

**GCE**

**Psychology**

Unit **G543**: Options in Applied Psychology

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2017**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

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

© OCR 2017

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
	Unclear
	Attempts evaluation
	Benefit of doubt
	Context
	Cross
	Evaluation
	Confirm at SSU
	
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	Not answered question
	Good use of resources
	Tick
	Development of point
	Omission mark

## MARK SCHEME

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	<p><b>Describe research into brain dysfunction as a cause of criminal behaviour.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>It is likely that students will refer to Raine's (1997) research into differences in glucose metabolism of NGRI murderers revealed by Positron Emission Tomography. Differences in glucose metabolism were found in the pre-frontal cortex, corpus callosum, amygdala and parietal cortex. Better answers will show understanding in describing the methodology or conclusions of the research. Other relevant research into brain dysfunction as a cause of criminal behaviour is creditworthy.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will clearly describe research into brain dysfunction, showing extension in detail and/or understanding.</p> <p>Second band will be accurate and specific to title but may demonstrate only limited detail or extension; third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material but not to effectively address the question.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
	(b)	<p><b>To what extent are biological explanations of why people turn to crime deterministic?</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>Biological explanations are often seen as deterministic in that they search for causes for criminal behaviour within the brain, genetics and sex/gender. Good responses will show understanding of the concept of determinism through definition and by applying it to the different biological explanations. Determinism can also be explored through its opposite pole, "free will". Relevant research includes Raine (1997), Beaver et al (2010), McDermott (2009), Dabbs et al (2001), Daly &amp; Wilson (2001).</p>	15	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well developed and/or elaborated response which clearly relates the concept of 'determinism' to different biological explanations of criminal behaviour. Candidates should engage with the "To what extent" aspect of the question.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant points supported by evidence but will lack balance or development.</p> <p>Band 3 will have some issues which address the determinism of biological explanations but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic – 'it is deterministic because.....' or an 'it isn't very deterministic' type response with little development or supporting evidence.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2	(a)	<p><b>Describe one way of detecting lies when interviewing suspects.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>To answer this question there are a wide range of techniques that could be described, from analysis of non-verbal cues, verbal cues including statement analysis (e.g. Few), polygraph, reverse order recall, Ekman's micro-expressions etc. To engage with the question the technique must be clearly described.</p>	<b>10</b>	<p>Top band candidates will clearly describe a way of detecting lies when interviewing a suspect, showing extension in detail and/or understanding. For example supporting points with evidence from research</p> <p>Second band will be accurate and specific to title but may demonstrate only limited detail or extension.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material but not to effectively address the question.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
	(b)	<p><b>Evaluate the methodology used in research into interviewing suspects.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>This question is an open evaluation so can refer to strengths and well as limitations. Candidates can use a wide range of issues to answer the question, as long as they relate specifically to the methods employed by researchers in this topic. Suitable issues may include: issues related to experimental design, validity, reliability, ethics, generalisation from the sample, ecological validity etc. Relevant research includes Vrij, Mann, Inbau &amp; Reid, Kassin et al.</p>	<b>15</b>	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues which impact on the methodology of the research. A balanced argument would contain both positive and negative points which show a deeper understanding of a range of methodological issues. Evidence to support points or issues will be apposite.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence but will lack balance or development.</p> <p>Band 3 will identify some issues which relate to the methodology of research but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic – 'it is valid because.....' or an 'it isn't very ethical...' type response with little development or supporting evidence.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3	(a)	<p><b>What have psychologists learned about majority influence in relation to juries reaching a verdict in court?</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>It is likely that Asch's (1953) research into conformity will form the basis of many answers, but to engage with the question, this must be discussed within the context of the courtroom. Kalven and Zeisel's (1966) post trial interviews with jurors also explore the effect of different size majorities in early stages of the trial upon the outcome. To engage with the question it is important that some sort of conclusion regarding majority influence on juries is given.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will clearly explain what psychologists have learned about majority influence on juries, showing extension in detail and/or understanding.</p> <p>Second band will be accurate and specific to title but may demonstrate only limited detail or extension.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material but not to effectively address the question. For example merely describing Asch's study with no link to jury decision making.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
	(b)	<p><b>Discuss the usefulness of research into reaching a verdict.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>"Discuss" suggests that debate is required. Research may be useful in that it explains factors that influence reaching a verdict; it may be useful in that it aids prosecution or defence lawyers. It may lead to improvements in juries etc. Research may also lack usefulness if it has methodological issues such as unrepresentative samples, poor validity etc. Relevant research includes Hastie et al (1983), Asch (1953), Moscovici (1976, 1980, and 1985).</p>	15	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues which impact on the usefulness of the research. The discussion should contain both positive and negative points which show a deeper understanding of usefulness. Points should be supported by appropriate evidence.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence but will lack balance or development.</p> <p>Band 3 will have some issues which address the usefulness of research but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic – 'it is useful because.....' or an 'it isn't very useful...' type response with little development or supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
4 (a)	<p><b>How do planned behaviours affect future behaviour once freed from jail?</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>The demand of this question could be addressed by an exploration of the theory of planned behaviour by Ajzen (1985) applied to released prisoners, or by engaging with the concept of rehabilitation whereby offenders are seen as wanting to change from criminal behaviours into the planned behaviour of “going straight”. These concepts can be supported by Gillis &amp; Nafekh (2005) who report on the importance of employment when prisoners are on conditional release, and its subsequent reduction of reoffending in those prisoners fortunate enough to secure employment. Farrington et al (2002) also compared two intensive regimes for young offenders and their impact on re-offending.</p>	<b>10</b>	<p>Top band candidates will clearly explain the relationship between planned behaviours and future behaviours drawing on psychological theory and/or research to support their answer.</p> <p>Second band will be accurate and specific to title but may demonstrate only limited detail or extension.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material but not to effectively address the question. For example merely describing interventions without engaging with the question.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Assess the ecological validity of research into imprisonment.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>Ecological Validity is the degree to which behaviours observed and recorded in a study reflect the behaviours that actually occur in natural settings. Essentially this is the extent to which findings can be generalised to the "real world".</p> <p>Stronger candidates will identify specific features from research which contribute to ecological validity or lessen it. Examples of suitable topics include demand characteristics, or differences between researching real prison situations and simulated prisons. Relevant research includes Gillis &amp; Nafekh (2005), Farrington et al (2002), Dooley (1990), Palmer &amp; Connelly (2005), Haney, Banks &amp;</p>	<b>15</b>	<p>Top band candidates will provide a well developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues relating to the ecological validity of research. For top band candidates must engage with the demand of the question which would involve an assessment of the level of ecological validity. Development/elaboration could be achieved, for example, by incorporating a discussion as to the impact of a study’s ecological validity on the usefulness or generalisation of the research, or a comparison of different studies in relation to ecological validity.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence, but will lack development.</p> <p>Band 3 will identify some issues which address the ecological validity of research but is quite limited.</p>

		Zimbardo (1973).		No more than an attempt to address the question or a superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. For example 'field research = good; lab studies = bad.'
--	--	------------------	--	--

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
5	(a)	<p><b>Outline a cognitive explanation for non-adherence to medical regimes.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>Research suggests the choice is rational, usually accountable in terms of cost-benefit analysis within the Health Belief Model. Research which has been used includes Bulpitt et al.'s (1988) review of research on adherence in hypertensive patients. Other cognitive explanations include forgetfulness for example. Causes for poor compliance include prescription not collected or not dispensed, purpose of treatment not clear, perceived lack of effect, real or perceived side-effects, instructions for administration not clear, unattractive formulation such as unpleasant taste, complicated regimen, cost.</p>	10	<p>The best candidates will show enough knowledge of detail or level of understanding to relate the research to specifically addressing the question. In this instance, emphasis on cognition may constitute a top band response.</p> <p>An answer in the second band will either do this but with less clarity, less detail or less explicitly.</p> <p>Third band will demonstrate knowledge of the relevant research but this may be superficial and/or not used to effectively to address the question; and flawed but with some creditworthy material will constitute a bottom band mark.</p>
	(b)	<p><b>Assess the usefulness of research into adherence to medical regimes.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>Usefulness may consider benefit, appropriateness, effectiveness, application and shortcomings, including methodological limitations. Usefulness to a medical setting may consider whether the research can be used appropriately in a clinical situation, with a patient or practitioner for example. This can take the form of broad general comments on principles and assumptions ie whether it convinces or not or specific application to a particular clinical setting. Better candidates will go beyond "Bulpitt's theory is useful because....and Watt is useful because....." by showing greater critical awareness.</p>	15	<p>Top band candidates will provide an accurate response specific to usefulness of research into features of adherence to medical regimes; and show extension, for example by involving a degree of judgement to assess, not merely identify, how applicable this is.</p> <p>Second band will be accurate and specific to title but may, for example, struggle to engage in meaningful discussion and hence fall short in terms of extension;</p> <p>Third band will be superficial; maybe accurate or appropriate material but not used to effectively or precisely address question. The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
6 (a)	<p><b>Describe research into life events or daily hassles as a cause of stress.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>The notion that stress is caused by life events, some of which have a more profound effect than others was measured in 1967 by Holmes and Rahe's SRRS (Social Re-adjustment Rating Scale). This was subsequently used in much research starting again in 1970 with Rahe's prediction that health change, particularly illness, may be improved through careful study of life changes in a person's recent experience. In the early 1980's, a number of pieces of research suggested 'daily hassles and uplifts' were a better predictor of mental wellbeing than life events. Researchers such as Kanner, Lazarus and DeLongis collaborated to provide this alternative account of stress and how it should be measured.</p>	10	<p>The best candidates will show enough knowledge of detail to relate the research specifically to addressing the question. In this instance, emphasis on the research constitutes a top band answer. This could be the methods or findings in more detail, or both. It could cover one or more pieces of research.</p> <p>An answer in the second band will do this but with less detail.</p> <p>Third band will demonstrate knowledge of the relevant research but this may be superficial and/or not used to effectively to address the question; and flawed but with some creditworthy material will constitute a bottom band mark.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Evaluate the limitations of research into causes of stress.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>There is a range of possible responses to this question. Methodological limitations of specified studies may be referred to such as small or unrepresentative samples, (lack of) control of extraneous variables questioning the validity of how stress is measured, ecological validity, other issues of validity. The reliability of measures can also limit research. Identifying the cause and measuring a conceptual construct also limits research in this field. In addition to methodological considerations are wider issues which may consider how useful the research is or how well it can be applied. Any other legitimate issues may also be creditworthy such as generalisability.</p>	15	<p>At the top level candidates will provide a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. Development/elaboration could be achieved, for example, by considering how useful or not some research is, its methodology or the degree to which practice is served by the research.</p> <p>A compromise in development/elaboration but a good response nonetheless will characterise a good response; a somewhat limited or superficial response will typify a third band answer and a bottom band mark will be awarded for work which is flawed or anecdotal but contains some creditworthy aspects.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
7 (a)	<p><b>Outline cognitive treatment for dysfunctional behaviour.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>Cognitive treatment for dysfunctional behaviour in general derives from the work of Albert Ellis and Aaron Beck. Ellis proposed Rational Emotive Therapy to which he later addressed the behavioural aspects in his REBT. He suggested that people have irrational assumptions which they hold on to. He talks of the ABC of irrational beliefs, which cognitive therapy addresses. Beck identifies a cognitive triad, particularly when considering depression, and therapy involves recognising and challenging dysfunctional thinking.</p>	10	<p>The better candidate will consider cognitive treatment of dysfunctional behaviour. This may be an overview of cognitive therapy or with reference to one or more cognitive approaches to treatment. Where CBT is used, then the cognitive elements referred to are creditworthy.</p> <p>The second band candidate will consider this but in less detail or less precisely.</p> <p>The third band candidate response may be very general and less specific, leading to a superficial response.</p> <p>A bottom band response may be muddled or flawed but with some creditworthy material.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Assess the effectiveness of treatment of dysfunctional behaviour.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>The question calls for a consideration of how successful are treatments for dysfunctional behaviour. This could be addressed by considering strengths and weaknesses of treatments available, or by comparing the biological, behavioural and cognitive paradigms. This question could also be addressed by suggesting that it is hard to consistently assess the effectiveness of different treatments because much contradictory research takes place in the field. Hence, it has high ecological validity but fails to control a number of extraneous variables, so we can never know for sure what produces the recovery in question. Other well practiced considerations may also follow such as what is the goal of treatment or what constitutes 'effective', for example.</p>	15	<p>The best candidates can be identified by a developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues. Development/elaboration could be achieved, for example, by incorporating a judgement as to the effectiveness of research into the treatment or by comparison of specific features or issues with other methods.</p> <p>An accurate response with less precision or detail will attract a second band mark; a more superficial or limited response, maybe a statement of effectiveness with not much substance or conviction would constitute a third band response.</p> <p>Muddled or flawed but with some creditworthy material or a highly superficial "this is effective and so is that...." type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
8 (a)	<p><b>How can a psychotic disorder be identified? Use a specific example.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>Candidates may identify a psychotic disorder, such as schizophrenia, and describe its characteristics and how it is classified. Reference to ICD/DSM may be useful but are not essential. Reference to different forms or dimensions (DSM-5) of a particular illness may indicate a more detailed knowledge than a general response.</p>	10	<p>A better response will see the candidate identify a psychotic disorder, such as schizophrenia, and describe its characteristics. The quality, detail and elaboration will mark out a strong response to the question. An appreciation that there are different forms of a particular illness and what distinguishes these different forms would constitute a better answer.</p> <p>A second band response will be less detailed but still clearly address the question.</p> <p>A third band response may provide a more general description or may not even specify a particular disorder. Such an answer would still be worthy of some credit however.</p>
(b)	<p><b>To what extent can the classification of characteristics of mental disorders be considered ethnocentric?</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>Ethnocentrism involves making judgements of other cultures from one's own perspective. This can include language, beliefs, religion or customs. Judging your own culture as the 'norm' may lead to bias or lack of appreciation of other cultures, possibly seeing them as abnormal or less than normal. Thus, mental disorders are identified by abnormal behaviours judged from a particular societal, cultural perspective. It is therefore not surprising that prisons in any country are overrepresented by minority groups. Manuals to help with diagnosis are culture-laden, partially explaining why there are differences such as those in DSM and ICD. It is acceptable to argue that mental disorders are inevitably culture specific as they are defined culturally. This may be answered conceptually or may make reference to specific disorders. Reference to different definitions may also help the candidate. By considering some of the definitions that exist about</p>	15	<p>Top band answers will consider ethnocentrism in context. The commentary will show appreciation of what ethnocentrism is beyond a bland statement, show some extension and go beyond mere evaluative statement. A judgement of degree of ethnocentrism addressing the 'to what extent' demand will be given with words such as more, very or slightly for example.</p> <p>Second band answers will competently address the title with some but limited extension, maybe poorly (or not) addressing the injunction.</p> <p>Superficial, bland, general are adjectives which will typify a third band judgement; whereas a bottom band response will fail to meet this but contain some creditworthy material.</p>

		dysfunctional behaviour against each other, thus the extent part of the question can be addressed by one definition being more ethnocentric than another, for example.		
<b>Question</b>			<b>Mark</b>	
<b>9</b>	<b>(a)</b>	<p><b>Outline how personality has been measured in sports research.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) or his Inventory (EPI) has been used by sports psychologists. Possibly more so is Cattell's 16 Personality Factors (16PF), being the choice of many researchers such as Kroll and Crenshaw (1970). Projective measures such as ink-blot or a Thematic Apperception Test are less regularly applied to sport performance but may lend themselves to this endeavour and so are legitimate responses provided the context is made explicitly. Psychometric testing is also commonly used in sport and sports psychology. Weaker answers may be very general and/or fail to contextualise. Better responses will show specific knowledge of the measure or its use.</p>	<b>10</b>	<p>The best candidates will provide a direct response to the context of the question, using psychological knowledge to address precisely the 'how' of how personality has been measured in sports research. Detail, quality of description or interpretation of evidence will typify the better response.</p> <p>An implied response to the 'how' in the question or less precision of detail may indicate a second band response, whereas a more superficial response would be credited in the third band.</p> <p>Failing to achieve this but with some creditworthy material will achieve a bottom band mark.</p>
	<b>(b)</b>	<p><b>Assess the reliability of research into personality in sport.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>Reliability refers to the consistency of a research study or measure. This can mean that if all things remain the same, a re-test will produce the same findings. It also refers to consistency from one researcher to another or one measure to another. Inconsistencies may arise where self-report is employed due to mood, lying, misjudgement or a desire to provide socially desirable responses. (This</p>	<b>15</b>	<p>Top band responses will clearly distinguish reliability, set it in the context of sport research into personality, and address the 'assess' component i.e. consider how reliable a particular measure is (e.g. "...which suggests it is very reliable", "more reliable than....", "...and so has low reliability").</p> <p>Second band answers will be characterised by a compromise such as with the 'assess' command or more limited elaboration but still provide a good response.</p> <p>Third band responses will be somewhat more limited or superficial and bottom band responses may be flawed but contain some creditworthy material.</p>

		<p>should not be confused with failing to measure what it is claiming to measure, which these features may also affect). Projective tests struggle in terms of reliability as they are so heavily reliant on subjective interpretation although psychodynamic psychologists may argue that experience would see greater consistency amongst its proponents. The search for reliability is further compounded as personality is a concept rather than something more tangible. It may be useful for candidates to consider reliability of research into personality in sport by looking at studies which used particular measures, or by looking at the measures themselves. Hence, Cattell or Eysenck's measures of personality, or their use in sports research itself, may prove the most fruitful approach.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
10 (a)	<p><b>What is achievement motivation in a sporting context?</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>The notion of ‘Achievement Motivation’ was introduced by McClelland in 1953, following a series of works in the preceding few years, and became known as the McClelland –Atkinson model. The model, or any study to which it is related, provides an acceptable response. Further, any works may be presented which consider the identification of the motive to achievement, from Murray’s projective testing in 1938 (from which the McClelland-Atkinson model was developed) through to present day papers. Finally any research, particularly from the discipline of sports psychology, which uses the McClelland-Atkinson model, is appropriate in response to this question. Whereas better candidates will be clear, precise and cogent in the context of the question, weaker candidates may provide a confused or more general account or fail to relate their answer to the context of the question.</p>	10	<p>Quality of description and interpretation in relation the sporting context will typify the better response. A clear, precise and cogent response to the context of the question, using psychological knowledge, will be indicative of a top candidate.</p> <p>Some compromising in detail may indicate a second band response.</p> <p>A more superficial response, maybe a straight reporting of a study with poorer reference to the specific question would be credited in the third band. Failing to achieve this but with some creditworthy material will achieve a bottom band mark.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Discuss difficulties of conducting research into motivation in sport.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>Motivation is a concept and as such is difficult to measure. Psychology has long shied away from dealing with motivation in its wider sense, beyond its biological sense, possibly for this very reason. Hence, the whole issue of definition and measurement is problematic. As such, the validity and reliability of any measure used is central for consideration. Early works used projective testing (eg Murray, 1938) and this is notoriously subjective and open to bias interpretation. Developments in the McClelland-</p>	15	<p>The best responses will consider difficulties of conducting research into motivation in sport. Candidates will indicate research in this area, be explicit about the context of research which applies to motivation in sport and provide commentary by way of discussing those difficulties.</p> <p>Second band answers may be characterised by a compromise in the ‘Discuss’ command or more limited elaboration but still provide a good response.</p> <p>Third band responses will be somewhat more limited or superficial and bottom band responses may be flawed but contain some creditworthy material.</p>

		<p>Atkinson model moved the study of motivation into the psychometric arena, which again throws up issues of reliability. Gill and Deeter's SOQ similarly uses psychometric measures, raising similar issues. Each researcher, however, is at pains to test and defend their measuring tools, rendering criticism and a defence available for discussion.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
11 (a)	<p><b>What does sports psychology tell us about imagery in sport?</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>By using mental images of success, self-confidence may be increased. Images to help with relaxation can control arousal and reduce anxiety. Imagery can help an athlete work through possible techniques to explore different approaches. Imagery can also provide practice by repeatedly running through routines. Imagery is also useful during periods of injury. Sports psychology tends to refer to imagery in the context of a more complete response to the athlete's need. Reference to research and examples of application will enhance a response.</p>	<b>10</b>	<p>Stronger candidates will provide accounts which appreciate the role imagery can play as part of various sporting situations. A top band candidate will provide a full and accurate account of one or more uses of imagery.</p> <p>Second band responses will compromise detail or precision.</p> <p>Third band will be more superficial such as struggling with the detail, oversimplifying or poorly contextualising their response.</p> <p>The weakest responses to receive a mark will be responses that are flawed but still contain some creditworthy material.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Evaluate the use of qualitative and quantitative data when researching self-confidence and imagery in sport.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>Vealey operationalised sport-confidence (SC-trait), state sport-confidence (SC-state) and Competitive Orientation into quantitative measures; much imagery research is qualitatively reported as was Bandura's original work on self-efficacy, although these concepts were later applied to the sporting context. This needs to be considered evaluatively The depth and richness of data is superior in the qualitative approach whereas quantitative data is easier to record, easier and clearer to analyse and more objective. It may lead to a more accurate measure of self-confidence as it will exclude reporting biases such as selection and distortion, for example.</p>	<b>15</b>	<p>Top band candidates will provide a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise points and/or issues. Development/elaboration could be achieved, for example, by considering the strengths or weaknesses of an approach, its methodology or the validity achieved.</p> <p>A compromise in development/elaboration but a good response nonetheless will characterise a response in the second band</p> <p>A somewhat limited or superficial response will typify a third band answer and a bottom band mark will be awarded for work which is flawed or anecdotal but contains some creditworthy aspects.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
12 (a)	<p><b>Describe how one theory of exercise and mental health applies to sport and exercise.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>There is a range of literature proposing the nature of the relationship between exercise and mental health, from Cognitive-Behavioural explanations through to more physiological explanations such as endorphin hypotheses. The responses to the question may broaden to include benefits in coping with illness and not necessarily be limited to the illness itself. Recent research into dance psychology shows the benefits of movement on mental health, including depression and Parkinson's disease. However, candidates may choose to theorise that the link is due to altered placebo and drug labelling effects such as recent research by Kam-Hansen et al (2014) into such effects on migraine attacks. The "Describe How" component should be directly addressed, such as with a description of the theory applied.</p>	<b>10</b>	<p>The level of detail and application of research to answer the question will determine how creditworthy is the response, as well as an explicit response to the "Describe how" command. Top band responses will provide accounts with greater detail to provide a more accurate account of the application of exercise and mental health to the sport and exercise context.</p> <p>Responses in the second band will typically compromise detail but still be accurate responses to the question.</p> <p>Third band responses will struggle with the detail or oversimplify the response. The weakest responses to receive a mark will be responses that are flawed but still contain some creditworthy material.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Evaluate limitations of research into exercise and mental health.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>The original study in support of the endorphin hypothesis turned mice into swimming 'junkies' through exercise. Therefore, animal issues of extrapolation and ethics can be seen as limitations. As a theory, it provides a coherent, credible and intuitively pleasing explanation of a positive link between exercise and mental health and wellbeing. However, other explanations are possible. Research has gone beyond Britain, USA and animals, such as research</p>	<b>15</b>	<p>At the top level candidates will provide a more developed and/or elaborated response. Development/elaboration could be achieved, for example, by comparing evidence, challenging assumptions or debating pros and cons.</p> <p>A compromise in development/elaboration but a good response nonetheless will characterise a second band response.</p> <p>A somewhat limited or superficial response will typify a third band answer and a bottom band mark will be awarded for work which is flawed or anecdotal but contains some creditworthy aspects.</p>

		<p>into Nordic skiers so comments on ethnocentrism or at least generalisability may be possible here. Meta-analyses have the advantage of a broad coverage. Measures used, such as for mood states can be argued to be highly developed, but still raise many examples of issues of reliability and validity. Any referenced methodological issues could also contribute to the candidate's answer.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
13 (a)	<p><b>Describe how discovery learning can be used in the classroom.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>Discovery learning is a teaching method where students are not given the information they need to learn, rather they are given experiences where they can discover the information themselves. This question could be answered in a variety of different ways. The candidate may engage with the theoretical concepts of discovery learning developed by Piaget &amp; Bruner e.g. the spiral curriculum and then apply them generally to classroom practice or describe an actual lesson or technique. A number of constructivist methods would be appropriate, e.g. Problem based learning. Klahr &amp; Nigam (2004) describe a science lesson using discovery learning in their study.</p>	<b>10</b>	<p>Top band candidates will provide an accurate response specific to the question and show extension in detail and/or understanding. They will effectively describe how discovery learning can be used in the classroom.</p> <p>Second band will be reasonably accurate and specific to the question.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material but not effectively linking it to the question. For example merely describing a lesson or method without making it clear why it is discovery learning.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Discuss the validity of research into personal approaches to teaching.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>Candidates should discuss the validity of research into the additional needs of students. Validity considers to what extent the research investigates what it claims to be investigating. "Discuss" requires the candidate to appreciate different views regarding the validity of research.</p> <p>Validity takes many forms and can refer to the internal validity of the research measures being used, such as tests on learning etc. Considerations of external validity are appropriate here. Ecological validity is a suitable issue; much of the</p>	<b>15</b>	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues which impact on the validity of the research. An argument would contain both positive and negative points which show a deeper understanding of validity. Evidence to support points or issues will be apposite. Top band answers should refer to more than one type of validity.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence but will lack development.</p> <p>Band 3 will have some issues which address the validity of research but is quite limited and doesn't engage with the "Discuss" demand of the question.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic – 'it is valid because.....' or an 'it</p>

		appropriate research is based in real world settings. Population validity is also relevant. Relevant research includes Asubel (1960), Bruner (1960), Klahr & Nigam (2004), Rittschof & Griffin (2001), Wood et al (1976)		isn't very valid...' type response with little development or supporting evidence.
--	--	--	--	--

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
14 (a)	<p><b>What have psychologists learned about ability grouping and its implications for educational engagement?</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>Research into ability grouping has given quite mixed results. Some studies e.g. Sukhnandan &amp; Lee (1998) find that higher ability students benefit, although to the detriment of lower ability students. Other research such as Boaler et al (2000) suggest a generally negative impact on learning but also disaffection in the lower groups and stress in the higher groups. There are also a number of DFES reports which review the literature.</p>	<b>10</b>	<p>Top band candidates will provide an accurate response specific to the question and show extension in detail and/or understanding. They will effectively explain the conclusions relating to the implications of ability grouping on educational engagement.</p> <p>Second band will be reasonably accurate and specific to the question.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material, but really engaging with the question.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Assess the usefulness of strategies for encouraging educational engagement.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>The term “useful” can be applied in several different ways – how useful the strategy/technique could be in improving educational performance of students, can it have positive impact on the self esteem of students etc. Conversely strategies may lack usefulness if negative effects on learning, self esteem etc. occur. If theories lack empirical support this could also limit usefulness. Relevant research includes Schweihart (1993, 2000), Wood (2007), Newsome et al (2000), Parker et al (2004), Sukhnandan &amp; Lee (1998), Boaler et al (2000).</p>	<b>15</b>	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response which assesses the usefulness of strategies for encouraging educational engagement. Evidence to support points or issues will be apposite.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence but will lack development.</p> <p>Band 3 will have some points which address the usefulness of strategies for encouraging educational engagement but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic with little development or supporting evidence. For example ‘it is very useful.....’ or an ‘it is not useful.....’ type response with little more than anecdotal support.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
15 (a)	<p><b>Describe research into moral development and the implication for social rules in education.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>Kohlberg's research is appropriate here and it's implication that children's moral reasoning develops and becomes more complex can be linked to the educational setting and social rules. For examples rules need to be appropriate to the level of moral reasoning. Other research such as Murray-Close et al (2006) is relevant also.</p>	10	<p>Top band candidates will provide an accurate response specific to the question and show extension in detail and/or understanding. They will effectively describe research into moral development and its implications for social rules.</p> <p>Second band will be reasonably accurate and specific to the question.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material e.g. just describing research/theory but with little relation to the question.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Evaluate limitations of research into personal and social development.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>Research refers to studies, theories or models. This question can be addressed in a number of ways. Firstly one could identify limitations in terms of problems associated with theories, for example Kohlberg's developmental stages are seen to be androcentric. Freud's theory of psychosexual development is very unscientific etc. Secondly one could take a more methodological focus, identifying methodological limitations, for example issues related to experimental design, validity, reliability, ethics, generalisation from the sample, qualitative/quantitative data etc. Relevant research includes Freud (1909), Piaget (1932), Erikson (1963), Carl Rogers, Johnson &amp; Johnson (1983), Kohlberg (1963), Murray-Close et al (2006).</p>	15	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues which highlight limitations of research in this area. Evidence to support points or issues will be apposite.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence but will lack development.</p> <p>Band 3 will identify some issues which relate to the limitations of research but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic – 'it is not valid because....' or an 'it isn't very ethical...' type response with little development or supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
16 (a)	<p><b>What have comparisons of teacher/student communications shown about student-teacher social interactions?</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 1</b></p> <p>Various researchers have compared teacher/student communications so there is a wide range of acceptable answers. Some have focussed on the number of approving/disapproving comments used by teachers for different situations such as commenting on behaviour or work e.g. Merrett &amp; Wheldall (1990). Ilatov et al (1998) found that teacher communication varied with class composition as well as the personality of the teacher. Teacher “immediacy” has been studied also, which is where teachers show behaviours such as humour and inclusive language, in order to reduce the perceived distance between teacher and learners e.g. Gorham &amp; Zakahi (1990)</p>	<b>10</b>	<p>Top band candidates will provide an accurate response specific to the question and show extension in detail and/or understanding. They will effectively explain what comparison of teacher/student communications show about student/teacher interactions.</p> <p>Second band will be reasonably accurate and specific to the question.</p> <p>Third band will be superficial, using accurate or appropriate material for example describing research without explaining what it reveals.</p> <p>The bottom band is for responses that may be flawed but have some creditworthy material included.</p>
(b)	<p><b>Discuss the ethics of research into student-teacher social interactions.</b></p> <p><b>Refer to Appendix 2</b></p> <p>Candidates can identify points within research where ethical guidelines have been adhered to, or conversely where guidelines may have been breached. This topic area should yield a variety of issues. For example the use of under 16’s and consent issues. Teachers’ awareness that their communications are being analysed could be stressful. “Discuss” suggests that the candidate should take into account differing views. Relevant research includes Merrett &amp; Wheldall (1990), Flanders (1970), Ilatov et al (1998), Gorham &amp; Zakahi (1990), Brophy &amp; Good (1974), Rosenthal &amp; Jacobson (1965), Rubie-Davies (2010), Galton (1999).</p>	<b>15</b>	<p>At the top band candidates will provide a well-developed and/or elaborated response containing precise evaluative points and/or issues which impact on the ethics of the research. A discussion should contain both positive and negative points which show a deeper understanding of ethics. Points should be supported by appropriate evidence.</p> <p>Band 2 will cover a range of relevant issues supported by evidence but will lack development.</p> <p>Band 3 will have some issues which address the ethics of research but is quite limited.</p> <p>Bottom band is very basic – ‘it is ethical because.....’ or an ‘it isn’t very ethical...’ type response with little development or supporting evidence.</p>

## APPENDIX 1 – GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR PART (A) QUESTIONS

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Generic Mark scheme (part a)</b>
<b>9-10 Marks</b>	Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.
<b>6-8 Marks</b>	Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.
<b>3-5 Marks</b>	Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/ quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors
<b>1-2 Marks</b>	Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.
<b>0 Marks</b>	No or irrelevant answer.

## APPENDIX 2 – GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR PART (B) QUESTIONS

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Generic Mark Scheme (part b)</b>
<b>12-15 Marks</b>	Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are highly skilled and show thorough understanding.
<b>8-11 Marks</b>	Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are competent and understanding is good.
<b>4-7 Marks</b>	Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are evident and demonstrate some understanding.
<b>1-3 Marks</b>	Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.
<b>0 Marks</b>	No or irrelevant answer.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2017

