriptions of studies about the interaction between practitioners and patients. A small number wrote down everything they knew on this topic and referred to numerous studies. There were no extra marks for this. Some described a model of interaction or described different communication styles but they only obtained minimal credit for these responses. The most commonly described studies were on the understanding of medical terms, the differences in symptom reports to computers and to doctors and the effect of presentation of information on subsequent recall.

Part (b) asked candidates to focus on the problems that patients have. A pleasing number of candidates were able to provide thoughtful and well-evidenced answers. The best answers stayed on the case of the problems of communication rather than drifting off into just describing more studies without comment, or to defaulting into their prepared answers for Section B (e.g. "my first problem is ethnocentrism..."). A rounded answer can obtain full credit if it considers three problems, illustrates each one with some evidence, maintains the focus of the question and creates an argument rather than providing bullet points.

Question 2

This question was less commonly attempted, possibly because of the perceived difficulty of part (b) or because students do not like the topic of pain. There is a wide range of possible responses. Weaker answers just suggested some actions that might be taken to reduce pain, such as aspirin or deep breathing etc. Better answers were able to identify the psychological component of the technique and focused on the idea of managing pain.

Part (b) appears to be more taxing but a little reflection should open it out to candidates. It is difficult to measure pain because it is a personal experience and you can only judge your pain against what you think pain levels should be and how much pain you think other people have. It is therefore difficult to measure how effective a pain management programme is. Among the better answers, candidates referred to effect of demand characteristics and experimenter effects, as well as the problems of actually measuring pain. A number of

candidates were also able to comment appropriately on the evidence we can get from placebo studies. Weaker answers tended to focus just on the difficulties of measuring pain and did not consider the measurement of effectiveness of pain reduction programmes.

Question 3.

You might well argue that the whole unit is about health promotion so the candidates had maybe too much material to draw on. The most common and the most credit-worthy responses outlined examples of empirical work on health promotion such as the three communities study. Candidates were also able to obtain some credit by looking at some general principles and describing ways to improve personal responses to health, for example through working on self-efficacy or locus of control. They were also able to obtain credit by considering information programmes and, for example, describing the Yale model of communication or reviewing fear appeals.

There were two routes of evaluation to follow. The least common one was to consider the effectiveness of the various attempts to promote good health. This was a perfectly acceptable reading of the question. The more common response, however, was to go through several general evaluation points about psychological evidence, for example, generalisability, validity, and reductionism. The success of this approach depends on the ability to make the points relevant to the material under consideration and also on the strength of the overall argument. This is a common observation of examiners and I refer you to previous reports.

Part (c) attracted fewer strong answers than expected. The trick to success in this part of the question is to match the answer to the problem. In this case, there could have been some acknowledgement of the reasons for the town's poor diet and a response to that based on psychological principles. Suggesting a visit from Jamie Oliver was just poor. They have suffered enough already.

Question 4.

Candidates were able to select from a wide range of material for this question. The answer did not need to have an even balance between causes and measurements, but candidates could not obtain the highest marks for evidence and understanding if they dealt with just one component. The most common answers gave examples of empirical work on stress, though candidates that reviewed theoretical and structural ideas were also able to obtain credit. The best answers made some reference to an explanation of the causes of stress and also to the attempts to measure it. Weaker answers were less explicit and offered information from their stress notes without comment or explanation.

There is a lot to say about the problems of measuring stress and candidates were able to gather valuable evaluation points considering these. An evaluation of the causes of stress also leads nicely into a discussion about reductionism. As with Question 3, however, many candidates went into their seemingly pre-prepared evaluation answer and did not make the best of the evidence at their disposal.

With regard to the stress of going to the dentist, we didn't read one answer suggesting 'don't go' and no comments about the difficulty of finding an NHS dentist to go to. Most candidates were able to identify one technique to deal with the stress, but weaker ones found it difficult to provide an appropriate rationale that made reference to theory and dealt with the specific request in the question. A little more reflection and a few less words would help many candidates lift their mark for this part of the question.

2546: Psychology and Organisations

General Comments

The paper was generally well answered and succeeded in obtaining the full range of marks. There was a slight preference for Question 2 (communication) and Question 3 (job satisfaction). 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 candidates were well prepared and scored highly. However, over preparation sometimes resulted in similar answer styles that may also have prevented some of the more able students from being more creative with their responses. General issues still include candidates attempting to fit 'famous' studies to answers, rather than offer more suitable examples. Maslow, Alderfer and the Hawthorn Effect are regular features and candidates need to consider if these are always the best sources of evidence. Similar comments can be made when dealing with evaluation issues. EV, reductionism, individual differences, etc. Such 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. Many centres have clearly given candidates a 'template' to present answers and, 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). 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 weaker candidates offer vague terminology often supported by inappropriate evidence, sometimes only anecdotal and not linked to psychology.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 (a) Too many candidates did not know what a temporal issue was and often gave answers about temperature. As this is the wording from the syllabus, it did come as a surprise. Those who identified temporal issues did tend to score highly as they gave answers that provided details of the effects of temporal conditions; it was this that gained the marks, not the discussion of the methodology.
- (b) Many good answers from those who correctly identified temporal issues. Appropriate examples were given of how methodology could effect the process and outcomes of research, the most frequent examples were those reflected in the mark scheme. Students who did not refer to temporal conditions but gave suitable methodological responses were limited to marks in the lower band.

- 2 (a) The vast majority of students who attempted this question provided appropriate responses, although many were superficial and anecdotal due to the lack of psychological evidence to support them. Common examples were suggesting 'face to face' meetings or open door policy, yet not mentioning eye contact, body language, voice tone etc,. Few candidates made the link to the process of communication (encoding, transmission) and therefore full marks were not often awarded.

- (b) The focus on usefulness within this question enabled it to be a good discriminator by enabling the more able candidates to offer responses that were not formulaic. Candidates had to make a case for why a study was useful, rather than provide a variety of evaluative issues. Many did attempt this and linked these to whether the research was indeed useful: these were often well written and gained high marks. Too often students just presented an evaluative answer and ignored the question request.
- 3 (a) This question provided a wide range of responses: many that did not follow the indicative comments in the mark scheme but were clearly linked to job satisfaction issues. These included effectiveness of appraisal, environmental conditions and suitability for roles. 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 job satisfaction. The demonstration of confident use of terminology comes from the defining of a viewpoint and supporting this with appropriate psychological evidence. Maslow was often presented here, with much detail of the hierarchy but little to link to job satisfaction. The structure of the responses to this question (Section A(a)) was better than previous years but the need to expand and explain is still evident.
- (b) Section B (b) questions were of a high standard, often due to very formulaic answers that enabled many candidates to obtain good marks. 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 were 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 job satisfaction. Fewer candidates made the error of placing Section B (b) responses in Section B (a). Candidates who planned their work were more likely to provide a logical and well-written account.
- (c) This question discriminated well and provided an excellent variety of responses that challenged candidates to apply their psychological knowledge. Simple financial reward was popular but also more complex responses suggesting job analysis 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.
- 4 (a) A high proportion of candidates who attempted this question had difficulty defining the question focus – they seemed unsure as to what a human resource practice, was. The question was intended to deal with issues directly from the syllabus specification: job analysis, appraisal and rewards. Those candidates who correctly identified HR practices provided good responses. The area of job analysis was debated most effectively but did, at times, lure candidates into a Section B (b) style evaluation answer. The answers on appraisal had less of an evidence base which matches much of the literature. Candidates do, therefore, need to provide a description that is sufficient to show a depth of knowledge.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

- (b) Similar issues to those in 3 (b). There did seem to be a weaker evidence base for this question which meant candidates used fewer studies to compare and contrast evaluative issues. This did produce a greater amount of 'shoe-horning' although the issues surrounding job analysis provided a rich seam of responses. Candidates who produced a variety of good evaluative points from within one issue, such as job appraisal, were given credit for 'reasonably wide-ranging' responses. This indicates the importance of selecting suitable issues and appropriate evidence.
- (c) Similar issues to 3 (c) but not as wide ranging as 'selecting carrots'. Most were fairly simplistic: sell more and get more money. Some candidates did attempt to discuss self-esteem and the value of the task.

2547: Psychology and Environment

General Comments

As in previous years, the standard of performance for the Environment option was pleasing with many candidates achieving high marks. A centre effect was again evident with some candidates very well prepared in order to meet the assessment requirements. There were very few rubric errors compared to January 2005 entry and almost all candidates attempted the required number of questions.

Section A was generally answered well for part (a) but more variable for part (b). A centre effect was more evident in Section B with some candidates very well prepared for parts (a) and (b), although candidates from some centres did not always fulfil the requirements of the mark scheme for part (b). Some centres are tending to teach one study to cover several different topic areas but this may not always address the specific question asked and weaker candidates often fail to make the study relevant to the question.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

- 1)
 - (a) Some very good and detailed answers directly relevant to urban living. Many candidates referred to research by Newman and McCauley, Milgram or Krupat on affiliation/helping behaviour.
 - (b) Generally answered well. Some candidates may have confused this question with 2(b) and only wrote about ethical problems. A wide range of difficulties was considered, although there was a tendency for weaker candidates to make general evaluation points with very little elaboration. Some candidates seemed to have a prepared list of issues which they did not always use effectively to answer the question, for example one difficulty could be Ecological Validity but was used by weaker candidates as "Milgram had good E.V. because ..." and so not making the issue into a difficulty.
- 2)
 - (a) This question was the more popular of the two Section A questions. It was generally well-answered, although a small number of candidates wrote about a natural disaster and some only gave a vague description of a technological catastrophe rather than a study.
 - (b) Most candidates were able to consider a number of ethical issues related to this topic area. However, a significant number of candidates listed difficulties/problems of investigating a technological catastrophe rather than ethics. Some candidates discussed ethical issues without relating them to technological catastrophes.

Section B

- 3)
 - (a) Generally well answered with a good range of studies – Matthews and Canon, Evans and Johnson, Cohen, Geen and O'Neal being the most frequently cited research. Some candidates included studies on the positive effect of music which in most cases was not relevant to the question ('Noise as an Environmental Stressor'). Credit was given if candidates attempted to make the study relevant.

Report on the Units Taken in June 2005

- (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. A significant number of candidates evaluated each study individually making it more difficult to gain marks for analysis.
 - (c) Some good suggestions based on relevant psychological research – most commonly North et al. Suggestions included playing music whilst students queue up for classes (link to North et al. playing music whilst waiting on telephone); playing music whilst revising/learning (Mozart); playing classical music in the refectory to encourage students to eat more healthily (as their mood is more sophisticated!).
- 4)
- (a) Generally research was described well using a range of human and animal studies. As in previous years, a small number of candidates confused this topic with 'Crowds, Collective Behaviour' and wrote about studies/theories of crowd behaviour and therefore gained no marks for this section. Most frequently cited studies for this section included animals – Calhoun, Christian, Dubos and humans – Baum & Valins, Saegert, and various studies on prisoners
 - (b) As 3(b)
 - (c) Some innovative suggestions were put forward by candidate's e.g. involving installing doors/walls (Baum & Davis) or 'suite-style' cages (Baum and Valins); giving prior warning (show animals round zoo before they move in); rectangular rather than square cages (Desor); glass panels in animal compounds or pictures of the jungle (visual escapes). Candidates tend to lose marks on this section by failing to give a rationale for their suggestion or by failing to link to psychological research/theory.

2548: Psychology & Sport

General Comments

The examination paper appeared to be fair, presenting no consistent confusion or difficulty. It clearly differentiated across the whole range of abilities.

There were minimal rubric errors or timing difficulties, and a majority of candidates seemed to understand the general requirements of the questions. However, reading and responding *directly* to the requirements of the question provided a means of differentiating candidates.

Most candidates referred to psychological theory, evidence and concepts, but to varying degrees of detail, accuracy and breadth. Many weaker candidates failed to use their psychological knowledge in a sporting context. Once again, the evaluation sections were the greatest means of differentiation.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

- 1(a) This question was generally well-answered by those who attempted it. Weaker answers lacked detail and/or were not related to sport. Some students outlined theories of motivation, with stronger candidates able to relate motivation to self-confidence.
- (b) The most effective answers contrasted issues between models of self-confidence. Weaker answers evaluated without comparing, as requested by the question, or simply outlined other theories.
- 2(a) Again, generally well answered. Weaker candidates gave superficial responses, but still received some credit. There was a clear distinction between these candidates and those who knew what is suggested by the research available.
- (b) Generally well answered, with better responses explicitly dealing with (usually methodological) limitations, most commonly lack of control over variables.

Section B

- 3(a) The most popular choice from this section. Weaker responses merely described theories of personality. This meant that answers lacked breadth and failed to refer to sport. Better answers were broader and were placed in a sporting context.
- (b) As ever the biggest differentiator. A centre effect remains apparent but is less marked. Weaker answers failed to explain and elaborate their evaluation issues, or to include comparisons in their evidence. Some candidates are well prepared, analysing the issues in relation to research available. Some over-prepared candidates lead one to question how much is rote-learned and how much is understood. Too often, the same evaluation issues were regurgitated regardless of how relevant they were or how well that particular candidate could apply them.
- (c) Although generally pleasing answers, weaker responses failed to give precise or detailed suggestions. Others failed to give a clear rationale or include appropriate psychological evidence.

- 4(a) This was less popular than Q3 but was generally better answered. Some candidates were still providing answers which relate to other areas of the specification without making this relevant. Other weaker responses included defining 'attitude' as in the school-related "I don't like your attitude" rather than a consideration of research into attribution, the link to health, burnout and withdrawal. Such candidates were clearly less well prepared.
- (b) As for 3(b), see above comments.
- (c) As for 3(c), see above comments.

2549: Psychology & Crime

General Comments

This June's cohort showed a wider spread of ability than the January session's candidates and they were similar to the June 2004 group. As in the previous session, there are still many anecdotal responses which seem to have almost no psychology at all, with whole centre cohorts failing to get a pass. Some candidates are using prepared answers extensively which may help the weakest ones pick up AO1 marks but despite their rote learning, they are unable to string together an argument in part (b), instead tending to continue with more descriptive material. This time we read about many 'bottoms up' approaches but there were fewer problems with the spelling of core psychological terms. Sadly, there were a number of messages from students who 'had not learned those topics' so could not give a meaningful response. This time the handwriting presented more problems than the spelling. Perhaps a need for some more timed essays?

Comments on the Individual Questions

Question 1 (a)

This question seemed very straightforward, but in the event turned out to present numbers of candidates with a lot of problems. It seems that candidates find it hard to separate 'prevention' from 're-offending' and see treatments and punishments as all the same. To be fair to the candidates, credit was awarded for treatments and punishments provided that they were set in the context of prevention. Of course, if a prevention approach was known, it was easy to score full marks here. This was one part of the paper which attracted the most anecdotal responses, e.g. more police on the beat.

Question 1 (b)

The problem for candidates here was to stay focused on effectiveness and again there were many candidates discussing the effectiveness of treatments and punishments. There seems to be a tendency for the prepared answer to creep in here with candidates offering general evaluation points without reference to effectiveness. This is surprising as effectiveness must surely be a key point of discussion when studying this topic.

Question 2 (a)

Lots of problems with this question too and again this was unexpected from a really quite straightforward question. The mark scheme was broadened to include attractiveness of the defendant provided it was in a deliberate context of a barrister advising his or her client to look smart but just being attractive could not really count as a procedure or technique. Candidates who used Asch struggled to link the relevance to persuasion but there were some excellent answers using primacy and recency effects, rhetorical strategies and the story order research.

Question 2 (b)

This question was challenging. Candidates were required to evaluate the usefulness of research into persuasion. Some candidates did exactly what others had done for 1(b) and used prepared evaluation points for the research, ignoring the, usefulness, dimension of the question. Others evaluated usefulness of persuasion and forgot the research but large numbers did well here by using mock and shadow juries and sampling.

Question 3 (a)

This question was well answered but there was a distinction between those who paid attention to processes and factors and those who just wrote all they knew. Even so, this part of the paper allowed even weak students to pick up marks.

Question 3 (b)

To encourage more variety of response, the mark scheme tries to encourage the use of strengths and weaknesses as analysis as well as contrasts which sometimes just seem very artificial. This has allowed candidates to gain more marks in this area which seems fairer and hopefully will allow a movement away from the very formulæic responses we have at present. The responses were across the whole range with huge centre effects.

Question 3 (c)

Some excellent responses here as would be expected by the hints in the question. It seems there may be some candidates who were not aware of research on ID parades or identikit and so they were unable to back their suggestions with evidence, but where the candidate was prepared, they often filled a whole side of A4 with suggestions and reasons.

Question 4 (a)

This question attracted the most extremes in the quality of response. At the top end, candidates have excellent understanding, more research to quote than in previous questions on this topic and generally very well-prepared responses. At the other end of the scale, we had the lurid responses characterised by case studies and the lack of understanding that allows candidates to talk about being able to create a photofit of a murderer from a crime scene. Unfortunately, some candidates offered Sheldon and Lombroso as profilers and gained no credit.

Question 4 (b)

Some candidates used this question well and because of their range of research in part (a) were able to compare different approaches effectively. There is some confusion between Kocsis and Finkel which lead the point being made to be lost.

Please can centres preparing for Section B part b answers, remind candidates to relate their issues to the question? Quite often at the end of this part of the question it was possible to ask, 'what was the question being evaluated' because the candidate had not referred to it throughout. They cannot get full marks for issues without this clear connection and there is an effect on their argument mark.

Question 4 (c)

As in 3(c), there were clues in the question here and these were picked up by well-prepared candidates and used effectively to justify why a profiler should be called in.

As they had a good range of research to draw upon, they were able to use this for their psychological rationale. Weaker candidates tended to justify their suggestion by reference to a case study but without using its psychological component.

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Psychology 3876
June 2005 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2540	Raw	60	45	40	35	30	26	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2541	Raw	50	36	32	28	24	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2542	Raw	50	42	38	35	32	29	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
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	15.8	38.6	62.3	79.8	91.0	100.0	13598

**Advanced GCE Psychology 7876
June 2005 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2543	Raw	80	60	54	48	42	36	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2544	Raw	50	37	33	29	26	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2545	Raw	50	37	33	29	26	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2546	Raw	50	38	33	29	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2547	Raw	50	36	32	28	25	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2548	Raw	50	36	32	28	25	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2549	Raw	50	35	31	27	23	19	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	16.7	44.3	71.0	89.4	97.8	100.0	9190

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 2005

