

# Psychology

Advanced GCE A2 H568

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H168

## Mark Scheme for the Units

---

**June 2009**

**HX68/MS/R/09**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 syllabuses 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 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

**Advanced GCE Psychology (H568)**

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Psychology (H168)**

### MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

<b>Unit/Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
G541 Psychological Investigations	1
G542 Core Studies	7
Grade Thresholds	27

# G541 Psychological Investigations

## Section A

A researcher is interested in finding out why students at a large sixth form college have decided to study psychology. He is going to use a self-report questionnaire.

<b>1(a) Suggest <u>one</u> open and <u>one</u> closed question that could be used to investigate subject choice. [4]</b>	
Open question could be <i>Why did you choose to study psychology?</i> Closed question could be <i>Why did you choose to study psychology? a) it sounds fun (b) my friend said it was groovy (c) I need it for my career (d) I just did, or (e) because my mum said</i>	
2 marks for open-ended question, 2 marks for closed-ended question	
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to suggest an appropriate open-/closed-ended question, but lacks some clarity
<b>2 marks</b>	Appropriate open-/closed-ended question clearly outlined

<b>1(b) Discuss the validity of the closed question you have suggested to investigate subject choice. [4]</b>	
The candidates response her must be related to the closed-ended question (not the open-ended one)	
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
<b>1 mark</b>	General evaluation of the question not related to validity
<b>2 marks</b>	Attempt to evaluate the validity of the question, but lacks detail
<b>3 marks</b>	Clear and detailed evaluation of the validity of the question, but not clearly in the context of the research outlined in the source material. <b>OR</b> an attempt to evaluate the validity of the question in the context of the research outlined in the source material but lacks some clarity.
<b>4 marks</b>	Clear and detailed evaluation of the validity of the question and in the context of the research outlined in the source material.

<b>2(a) Suggest how the researcher could use a random sampling technique to get 40 psychology students to complete the questionnaire. [2]</b>	
Candidates need to demonstrate knowledge and understanding that random sampling must involve access to all members of the identified target population (in this case 'the psychology students at the large sixth-form college' referred to in the source material). Suggestions may be based on manual selection (names from a hat), the use of random number tables or computer-based selection.	
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to describe an appropriate random sampling technique, but omissions make replication not possible (simply stating 'put all the names into a hat and select from there')
<b>2 marks</b>	Clear and detailed description related to the target population referred to in the source material ('a large sixth-form college') that would allow replication

<b>2(b) Evaluate the use of random sampling in this study. [4]</b>		
Evaluative points can be positive and/or negative. Strengths include much better likelihood of obtaining a representative sample and less bias in the data collected. Also, for the research outlined in the source material the relative ease of implementation. Weaknesses include the fact that it can be more time consuming and does not always guarantee full representation of the target population.		
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	
<b>1 mark</b>	Brief response related to just one aspect of the use of random sampling. Lack of clarity	
<b>2 marks</b>	Reference to more than one aspect of the use of random sampling, but lacks clarity	<b>OR</b> a clear and detailed response to just one aspect of the use of random sampling (in context or not)
<b>3 marks</b>	Clear and detailed response related to more than one aspect of the use of random sampling but not related to the research outlined in the source material	<b>OR</b> the evaluation lacks clarity but some attempt to discuss in the context of the research outlined in the source material
<b>4 marks</b>	Clear and detailed response related to more than one aspect of the use of random sampling and related to the research outlined in the source material	

<b>3(a) What is quantitative data? [2]</b>		
Quantitative data is data that can be expressed numerically in some way (measurement of the DV in numbers)		
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	
<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to describe quantitative data, but lacks some clarity	
<b>2 marks</b>	Clear and detailed description of quantitative data	

<b>3(b) Outline one strength and one weakness of quantitative data in this study. [4]</b>		
Strengths could include: can quantify differences in reasons for choosing to study psychology. Weaknesses could include: the quantitative data may not fully reveal the reasons behind why someone chose to study psychology.		
2 marks for strength, 2 marks for weakness		
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	
<b>1 mark</b>	Strength/weakness outlined in general, not in the context of the research outlined in the source material.	
<b>2 marks</b>	Strength/weakness clearly outlined in the context of the research outlined in the source material.	

## Section B

A researcher wants to conduct an experiment to investigate if there is a difference in the memory ability of primary school pupils in the morning compared to the afternoon. Each pupil will be assessed in both the morning and the afternoon.

<b>4 Describe and evaluate <u>one</u> way in which memory could be measured in this investigation. [10]</b>	
Could include: number of words correctly recalled, items remembered from a tray or recollection of extracts from a passage etc. Evaluation must refer to the measure of the DV and not general issues (eg design, procedure, sampling, ethics)	
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
<b>1-2 marks</b>	Attempt to describe a way in which memory could be measured, but no evaluation <b>OR</b> attempt to evaluate a way to measure memory that has not been described (ie attempted evaluation only)
<b>3-4 marks</b>	Attempt to describe a way to measure memory but lacks clarity (not replicable) with attempt at evaluation
<b>5-6 marks</b>	Clear description of a way to measure memory that is fully replicable, but no evaluation <b>OR</b> attempt to describe a way to measure memory (but lacks some clarity and not replicable) with clear evaluation
<b>7-8 marks</b>	Clear description of a way to measure memory that is replicable, with some evaluation (or just one evaluation issue in detail)
<b>9-10 marks</b>	Description of a way to measure memory that is replicable and clear and detailed evaluation of it (with reference to more than one evaluation issue)

<b>5 Explain the difference between an independent measures design and a repeated measures design. [4]</b>	
An independent measures design is where participants only take part in one condition of the experiment. A repeated measures design is where participants take part in both (or all) conditions of an experiment.	
2 marks for comments about independent measures design, 2 marks for repeated measures	
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
<b>1 mark</b>	Brief, unclear outline of what is involved in an independent/repeated measures design
<b>2 marks</b>	Clear outline of what is involved in an independent/repeated measures design

<b>6 Outline <u>one</u> strength and <u>one</u> weakness of using a repeated measures design for this investigation. [6]</b>	
Strengths include: controlling for individual differences in memory between the pupils; and fewer participants required overall. Weaknesses include: the memory task needs to be different in the morning compared to the afternoon (one may be more difficult than the other); there may be carry-over effects that effect performance in the second condition (such as practice gained from having taken a memory test already or fatigue)	
3 marks for strength, 3 marks for weakness	
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to describe strength/weakness, but lacks clarity and not in the context of the research outlined in the source material
<b>2 marks</b>	Clear and detailed outline of strength/weakness, but in general - not in the context of the research outlined in the source material <b>OR</b> attempt to describe strength/weakness that lacks clarity, but is in context
<b>3 marks</b>	Clear and detailed outline of strength/weakness in the context of the material presented in the source material

## Section C

A researcher has conducted a correlational study to investigate the relationship between how important a person thinks appearance is and how much they spend on clothes each month. The first variable was 'self rating of the importance of appearance' measured on a ten point scale (where 1 = not important and 10 = extremely important). The second variable was 'amount of money spent on clothes each month' measured by asking people to estimate to the nearest five pounds how much they spent in a typical month. The results are in the table below.

Participant (initials)	Self-rating of importance of appearance	Amount spent on clothes each month
HA	6	£80
EP	8	£120
SF	9	£100
PR	3	£110
MS	7	£75
JP	4	£35
AG	3	£15
BF	5	£50

<b>7 Suggest an appropriate null hypothesis for this study. [4]</b>	
An appropriate null hypothesis should be something like ... 'there will be (or is) no correlation between self rating of the importance of appearance and the amount spent on clothes each month. Note a null hypothesis should not be directional. Zero marks for stating 'a difference'.	
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
<b>1 mark</b>	The candidate has written an appropriate null hypothesis but has simply stated 'there will not be/is no correlation'. There is no indication of either of the measured variables
<b>2 marks</b>	The candidate has written an appropriate null hypothesis but has only referred to one variable (eg 'there will not be/is no correlation between self rating of importance of appearance')
<b>3 marks</b>	The candidate has written a null hypothesis referring to both variables, but there is a lack of clarity about one of the measured variables or both
<b>4 marks</b>	The candidate has written a clearly stated appropriate null hypothesis referring to both of the measured variables

<b>8(a) Sketch an appropriately labelled scattergraph displaying the results of this study. [4]</b>																			
The scattergraph should look something like ...																			
<p><b>A scattergraph showing the relationship between self rating of the importance of appearance and the amount spent on clothes each month</b></p> <table border="1" style="margin: 10px auto;"> <caption>Data points from the scattergraph</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Self rating of the importance of appearance</th> <th>Amount spent on clothes each month (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>3</td><td>110</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>15</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>35</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>50</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>80</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>75</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>120</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>100</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Self rating of the importance of appearance (1 = not very important 10 = very important)</b></p>		Self rating of the importance of appearance	Amount spent on clothes each month (£)	3	110	3	15	4	35	5	50	6	80	7	75	8	120	9	100
Self rating of the importance of appearance	Amount spent on clothes each month (£)																		
3	110																		
3	15																		
4	35																		
5	50																		
6	80																		
7	75																		
8	120																		
9	100																		
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information																		
<b>1 mark</b>	Appropriate scattergraph, but no labelling																		
<b>2 marks</b>	Appropriate scattergraph but incomplete or unclear labelling on both axes																		
<b>3 marks</b>	Appropriate scattergraph, but incomplete or unclear labelling on one axis																		
<b>4 marks</b>	Appropriate and accurate scattergraph with clear labelling and scales indicated on both axes																		

<b>8(b) Outline <u>two</u> conclusions from the data in this scattergraph. [4]</b>	
2 marks for each conclusion	
Responses here could include ... Generally, the higher an individual rates their appearance, the more they spend on clothes each month; PR has low rating of importance of appearance but spends a lot (£110) on clothes; the amount spent on clothes each month varies quite a lot – between £15-£120; No one rated the importance of appearance below three and no one rated themselves above nine. Note correlations do not imply causation, therefore we can not conclude that the amount spent on clothes each month is determined by an individuals self rating of the importance of appearance.	
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
<b>1 mark</b>	The candidate has stated a conclusion, but this lacks clarity, or can not be clearly derived from the scattergraph presented
<b>2 marks</b>	The candidate has stated a clear conclusion and this can be clearly derived from the scattergraph presented

<b>9 Outline <u>one</u> strength and <u>one</u> weakness of the way 'importance of appearance' was measured in the study. [6]</b>	
Strengths may include: quantifiable scale to allow importance of appearance to be expressed numerically, and easy numerical comparisons across different people; simple, easy to understand scale, with clear definitions at each end etc. Weaknesses may include: subjective interpretation of the scale; scale may be too narrow (just 1 to 10); does not allow full expression of what individuals mean etc	
3 marks for strength, 3 marks for weakness	
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to explain strength/weakness of the way 'importance of appearance' was measured, but brief/lacks clarity
<b>2 marks</b>	Clearly explained strength/weakness of the way 'importance of appearance' was measured but not in the context of the information outlined in the source material <b>OR</b> explanation of strength/weakness lacks clarity but in context
<b>3 marks</b>	Clearly explained strength/weakness of the way 'importance of appearance' was measured in the context of the information outlined in the source material

<b>10 Explain what is meant by a negative correlation. [2]</b>	
A negative correlation is where as the values of one variable increase the values of the other tend to decrease, although not necessarily at the same rate	
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to explain what a negative correlation is, but lacks clarity
<b>2 marks</b>	Clear explanation of what a negative correlation is

## G542 Core Studies

Section A		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1	<p><b>From the study by Baron-Cohen Joliffe, Mortimore and Robertson on autism in adults:</b></p> <p><b>(a) Identify <u>one</u> difference between the performance of the autistic adults and the Tourette Syndrome adults.</b></p> <p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The autistic adults did not perform as well as the Tourette Syndrome adults on the 'Eyes Task'.</li> <li>There was a greater range in performance in the autistic group.</li> <li>The autistic adults performed better than the Tourette Syndrome adults when identifying gender.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer, difference not clear eg the autistic adults scored an average of 16.3 whereas the Tourette Syndrome adults scored an average of 20.4.  <b>2 marks</b> – Full description of difference the autistic adults did not perform as well as the Tourette Syndrome adults on the eye test.</p> <p><b>(b) Outline what this study tells us about advanced theory of mind.</b></p> <p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adult autistics are less likely to possess a TOM than either normal or Tourette Syndrome adults, shown through the 'Eyes Task' where their average score was only 16.3 compared to the normal individuals whose score was 20.3 and the Tourette Syndrome adults whose average score was 20.4.</li> <li>There are individual differences in relation to TOM which are more prevalent in adults with autism than either normal or Tourette Syndrome adults because there was a greater range of scores in the autistic group (10) than in the normal and Tourette group (9).</li> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – Definition of TOM.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg Autistics are less likely to have TOM than either normal or Tourette Syndrome adults.  <b>2 marks</b> – Clear explanation in relation to TOM, supported by evidence. IE Contextualised.</p>	<p>[2]</p> <p>[2]</p>

Section A		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2	<p><b>From the study by Loftus and Palmer on eyewitness testimony, outline <u>two</u> ways in which the procedure was standardised.</b></p> <p>Any two from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All participants watched the same film clips.</li> <li>• All participants were asked the same questions, except for the critical question.</li> <li>• All participants experienced the same time-lapse between questioning in the second experiment.</li> <li>• All participants were asked to give a general account of what they remembered.</li> <li>• All participants saw the film clips in the same environment, at the same time.</li> <li>• All participants were given the same standardised instructions.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg standardised instructions.  <b>2 marks</b> – Full outline of one way the procedure was standardised.</p>	<p><b>[2+2]</b>  <b>[4]</b></p>
3(a)	<p><b>From the study by Savage Rumbaugh identify <u>one</u> reason why Kanzi was taught symbol acquisition as a means of communication.</b></p> <p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because he had already been assigned to the language research centre.</li> <li>• Because he was reared in a 'language using' environment.</li> <li>• Because his mother was a 'language' chimp.</li> <li>• Because he had already been observed spontaneously using symbols.</li> <li>• Because chimps do not have appropriate vocal chords to produce human speech.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg Because chimps can't speak.  <b>2 marks</b> – Full description of one of the above reasons.</p>	<p><b>[2]</b></p>
(b)	<p><b>Outline <u>one</u> way in which the researchers recorded Kanzi's symbol acquisition.</b></p> <p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All lexigrams were automatically recorded by computer-monitored keyboards when Kanzi was indoors.</li> <li>• Lexigram utterances were recorded by hand and entered into the computer at the end of the day when Kanzi was in the woods.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg Recorded on a computer, noted by observer/researcher.  <b>2 marks</b> – Clear outline of how acquisition was recorded as detailed above.</p>	<p><b>[2]</b></p>

Section A		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4	<p><b>Bandura, Ross and Ross in their study of aggression used a 'matched pairs' experimental design.</b></p> <p><b>(a) How were the children matched in this study?</b></p> <p>They were matched on pre-measured levels of aggression by teachers observing them in the playground using a 5 point likert scale.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg pre-measured/pre-tested.  <b>2 marks</b> – Clear description of how they were matched as detailed above.</p> <p><b>(b) Outline why the children were matched in this study.</b></p> <p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To control for individual differences in levels of aggression so all the aggressive children did not end up in the same group.</li> <li>To make it a fair test so not all the aggressive children ended up in the same group.</li> <li>So level of aggression was not a confounding variable that could have influenced results.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg To make it fair, as a baseline measurement.  <b>2 marks</b> – Full explanation of reason for matching as detailed above.</p>	<p>[2]</p> <p>[2]</p>
5	<p><b>In the study by Samuel and Bryant on conservation, in the 'one-question condition', children were asked a question about number, mass or volume, only after they had seen the transformation.</b></p> <p><b>(a) Identify the other <u>two</u> conditions of this experiment.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard (Piagetian) condition/Two question condition.</li> <li>Fixed array condition.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for correctly identifying one condition.  <b>2 marks</b> – for correctly identifying both conditions.</p> <p><b>(b) In addition to these conditions, two other factors affected the children's ability to conserve. Identify both of these factors.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age.</li> <li>Materials/task used/whether counters, play dough or water was used.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – if only one factor identified.  <b>2 marks</b> for correctly identifying both factors.</p>	<p>[2]</p> <p>[2]</p>

Section A		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6	<p><b>From Freud's study of Little Hans:</b></p> <p><b>(a) Briefly describe <u>one</u> of Little Hans' dreams or fantasies.</b></p> <p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Giraffe daydream</u> – Big giraffe and a crumpled one. Hans took the crumpled giraffe away from the big one and after a while the big one stopped calling out for it.</li> <li>• <u>Plumber fantasy (1)</u> – Hans was in the bath and a plumber came and unscrewed it. The he took a big borer and stuck it in his stomach.</li> <li>• <u>Plumber fantasy (2)</u> – The plumber came and took away Hans' behind and widdler with a pair of pliers and replaced them with larger ones.</li> <li>• <u>Parenting fantasy</u> – Hans became the father of his imaginary children, Hans' mother was their mother (therefore Hans' wife), Hans' father was their grandfather.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg The giraffe fantasy.  <b>2 marks</b> – Clear description of daydream/fantasy as detailed above.</p>	[2]
	<p><b>(b) Outline Freud's explanation of this dream or fantasy.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Giraffe daydream</u> – A re-enactment of what happened in the morning when Hans climbed into bed with his parents. His father (the big giraffe) objected and called out because Hans took his mother (the little giraffe) away from him.</li> <li>• <u>Plumber fantasy (1)</u> – The plumber equates to Hans' father with his big borer (penis) with which he 'bored' Hans and put him in his mother's womb.</li> <li>• <u>Plumber fantasy (2)</u> – Hans' small bottom and widdler were replaced by bigger ones, like his father's, indicating Hans wanted to be like his father.</li> <li>• <u>Parenting fantasy</u> – Hans' sexual desires for his mother are apparent as he fantasises about being married to her and having children with her. His fear of his father is removed as he is displaced to the role of grandfather.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer. Eg <u>Parenting fantasy</u>: Hans had sexual desires for his mother; Hans was in the phallic stage/experiencing the Oedipus complex.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear description of Freud's explanation as outlined above.</p>	[2]

Section A		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7	<p><b>From Sperry's 'split-brain' study:</b></p> <p><b>(a) Identify <u>one</u> difference between 'split-brain' patients and 'normal' people in their ability to identify objects by touch alone.</b></p> <p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects put in the left hand could not be described or named but could be correctly selected from a collection of objects with the same hand as they were originally placed in by split-brain people. Whereas 'normal' people could describe and name objects put in either hand and select the correct object with either hand.</li> <li>• If two objects were placed one in each hand of split-brain participants, each hand could only search for and find its own object from a collection of objects whereas a 'normal' person could use either hand.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> - Partial or vague answer eg Could find the object with the same hand/reference to performance of split-brain participants only.  <b>2 marks</b> – Clear explanation of difference as detailed above.</p> <p><b>(b) Outline <u>one</u> reason for this difference.</b></p> <p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects placed in right hand are identified by left hemisphere which controls speech.</li> <li>• Objects placed in left hand are identified by right hemisphere which has no speech capacity.</li> <li>• Objects can only be retrieved by the same hand because information cannot be passed to the opposite hemisphere as the corpus callosum had been severed.</li> <li>• Two objects can be retrieved at the same time with the original hand because the hemispheres work independently.</li> <li>• Because split-brain people have had the two hemispheres disconnected so information cannot be passed across/the two hemispheres cannot communicate with each other.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg left hemisphere controls speech, corpus callosum had been severed.  <b>2 marks</b> – Clear explanation of the difference as outlined above.</p>	<p>[2]</p> <p>[2]</p>

Section A		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8	<p><b>In the study by Maguire et al of taxi drivers:</b></p> <p><b>(a) Describe <u>two</u> features of the sample.</b></p> <p>Any two from:</p> <p>Two groups: 16 right-handed, licensed taxi driver, male taxi drivers, average age 44 were matched with 16 right-handed, male, non taxi divers of the same age etc.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – One feature identified  <b>2 marks</b> – Two features identified</p> <p><b>(b) Outline <u>one</u> limitation of this sample.</b></p> <p>Likely answers:</p> <p>* The sample consisted of only male participants so results cannot be generalised to all taxi drivers as female brains may be different.  * All were right-handed so results cannot be generalised to left-handed taxi-drivers.  * Other appropriate answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg Only males used.  <b>2 marks</b> – Full description of limitation and the implications as detailed above.</p>	<p><b>[1+1]</b>  <b>[2]</b></p> <p><b>[2]</b></p>
9	<p><b>In Dement and Kleitman's study on sleep and dreaming, it is suggested that Rapid Eye Movements (REM) only occur during dreaming.</b></p> <p><b>Give <u>one</u> piece of evidence that supports this suggestion and <u>one</u> piece of evidence that challenges it.</b></p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Supporting evidence</u>  Majority of dreams were reported when participants were awoken from REM sleep.</li> <li>• <u>Challenging evidence</u>  Some participants reported dreams when awoken from NREM sleep.</li> <li>• Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg dreams don't occur in NREM , only supporting or challenging evidence cited.  <b>2 marks</b> - Clear description of both supporting and challenging evidence as detailed above or other appropriate answer.</p>	<p><b>[2+2]</b>  <b>[4]</b></p>



Section A		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
12	<p><b>In the subway Samaritan study by Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin, some of the researchers acted as models.</b></p> <p><b>(a) Identify <u>one</u> of the model conditions.</b></p> <p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjacent area early.</li> <li>• Adjacent area late.</li> <li>• Critical area early.</li> <li>• Critical area late.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg identification of time or area only.  <b>2 marks</b> – Identification of both time and area.</p> <p><b>(b) Outline <u>one</u> finding from the model conditions.</b></p> <p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area variable had no effect on help received.</li> <li>• Early model elicited significantly more help than late model.</li> <li>• Too few instances to allow an analysis.</li> </ul> <p>1 mark – Partial or vague answer eg model elicited more help.  2 marks – Clear conclusion drawn and related to the findings of the study.</p>	[2]
13(a)	<p><b>Identify <u>two</u> psychological tests carried out on Eve White and Eve Black in Thigpen and Cleckley's study of multiple personality disorder.</b></p> <p>Any two from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rorschach Inkblot Test.</li> <li>• Drawings of human figures.</li> <li>• Wechsler Memory Scale/Test.</li> <li>• Wechsler-Bellevue IQ Test.</li> <li>• Projective test.</li> <li>• Psychometric test.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Only one psychological test identified.  <b>2 marks</b> – Two of the above tests identified.</p>	
(b)	<p><b>Outline the findings of <u>one</u> of these tests.</b></p> <p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Rorschach Inkblot Test</u>: EW: constriction, anxiety, obsessive, compulsive traits, rigid, hostile; EB: healthier, hysterical tendency.</li> <li>• <u>Drawings of human figures</u>: EW: repressive; EB: regressive.</li> <li>• <u>Wechsler Memory Scale</u>: EW: superior (above IQ level) EB: inferior (on par with IQ level).</li> </ul>	[2]

Section A		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Wechsler-Bellevue</u> Intelligence Test: EW: 110; EB: 104.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg EW more intelligent.  <b>2 marks</b> – Findings in relation to one test for both EW and EB are clearly identified as detailed above.</p>	[2]
14	<p><b>Explain how Griffiths used the quasi-experimental method in his study into fruit machine gambling.</b></p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <p>A quasi experiment is an experiment where the conditions (IV's) already exist, and so participants cannot be randomly allocated to them/an experiment where the researcher cannot directly manipulate the IV. Here participants were either gamblers or non gamblers, so Griffiths could not randomly allocate them to the two conditions.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg Griffiths couldn't make participants into gamblers.  <b>2 marks</b> – <b>Either</b> Clear and accurate explanation of what a quasi-experiment is <b>or</b> why Griffiths could not randomly allocate his participants to either the regular or non-regular condition.  <b>3 marks</b> – Clear and accurate explanation of what a quasi-experiment is and why Griffiths could not randomly allocate his participants to either the regular or non-regular condition, with some minor omissions.  <b>4 marks</b> – Clear and accurate explanation of what a quasi-experiment is and why Griffiths could not randomly allocate his participants to either the regular or non-regular condition.</p>	[4]
15(a)	<p><b>From Rosenhan's study 'On being sane in insane places', give <u>one</u> example of how the pseudopatients' requests were dealt with by the staff.</b></p> <p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When pseudopatients tried to talk to staff they were ignored as if they did not exist.</li> <li>• When pseudopatients tried to talk to staff, staff moved on with heads averted.</li> <li>• When pseudopatients tried to talk to staff, staff avoided eye contact.</li> <li>• When pseudopatients tried to talk to staff, staff avoided speaking with them.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg avoided them.  <b>2 marks</b> – Clear description of how staff tried to avoid any contact with the pseudopatients as detailed above.</p>	[2]
(b)	<p><b>Outline how staff reactions affected the pseudopatients.</b></p> <p>Likely answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pseudopatients experienced powerlessness, depersonalisation and helplessness as they felt they were unable to do anything to improve their situation.</li> <li>• Other appropriate response.</li> </ul>	

<b>Section A</b>		
<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>
	<b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg depersonalisation not supported with reference to the study. <b>2 marks</b> – Good description of how the pseudopatients felt.	<b>[2]</b>
<b>Section A Total</b>		<b>[60]</b>

Section B		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16	<p><b>Choose one of the core studies below:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rosenhan: on being sane in insane places.</li> <li>• Bandura: transmission of aggression.</li> <li>• Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin: good Samaritanism.</li> </ul> <p><b>and answer the following questions:</b></p> <p><b>(a) What was the aim of your chosen study?</b></p> <p>Most likely answer:  Rosenhan: to investigate whether hospital staff could tell the sane from the insane, to test the reliability of the DSM.  Bandura: to investigate whether children will imitate aggression demonstrated by significant others; any one of the four stated hypotheses.  Piliavin: to investigate the effect of race (black/white) and physical state (drunk/ill) on helping behaviour; to test the diffusion of responsibility hypothesis.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Aim is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>2 marks</b> – Aim is clearly stated. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good. Fine details may be added. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p> <p><b>(b) Describe the method in your chosen study and give <u>one</u> advantage of using this method.</b></p> <p><b>Method:</b>  Most likely answers:  Rosenhan = field experiment/observational study + details of how data was gathered using observation  Bandura = laboratory experiment + how the IV's were manipulated and the DV measured and recorded.  Piliavin = field experiment + how the IV's were manipulated and the DV measured and recorded.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Method is identified, with little or no elaboration/description of the procedure, no link to chosen study.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of method is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of method is accurate, has elaboration and is appropriately applied to the chosen study. Understanding is good eg how the variables were manipulated/measured.</p>	[2]

Section B		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p><b>Advantage:</b> Likely answers: Rosenhan: the use of covert observation allowed the researchers to record how patients are treated/mistreated in many American psychiatric hospitals. Bandura: the controlled environment and manipulation of IV's allowed researchers to show cause and effect in relation to the imitation of aggression. Piliavin: the use of the New York subway, a natural environment, allowed observers to gather data in relation to how normal people show helping behaviour when in a restricted area.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - No or irrelevant answer. <b>1 mark</b> – Peripherally relevant advantage is identified, not linked to chosen study and with little or no elaboration eg Reliability. <b>2 marks</b> – Appropriate advantage chosen. Description of advantage is basic and lacks detail. <b>3 marks</b> – Appropriate advantage is chosen. Description of advantage is accurate and has elaboration.</p>	
16(c)	<p><b>Describe <u>two</u> ethical issues raised by your chosen study.</b></p> <p><b>Answers are likely to refer to any of the BPS ethical guidelines.</b> Eg Rosenhan: no consent + deception of hospital staff, Bandura: no consent gained from children + stress caused to children by being shown aggressive acts. Piliavin: no consent gained from participants + deception in relation to the victim feigning condition.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer. <b>1 mark</b> – One ethical issue is identified, not linked to chosen study and with little or no elaboration. <b>2 marks</b> – Description of ethical issue is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. <b>3 marks</b> – Description of ethical issue is accurate, is elaborated and clearly linked to the study. Understanding is good.</p>	[3+3] [6]
(d)	<p><b>With reference to your chosen study, explain <u>one</u> reason why the researcher(s) needed to break ethical guidelines and <u>one</u> reason why they should not have done so.</b></p> <p><b>Likely reasons for breaking guidelines include:</b> Rosenhan: if hospital staff knew the pseudopatients were not insane they would have treated them differently (better). Bandura: if children had not been exposed to aggression researchers would not have been able, so easily, to see how readily children imitate the behaviour modelled by significant others. Piliavin: if participants had given informed consent they may not have acted naturally, showing demand characteristics and/or socially desirable responses</p>	[3+3] [6]

Section B		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16(e)	<p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Reason for breaking ethical guidelines is identified, not linked to chosen study and with little or no elaboration.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Description of why the researcher(s) needed to break ethical guidelines is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – Description of why the researcher(s) needed to break ethical guidelines is accurate, has elaboration and is clearly linked to the study. Understanding is good.</p> <p><b>Likely reasons against breaking guidelines include:</b>  Rosenhan: The hospital staff may have suffered long-term psychological harm when they realised they could not tell the sane from the insane.  Bandura: It is not fair to put children in such stressful situations especially if they challenge the morals of society.  Piliavin: Passengers who did not help/felt unable to help may have left the study feeling guilty or distressed.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Reason why ethical guidelines should not be broken is just identifiable, not linked to chosen study and with little or no elaboration.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Description of why ethical guidelines should not be broken is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – Description of why ethical guidelines should not be broken is accurate, has elaboration and is clearly linked to the study. Understanding is good.</p> <p><b>Suggest how your chosen study could be made more ethical.</b></p> <p>Possible answers include:  Rosenhan: For experiment 1 get hospitals to consent to participation in psychological research before the study begins; for experiment 1, pre-warn hospital staff (as they did in Experiment 2) that pseudopatients would try to get themselves admitted/would be admitted, so giving staff forewarning of the event.  Bandura: Get informed consent from parents before the study and debrief them afterwards so they appreciate both the positive and negative sides of the behaviours they model in front of children.  Piliavin: Advertise on the New York subway/in local newspapers prior to the study taking place that an investigation is imminent; post the results of the study around the appropriate stations/in local newspapers as a form of debrief.</p>	[3+3] [6]

Section B		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16(f)	<p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – One or two changes suggested which are very basic and lack detail (eg one or two general statements are identified such as: get informed consent). Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. The answer is unstructured, lacks organisation, grammatical structure is poor and there are many spelling errors.</p> <p>A maximum of three marks if not linked to chosen study or if list with no detail.</p> <p><b>4-6 marks</b> – Description of one or more appropriate changes is accurate. Detail is good and some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation, is mostly grammatically correct and has few spelling errors.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Description of at least two appropriate changes is accurate. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding is very good. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good. The answer is competently structured and organised and is grammatically correct with only occasional spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Outline the implications of the ethical changes you have suggested for your chosen study.</b></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Getting informed consent will lead to demand characteristics/socially desirable responses</li> <li>* Getting informed consent will reduce stress but may not lead to valid responses.</li> <li>* Debriefing may make participants feel better/salve their consciousness.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Description of one or two implications is very basic and lacks detail (eg one or two general statements are identified such as increased EV, no demand characteristics). Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. The answer is unstructured, lacks organisation, grammatical structure is poor and there are many spelling errors.</p> <p>A maximum of three marks if not linked to chosen study or if list with no detail.</p> <p><b>4-6 marks</b> – Description of one or more implications is accurate. Detail is good and some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is reasonable. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Description of implications is accurate. Detail is</p>	[8]

<b>Section B</b>		
<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>
	appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding is very good. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good. The answer is competently structured and organised. The answer is grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.	<b>[8]</b>
	<b>Section B Total</b>	<b>[36]</b>

Section C		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
<b>EITHER</b>		
<b>17(a)</b>	<p><b>Outline <u>one</u> assumption of the social approach.</b></p> <p>Likely answer: It assumes that other people and the surrounding environment are major influences on an individual's behaviour, thought processes and emotions</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer. <b>1 mark</b> – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. <b>2 marks</b> – Description of assumption is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good. Fine details may be added. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>	<b>[2]</b>
<b>(b)</b>	<p><b>Describe how the social approach could explain helping behaviour.</b></p> <p>Likely answer: The environment and situation we are in are major influences on whether or not individuals will help another person. In a closed area individuals tend not to diffuse responsibility. If a victim is lame people are more likely to help than if the victim is drunk. If a victim is the same race as a potential helper they are more likely to help them.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer. <b>1-2 marks</b> – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and or elaboration may be evident. Expression generally poor. Generic explanation not linked to a known study. <b>3-4 marks</b> – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (eg specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good</p>	<b>[4]</b>
<b>(c)</b>	<p><b>Describe <u>one</u> similarity and <u>one</u> difference between any social approach studies.</b></p> <p><b>Similarity:</b> Eg Both Milgram and Reicher and Haslam used samples comprised of all males .....</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer. <b>1 mark</b> – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration, topic of study restated. <b>2 marks</b> – Description of similarity is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. <b>3 marks</b> – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>	

Section C		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
17(d)	<p><b>Difference:</b> Eg Milgram's study was conducted in America whereas Reicher and Haslam's took place in England...</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> –Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration, topic of study is restated.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of difference is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p> <p><b>Discuss strengths and weaknesses of the social approach using examples from any social approach studies.</b></p> <p>Strengths may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It helps us understand how behaviour can be influenced by other people and the situation in which people find themselves...</li> <li>• It can provide explanations for a great many phenomena...</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It underestimates the influence of individual differences on behaviour...</li> <li>• It often fails to emphasise that human behaviour has not just a cultural but also an historical context...</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1-3 marks</b> – There may be some strengths or weaknesses which are appropriate or peripheral to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is poor with limited or no understanding. Expression is poor. Analysis is sparse and argument may be just discernible. Sparse or no use of supporting examples.  <b>4-6 marks</b> – There may be some strengths and weaknesses which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be limited. Analysis is effective sometimes and argument limited. Sparse use of supporting examples.  <b>7-9 marks</b> – There may be a range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is good with some understanding and good expression. Analysis is reasonably effective and argument is informed. Some use of supporting examples. Maximum mark of 7 for strengths or weaknesses only.  <b>10-12 marks</b> – There is a good range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) which are appropriate to the question. There is a good balance between the two. Discussion is detailed with good understanding and clear expression. Analysis is effective and argument well informed. Appropriate use of supporting examples. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Question total [24]</b></p>	<p><b>[3+3]</b> <b>[6]</b></p> <p><b>[12]</b></p>

Section C		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
OR 18(a)	<p><b>Outline <u>one</u> assumption of the cognitive approach.</b></p> <p>Likely answer: Internal mental processes such as memory, thinking, reasoning, problem-solving and language, are important features influencing human behaviour.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer. <b>1 mark</b> – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. <b>2 marks</b> – Description of assumption is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is very good. Fine details may be added. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>	[2]
(b)	<p><b>Explain how the cognitive approach could explain the inaccuracy of eyewitness testimony.</b></p> <p>Likely answer: There are two types of information that make up memory of a complex event: information gathered from perceiving the event and information gathered after the event. These two pieces of information become integrated and if the information after the event is influenced by leading questions the individual is left with an inaccurate memory of that event. Any testimony relating to the event may therefore be inaccurate.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer. <b>1-2 marks</b> – Description is generally accurate, but is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding and or elaboration may be evident. Expression generally poor. <b>3-4 marks</b> – Description is accurate. Detail is appropriate and understanding is good. Elaboration (eg specific detail or example) is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is good.</p>	[4]
(c)	<p><b>Describe <u>one</u> similarity and <u>one</u> difference between any cognitive approach studies.</b></p> <p><b>Similarity:</b> Eg Both Loftus and Palmer and Baron-Cohen used laboratory experiments to investigate how cognitive processes influence behaviour...</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer. <b>1 mark</b> – Similarity is identified, with little or no elaboration. <b>2 marks</b> – Description of similarity is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor no link to known study. <b>3 marks</b> – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>	[3+3] [6]

Section C		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
18(d)	<p><b>Difference:</b> Eg Loftus and Palmer used American students, whereas Savage-Rumbaugh studied pygmy and common chimpanzees...</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> –Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of difference is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor , no link to known study.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p> <p><b>Discuss strengths and weaknesses of the cognitive approach using examples from any cognitive approach studies.</b></p> <p>Strengths may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has provided explanations of how specific cognitive deficits influence behaviour....</li> <li>• It shows that animals other than humans are capable of using language...</li> <li>• It provides explanations of many aspects of human behaviour such as the influence of leading questions on the accuracy of recall....</li> <li>• It has useful applications eg when interviewing witnesses the police should avoid using leading questions....</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is often over simplistic and ignores the complexity of human functioning...</li> <li>• It is unrealistic and ignores biological influences and the grounding of mental processes...</li> <li>• Usually studied through either laboratory experiments or case studies....</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1-3 marks</b> – There may be some strengths or weaknesses which are appropriate or peripheral to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is poor with limited or no understanding. Expression is poor. Analysis is sparse and argument may be just discernible. Sparse or no use of supporting examples.  <b>4-6 marks</b> – There may be some strengths and weaknesses which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is reasonable with some understanding though expression may be limited. Analysis is effective sometimes and argument limited. Sparse use of supporting examples.  <b>7-9 marks</b> – There may be a range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) which are appropriate to the question, or there may be an imbalance between the two. Discussion is good with some understanding and good expression. Analysis is reasonably effective and argument is informed. Some use of supporting examples. Maximum mark of 7 for strengths or weaknesses only.</p>	

Section C		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p><b>10-12 marks</b> – There is a good range of strengths (2 or more) and weaknesses (2 or more) which are appropriate to the question. There is a good balance between the two. Discussion is detailed with good understanding and clear expression. Analysis is effective and argument well informed. Appropriate use of supporting examples. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	
	<b>Question Total [24]</b>	<b>[12]</b>
	<b>Section C Total</b>	<b>[24]</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>[120]</b>

# Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE Psychology H168 H568  
June 2009 Examination Series

## Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
G541	Raw	60	45	41	37	33	29	0
	UMS	60	48	42	36	30	24	0
G542	Raw	120	81	72	63	54	46	0
	UMS	140	112	98	84	70	56	0

## Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
H168	200	160	140	120	100	80	0

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

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
H168	11.3	25.8	44.5	63.6	79.0	0	17222

## 17222 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

[http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums\\_results.html](http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

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 2009

