

# Psychology

Advanced GCE A2 H568

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H168

## Mark Scheme for the Units

---

**January 2010**

**HX68/MS/R/10J**

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, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 2010

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	13
G543 Options in Applied Psychology	43
G544 Approaches and Research Methods in Psychology	75
Grade Thresholds	94

# G541 Psychological Investigations

Section A				
Question Number	Answer		Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>Researchers conducted an experiment to investigate the ability of ten males and ten females to recognise emotions displayed on the face. A set of 12 photographs of the same person displaying the six primary emotions (happiness, sadness, anger, surprise, fear and disgust) was used. Participants had ten seconds to look at each photograph and had to identify the emotion displayed before moving onto the next. One mark was awarded for each correct response, giving a total out of 12.</p>			
1 (a)	<p><b>Explain what is meant by the descriptive statistic called the mean.</b></p> <p>The mean is the arithmetic average that indicates the typical score in a data set.</p>		<b>[2]</b>	<p>1 mark - The average or central tendency identified in the answer. 2 marks can be gained if candidate provides a detailed description of how to calculate the mean.</p>
	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		
	<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to explain what the mean is but unclear		
	<b>2 marks</b>	Clear explanation of what the mean is		

Section A					
Question Number	Answer		Max Mark	Additional Guidance	
1 (b)	<b>Explain how the mean would have been calculated for the males and females in this study.</b>			<p>1 mark - An example of an attempt could be made by referring to addition or division even if the total number of scores is incorrect. Eg divided by 15.</p> <p>2 marks (right side) - Any context can be seen as appropriate (eg reference to gender). If candidates in calculation just confuse the items but it is relevant to the study (eg division by 12 rather than 10) their answer can be placed in this band.</p> <p>4 marks - The candidate must contextualise their answer back to the topic area or measurement (eg emotion, facial expressions, pictures).</p>	
	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information			
	<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to explain how the mean would have been calculated			
	<b>2 marks</b>	Clear, but general explanation of how the mean is calculated			<b>OR</b> attempt to explain how the mean would have been calculated in this study, but lacks some clarity
	<b>3-4 marks</b>	Clear explanation of how the mean would have been calculated for both the males and females in this study			
			[4]		

Section A				
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance	
2	<p><b>When would the descriptive statistic called the ‘median’ be more appropriate and why?</b></p> <p>The median is a more representative form of a measure of central tendency (average) when there is anomalous data, or ‘outliers’. Why? – this is because any ‘extreme’ or ‘unusual’ scores that would otherwise artificially inflate or deflate the average if the mean was calculated are marginalised and do not feature in the calculation</p>		<p>0 marks - Any calculation of median.</p> <p>1 mark - Brief comment about the middle, data is ordinal, refer to fact that it is a measure of central tendency or it is an average.</p>	
	<b>0 marks</b>			The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information.
	<b>1 mark</b>			Attempt to explain when the median would be more appropriate, but lacks clarity or an attempt to explain why.
	<b>2 marks</b>			Clear explanation of the circumstances under which the median would be more appropriate or an attempt to explain when the median would be more appropriate and an attempt to explain why.
	<b>3 marks</b>			Clear explanation of the circumstances under which the median would be more appropriate and an attempt to explain why <b>OR</b> attempt to explain when the median would be more appropriate and a clear explanation of why.
	<b>4 marks</b>			Clear explanation of the circumstances under which the median would be more appropriate <b>and</b> a clear explanation of why
		[4]		

Section A					
Question Number	Answer		Max Mark	Additional Guidance	
3	<p><b>Evaluate the reliability and validity of the way the dependent variable (DV) has been measured in this study.</b></p> <p>Comments about the reliability of the measure could include: standardised face/photograph used; same male and female used on each occasion; standardised testing arrangements</p> <p>Comments about the validity of the measure could include: artificially posed expressions; only still photographs used; not like emotions are usually experienced on the face (no context or build-up to the expression); all six primary emotions assessed</p>			<p>No credit given to any evaluation points that do not relate to the DV (eg sample, population validity).</p> <p>6 marks – This could be where candidates frequently get confused between reliability and validity but are making accurate points.</p> <p>7 marks – Attempt not in context.</p> <p>8 marks – Attempt in context (eg the topic area or the measure).</p> <p>10 marks – The candidate needs to correctly label all the evaluative points back to reliability and validity.</p>	
	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information			
	<b>1-2 marks</b>	General attempt to evaluate the reliability of the measure	<b>OR</b> General attempt to evaluate the validity of the measure		
	<b>3-4 marks</b>	General attempt to evaluate both the reliability and validity of the measure	<b>OR</b> attempt to evaluate reliability or validity in context		
	<b>5-6 marks</b>	Clear evaluation of the reliability of the measure in the context of the information in the source material	<b>OR</b> Clear evaluation of the validity of the measure in the context of the information in the source material		<b>OR</b> attempt to evaluate both reliability and validity in context (only one in context is awarded 5)
	<b>7-8 marks</b>	Clear evaluation of the reliability of the measure in the context of the information in the source material and an attempt at evaluation of the validity	<b>OR</b> clear evaluation of the validity of the measure in the context of the information in the source material and an attempt at evaluation of the reliability		
	<b>9-10 marks</b>	Clear evaluation of both the reliability and validity of the measure of the dependent variable in the context of the information provided in the source material			<b>[10]</b>
<p><b>Researchers want to conduct an observation study of shopping behaviour at a large local supermarket. [10]</b></p>					

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance		
4	<p><b>Describe and evaluate a suitable procedure for this observation study. [10]</b></p> <p>For full marks candidates must provide a detailed description of an appropriate procedure and evaluate it. Both must be in the context of the information outlined in the source material.</p>		<p>Major omissions include <b>what</b> and <b>how</b>. The 'what' does include examples of the behaviours/behavioural categories. The 'how' can be either where the observer is in the supermarket or something to do with the timings of the observation or sampling technique of the behaviour (eg event or time sampling).</p> <p>Minor omissions include who, when and where. 'Who' could include the characteristics of the sample, sampling technique or sample size.</p> <p>Candidates can describe 'aggressive' as a valid behavioural category for their observation.</p> <p>To be considered replicable the candidate should include who, what, when, where and how.</p> <p>Please note that it is possible that some of the characteristics of the procedure could be indicated in the evaluation points.</p> <p>9 marks: Only one of the evaluative points has to be in context.</p> <p>10 marks: At least two of the evaluative points must be in context.</p>		
	<b>0 marks</b>			The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	
	<b>1-2 marks</b>			Minimal information – attempt to describe procedure only – replication not possible	<b>OR</b> Attempt to evaluate a procedure that has not been described (ie attempted evaluation only)
	<b>3-4 marks</b>			Attempt to describe procedure, but minor omissions make replication difficult. No evaluation	<b>OR</b> Attempt to describe procedure, but not replicable (more than minor omissions) and attempt to evaluate
	<b>5 marks</b>			Description of procedure that is replicable, but no evaluation	<b>OR</b> Attempt to describe procedure, but minor omissions make replication difficult. Attempt at evaluation
	<b>6 marks</b>			Detailed description of procedure that is replicable, with attempt at evaluation	<b>OR</b> Attempt to describe procedure, but minor omissions make replication difficult, but detailed evaluation
	<b>7-8 marks</b>			Detailed description of procedure that would allow replication, and detailed evaluation, but not in context	<b>OR</b> Attempt to describe procedure, but minor omissions make replication difficult, but detailed evaluation mainly in context
	<b>9-10 marks</b>			Detailed description of procedure that would allow replication and clear, detailed evaluation with reference to at least two appropriate evaluation issues in context outlined in the source material.	<b>[10]</b>

Section B				
Question Number	Answer		Max Mark	Additional Guidance
5	<b>Describe <u>one</u> ethical issue that the researchers need to consider when conducting this observation and suggest how this could be dealt with.</b>			If there is no context then the answer is capped at two. The context is shopping behaviour in a supermarket.
	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		
	<b>1 mark</b>	Ethical issue identified, but not in the context of the information in the source material and no attempt to suggest how to deal with it.		
	<b>2 marks</b>	Ethical issue described in the context of the information in the source material, but no attempt to suggest how to deal with it <b>OR</b> ethical issue described and a suggested way to deal with it, but neither in the context of the information in the source material (eg simply stating 'lack of consent, so ask for consent')		
	<b>3 marks</b>	Ethical issue described in the context of the information in the source material and attempt to suggest how to deal with it, but the discussion is brief/lacks detail.		
	<b>4 marks</b>	Ethical issue described in the context of the information in the source material and a way to deal with it discussed clearly and in detail		
			<b>[4]</b>	

<b>Section B</b>				
<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Answer</b>		<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>Additional Guidance</b>
6 (a)	<b>Explain what is meant by inter-rater reliability in observational research.</b>		<b>[2]</b>	
	Inter-rater reliability in observational research refers to the extent to which different observers are able to observe and rate (or code) the same behaviour in the same way.			
	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		
	<b>1 mark</b>	General attempt to describe inter-rater reliability (eg simply stating that 'it refers to consistency')		
	<b>2 marks</b>	Clear description of inter-rater reliability		

Section B				
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance	
6 (b)	<p><b>Suggest how the researchers could ensure that this observation has inter-rater reliability.</b></p> <p>Several suggestions could be made here. For example training observers beforehand in the use of the coding scheme, clarifying what the behavioural categories being used refer to and conducting a pilot study to test for agreement amongst observers etc. Candidates can gain full marks if they discuss checks for inter-rater reliability before doing an observation or after doing an observation.</p>	<b>[4]</b>	1 mark: More than one observer.	
	<b>0 marks</b>			The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
	<b>1 mark</b>			Brief response lacking detail and not in the context of the research outlined in the source material
	<b>2 marks</b>			Appropriate and detailed response, but not in the context of the research outlined in the source material or brief response that is lacking detail that is in the context of the research outlined in the source material.
	<b>3 marks</b>			Appropriate, clear and detailed response with an attempt to relate it to the context of the research outlined in the source material <b>OR</b> a suggestion is made that lacks detail/clarity, but is outlined in the context of the research outlined in the source material
	<b>4 marks</b>			Appropriate, clear and detailed suggestion outlined in the context of the research outlined in the source material

Section C												
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance									
	<p>Researchers conducted an investigation about dreaming using a self-report. Some examples of what participants were asked are presented below.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>- <i>On average, how many dreams do you remember having each week?</i></p> <p>- <i>Briefly describe the best dream you have ever had.</i></p> <p>- <i>Do you appear in your own dreams?</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Never</i>    <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sometimes</i>    <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Always</i></p> </div>											
7 (a)	<p>Identify <u>one</u> open question and <u>one</u> closed question from this investigation.</p> <p>There is a choice of two open questions ... <i>On average, how many dreams do you remember having each week?</i> OR <i>Briefly describe the best dream you have ever had.</i></p> <p>The closed question is ... <i>Do you appear in your own dreams?</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Never</i>    <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Sometimes</i>    <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Always</i></p>		<p>Candidates can make up their own relevant questions and receive full credit.</p> <p>If the candidate makes up their own relevant closed question they must include the options to receive any marks. This is not necessary for the closed question which is cited in the source.</p> <p>0 marks if the candidate does not label if the question is open or closed.</p>									
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>0 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2">The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>1 mark</b></td> <td>Correct identification of the open question</td> <td><b>OR</b> correct identification of the closed question</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2">Correct identification of both the open and closed question</td> </tr> </table>	<b>0 marks</b>		The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		<b>1 mark</b>	Correct identification of the open question	<b>OR</b> correct identification of the closed question	<b>2 marks</b>	Correct identification of both the open and closed question		
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information											
<b>1 mark</b>	Correct identification of the open question	<b>OR</b> correct identification of the closed question										
<b>2 marks</b>	Correct identification of both the open and closed question											
		[2]										

Section C				
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance	
7 (b)	<p><b>Outline <u>one</u> strength and <u>one</u> weakness of the closed question you have identified.</b></p> <p>3 marks for the strength, 3 marks for the weakness</p> <p>Strengths include: easier to analyse; easier to present data; easier to make comparisons across participants, social desirability (comments must be in context of the actual closed question discussed for full marks)</p>	<b>[6]</b>		
	<b>0 marks</b>			The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
	<b>1 mark</b>			Brief, unclear and general outline of the strength/weakness of closed questions
	<b>2 marks</b>			Clear outline of the strength/weakness of closed questions, but not in the context of an investigation about dreaming or brief, unclear and general outline of strength/weakness of closed questions but in context.
	<b>3 marks</b>			Clear outline of the strength/weakness of the closed question in the context of an investigation about dreaming
8 (a)	<p><b>What is qualitative data?</b></p> <p>Qualitative data is descriptive, in-depth and rich data that can give you insight into the participants' thoughts and beliefs.</p>	<b>[2]</b>		
	<b>0 marks</b>			The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
	<b>1 mark</b>			Attempt to explain what qualitative data is
	<b>2 marks</b>			Clear explanation of what qualitative data is

Section C																										
Question Number	Answer		Max Mark	Additional Guidance																						
8 (b)	<p><b>Identify how qualitative data would be obtained from <u>one</u> of the questions used in the investigation.</b></p> <p>Qualitative data could be obtained from the question asking about the best dream ever had by the many and varied descriptions of the individual dreams outlined in response to this question.</p>		<b>[3]</b>	<p>1 mark: Brief or identifies the correct question.            2 marks: Either clear <b>or</b> brief and in context            3 marks: Both clear and in context. If the question has been chosen straight from the source then credit can be gained by partially referring back to this question. If the candidate has written their own question then the question has to be clearly identified.</p>																						
	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information																								
	<b>1 mark</b>	Brief attempt to identify how qualitative data would be obtained from the selected question																								
	<b>2-3 marks</b>	Clear identification of how qualitative data would be obtained that relates to the information asked in the selected question																								
9 (a)	<p><b>The table below shows the results from ten participants (five males and five females aged 16 to 25) when asked the question about the number of dreams they remember each week. Outline <u>two</u> findings from the data in this table.</b></p>		<b>[3]</b>																							
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Participants</th> <th style="width: 50%;">The number of dreams that people remember having each week</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">1</td><td style="text-align: center;">1</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">2</td><td style="text-align: center;">3</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">3</td><td style="text-align: center;">2</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">4</td><td style="text-align: center;">3</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">5</td><td style="text-align: center;">1</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">6</td><td style="text-align: center;">12</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">7</td><td style="text-align: center;">2</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">8</td><td style="text-align: center;">2</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">9</td><td style="text-align: center;">3</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">10</td><td style="text-align: center;">2</td></tr> </tbody> </table>				Participants	The number of dreams that people remember having each week	1	1	2	3	3	2	4	3	5	1	6	12	7	2	8	2	9	3	10	2
	Participants	The number of dreams that people remember having each week																								
	1	1																								
	2	3																								
	3	2																								
	4	3																								
	5	1																								
	6	12																								
	7	2																								
	8	2																								
9	3																									
10	2																									

Section C				
Question Number	Answer		Max Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (a) continued	Findings could include: the most number of dreams reported in a week was 12; the fewest was one; most people reported two dreams; no one reported having no dreams; most people reported having between one and three dreams; median dreams is 2, mode dreams is 2, mean dreams is 3.1 (3 is acceptable), range of dreams is 11 and the mean without the one outlier is 2.11 dreams.		[4]	Context refers to dreams.
	2 marks for each finding			
	0 marks	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		
	1 mark	The candidate has stated a finding, but this lacks clarity, or is not in the context of the research outlined in the source material		
2 marks	The candidate has stated a clear finding and this is in the context of the research outlined in the source material			
9 (b)	<b>Evaluate the sample used to obtain the data presented in this table.</b>		[3]	Context refers to dreams.
	Evaluation points can be positive and/or negative. For example: small, so generalisation problems; equal number of males and females; narrow age range etc			
	0 marks	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		
	1 mark	Attempt to evaluate the sample used in the study		
	2 marks	One or more appropriate evaluation points discussed in general or attempt to evaluate the sample used in the study in the context of a study investigating dreaming.		
3 marks	One or more appropriate evaluation points discussed clearly and at least one in the context of a study investigating dreaming			

## G542 Core Studies

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Guidance
1 (a)	Any two from:  Apple, orange, banana, chase, peanut, bedroom, Austin. <b>1 mark</b> – Identification of only one symbol. <b>2 marks</b> – Identification of any two symbols.	[1+1] [2]	<i>'Before any training' refers to the time before Kanzi was separated from his mother. This occurred when Kanzi was 2½ years old (30 months). Therefore the only acceptable answers are the ones listed (taken from the original study).</i>
(b)	Because (before being separated from his mother) he had observed his mother identifying them using a lexigram keyboard.  <b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg because he'd observed his mother. <b>2 marks</b> – Full explanation as described above or other appropriate answer.	[2]	<i>Reference should be made to observational learning – observation + imitation/copying – and who Kanzi had observed – his mother/Matata. Eg 1 mark for observed his mother + 1 mark for imitation/copying (2 elements needed for 2 marks).</i>

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Guidance
2	<p><b>Strength (most likely answer)</b></p> <p>It gives the researcher a high level of control over variables eg here all participants saw exactly the same film clips.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg allows high control over variables, answer not contextualised.  <b>2 marks</b> – Full description of strength contextualised as described above or other appropriate answer.</p> <p><b>Weakness (most likely answer)</b></p> <p>It is low in ecological validity eg here in real life, eyewitness testimony is not based on watching film clips and then completing questionnaires.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg it lacks ecological validity.  <b>2 marks</b> – Full description of weakness contextualised as described above or other appropriate answer.</p>	[2+2] [4]	<p><i>A strength of the experimental method should be accurately described and demonstrated clearly in the context of L&amp;P's study. If the description and link are not clear only award 1 mark.</i></p> <p><i>A weakness of the experimental method should be accurately described and demonstrated clearly in the context of L&amp;P's study. If the description and link are not clear only award 1 mark.</i></p>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Gender Recognition Task</u>: this involved looking at the same sets of eyes as in the experimental task but here participants were asked to identify the gender of the person in each photograph.</li> <li>• <u>Basic Emotion Recognition Task/Emotion Task</u>: this involved judging 6 photographs of whole faces displaying the basic (Ekman categories) emotions.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg identification of task only.  <b>2 marks</b> – Identification and description of control task as described above.</p>	[2+2] [4]	<p><i>This question does not ask for the results of the control tasks. If results only are given, award 0 marks.</i></p> <p><i>For the <u>Gender recognition task</u>: full marks can be awarded if the description is accurate but fails to mention that the photos of the eyes were the same as the ones used in the experimental task.</i></p> <p><i>For the <u>Emotion task</u>: neither the number of photographs used need be mentioned nor reference made to the Ekman categories to gain full marks.</i></p> <p><i>Task need not be named but the description must make the task clearly identifiable.</i></p> <p><i>No credit should be given to description of other named tasks.</i></p>

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
4	<p><b>Strength (most likely answers)</b> Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It allowed an in-depth study/lots of detail to be gathered about Hans' fears, dreams, fantasies etc</li> <li>Hans was less likely to be stressed by his father asking questions so will have answered willingly.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg allowed lots of detail to be gathered about Hans, answer not contextualised, mere identification of appropriate strength of a case study. <b>2 marks</b> – Full description of strength contextualised as outlined above or other appropriate answer.</p> <p><b>Weakness (most likely answers)</b> Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>His father was a follower of Freud and so may have asked leading questions to get answers to support Freud's theories</li> <li>Hans was questioned by his father rather than a neutral researcher so emotional involvement may have influenced what he said.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg Hans' fathers use of leading questions, answer not contextualised, mere identification of appropriate weakness of a case study. <b>2 marks</b> – Full description of weakness contextualised as outlined above or other appropriate answer.</p>	[2+2] [4]	<p><i>Any appropriate strength/weakness can be credited but it must be fully contextualised in relation to the Freud study to gain 2 marks ie mere reference to Hans would only count as a vague/partial answer (he is mentioned in the strap line anyway). Accept reference to longitudinal studies.</i></p>

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
5	<p>Any two from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• children who saw an aggressive model reproduced more aggressive acts resembling the acts of the model than all the other children</li> <li>• children who saw the aggressive model showed more partial imitation of the role model or non-imitative physical and verbal aggression than those who saw the non-aggressive or no model</li> <li>• children who saw the non-aggressive model showed low levels of aggression though they were not significantly lower than the group that had no role model</li> <li>• boys imitated male role models more than girls for physical and verbal imitative aggression, non-imitative aggression and gun play</li> <li>• girls imitated female models more than boys for verbal imitative aggression</li> <li>• boys were generally more aggressive than girls except when they saw an aggressive female model</li> <li>• boys were more aggressive than girls</li> <li>• any other appropriate answers.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg boys were more aggressive. Children were more likely to imitate a same sex model.  <b>2 marks</b> – Accurate description as detailed above or other appropriate answer. Eg Overall boys were more aggressive than girls.</p>	<p>[2+2] [4]</p>	<p><i>The listed findings are the ones candidates are most likely to give. If other suggestions are made, these should be checked against the original study before marking the answer right or wrong.</i></p> <p><i>For full marks the answer must have a comparison.</i></p>

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
6	<p>Any two from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>conservation of number</u>: two identical rows of counters were displayed. One row was then spread out or bunched up and the child was asked if there were the same number of counters in each row</li> <li>• <u>conservation of mass</u>: two identical Playdoh cylinders were displayed. One cylinder was then squashed into a pancake or sausage shape and the child was asked if there was the same amount of Playdoh in each shape</li> <li>• <u>conservation of volume</u>: two identical glasses of water were displayed. The water from one glass was poured into a taller, narrower or shallower, wider glass and the child was then asked if there was the same amount of liquid in each glass.</li> <li>• description of the fixed array condition.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg identification of task without a description.  <b>2 marks</b> – Full description of task as detailed above.</p>	<p>[2+2] [4]</p>	<p><i>The descriptions in the mark scheme have been taken from the original study but reference to plasticine/water etc should be credited provided the overall description is accurate.</i></p> <p><i>Task need not be named but the description must make the task clearly identifiable. No credit should be given to description of other named tasks.</i></p>

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
7	<p>(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• caffeine</li> <li>• alcohol.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – For each correct substance. <b>0 marks</b> – For cigarettes, medication.</p> <p>(b)</p> <p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If their normal routines included these substances, participants may not have slept normally</li> <li>• researchers could not be certain participants had not ingested these substances unknowingly/without thinking, so the researchers could not be certain results were not influenced by them.</li> <li>• traces of the substances may still have been in participants' systems from the previous day, so the researchers could not be certain results were not influenced by them.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg participants may normally take these substances, mere identification of problem <b>2 marks</b> – Clear description of problem and its implication as outlined above, or other appropriate answer.</p>	<p>[1+1] [2]</p> <p>[2]</p>	<p><i>Although not technically correct, accept coffee instead of caffeine.</i></p> <p><i>Here both the problem and its implications need to be outlined to gain full marks.</i></p>

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
8 (a)	<p>One from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>participants suffered from epilepsy which could not be otherwise controlled/controlled by medication</li> <li>because participants suffered from severe epilepsy and this operation allowed the epilepsy to be contained in one hemisphere thus reducing the severity of the symptoms</li> <li>to reduce the effects of epilepsy.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg because participants were ill/schizophrenic/had epilepsy  <b>2 marks</b> – Full and explicit reason provided as outlined above.</p>	[2]	<i>To gain full marks candidates need to expand on the fact that participants suffered from epilepsy.</i>
(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the sample was too small (11 participants) so one may not be able to generalise the findings to the wider population</li> <li>all participants had the split brain operation to cure epilepsy and epilepsy may alter the brain (so one cannot generalise to non-epileptics)</li> <li>other appropriate answer</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg participants were epileptic, small sample, not representative.  <b>2 marks</b> – Full explanation of problem as detailed above or other appropriate answer.</p>	[2]	<p><i>No marks should be awarded for reference to gender bias– 1 participant was male, 1 was female, the gender of the other 9 was not identified in the study.</i></p> <p><i>For 2 marks the limitation must be identified and the implication considered.</i></p>

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
9	<p>(a) IV = London taxi driver (brain) or non-taxi driver (brain). DV = Structure of hippocampi or volume/distribution/density of grey matter in hippocampus.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg only one variable identified. <b>2 marks</b> – Both variables correctly identified.</p> <p>(b) Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• taxi drivers had greater volume (of grey matter) in the posterior hippocampus than non-taxi drivers</li> <li>• taxi drivers had less volume (of grey matter) in the anterior hippocampus than non-taxi drivers</li> <li>• non-taxi drivers had less volume (of grey matter) in the posterior hippocampus than taxi drivers</li> <li>• non-taxi drivers had greater volume (of grey matter) in the anterior hippocampus than taxi drivers.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg there was a difference in the structure/volume of the hippocampi of taxi and non-taxi drivers. <b>2 marks</b> – Accurate description of one of the effects as outlined above.</p>	<p>[2]</p> <p>[2]</p>	<p><i>To gain 1 mark for the IV both conditions must be identified.</i></p> <p><i>0 marks awarded for DV if just reference to brain made ie hippocampus must be mentioned. Not size or amount.</i></p> <p><i>Grey matter need not be mentioned to gain full marks.</i></p> <p><i>For 2 marks both conditions must be mentioned.</i></p>

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
10 (a)	<p>Likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• race (black/white) of every passenger in critical and adjacent areas</li> <li>• sex of every passenger in critical and adjacent areas</li> <li>• location of every passenger in critical and adjacent areas</li> <li>• whether passengers were seated or standing in critical or adjacent areas</li> <li>• total number of passengers in the carriage</li> <li>• total number of passengers who helped the victim</li> <li>• race of helper (black/white)</li> <li>• sex of helper</li> <li>• location of helper – critical or adjacent area</li> <li>• latency of first helper's arrival</li> <li>• latency of first helper's arrival after the model had intervened</li> <li>• other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg race.  <b>2 marks</b> – Accurate description of one of the quantitative measures as described above eg race of passengers/helpers.</p>	[2]	<p><i>The question asks the candidate to 'describe', so mere identification of a quantitative measure will only score 1 mark.</i></p>
(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in the majority/most/60% of the trials spontaneous help came from more than one helper</li> <li>• the lame victim was offered help more quickly than the drunk victim</li> <li>• most/the majority/90% of spontaneous first helpers were males</li> <li>• there was a slight tendency to same race helping, (this being more evident in the drunk condition).</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg more males helped than females.  <b>2 marks</b> – Accurate description of finding as detailed above or other appropriate answer.</p>	[2]	<p><i>Candidates' answers may need checking for accuracy against the original study.</i></p> <p><i>Numbers/percentages need not be accurate but the overall answer must be correct.</i></p>

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
11 (a)	<p>By the number of participants that went up to 450 volts/top of the scale.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg outline of the procedure, by the voltage level administered to the learner.  <b>2 marks</b> – Clear description of how obedience was measured as outlined above.</p>	[2]	<p><i>To gain full marks the problem should be identified and contextualised.</i></p>
(b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• because the task lacked ecological validity (one doesn't normally punish someone with an electric shock because an authority figure demands it) so one cannot say the results reflect what would happen in a real-life situation</li> <li>• because it raises serious ethical concerns eg deception, stress etc. Contextualised.</li> <li>• other appropriate answer</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg, task lacked ecological validity, ethical concerns. Not contextualised.  <b>2 marks</b> – Suggestion as outlined above or other appropriate suggestion clearly described.</p>	[2]	

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
12 (a)	<p>Any one from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the study design was submitted for scrutiny by the BPS ethics committee</li> <li>• all participants underwent clinical, medical and background screening to ensure suitability</li> <li>• all participants gave fully informed consent</li> <li>• clinical psychologists monitored participants throughout the study</li> <li>• a paramedic was on duty throughout the study</li> <li>• security guards were on duty throughout the study</li> <li>• the study was monitored by a 5-person ethics committee.</li> <li>• no physical violence would be tolerated.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg participants were screened.  <b>2 marks</b> – Clear and accurate description of one of the checks as outlined above.</p>	<b>[2]</b>	<i>The ways in the mark scheme have been taken from the original study and are therefore the only acceptable answers.</i>
12 (b)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all participants may have been affected by the internal dissent and loss of confidence in the communal system</li> <li>• the guards may have suffered as a result of failing to identify and cohere as a group</li> <li>• the guards may have suffered as a result of being challenged by the prisoners</li> <li>• the prisoners may have suffered as a result of having no shared identity</li> <li>• the prisoners may have suffered as a result of having no consensus about how to behave</li> <li>• the prisoners may have suffered as a result of conflict with the guards</li> <li>• prisoners may have suffered as a result of the deception in relation to role allocation.</li> </ul>		<i>Answers should not be generic. They must refer to this study and not overtly to Zimbardo. Eg uniforms dehumanised them causing stress- should not be credited.</i>

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg as a result of arguments between the guards and prisoners or answer not contextualised.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear description of how participants may have experienced stress as outlined above or any other appropriate answer.</p>	[2]	
13 (a)	<p>To stay on the fruit machine for 60 gambles to break even and win back the £3.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg to stay on the fruit machine as long as possible, to try to get 60 gambles.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear and accurate description of the gambling task as described above or other appropriate description of the task.</p>	[2]	<p><i>Ignore answers which focus on ‘thinking aloud/not thinking aloud’. This was NOT part of the actual gambling task.</i></p> <p><i>The explanation must be fully contextualised to gain full marks.</i></p>
(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a form of experimental control/to make it a fair test all participants used the same machine so other variables introduced through the use of different machines could not influence the results.</li> <li>• any other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg as a control/to make it a standardised/reliable test.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – Clear description, as outlined above, of why all participants were asked to use the same machine.</p>	[2]	

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
14 (a)	<p>Any two from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• hearing voices</li> <li>• writing notes</li> <li>• queuing early for lunch</li> <li>• pacing the corridors</li> <li>• asking questions.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> - For each correctly identified behaviour as given above  <b>2 marks</b> - two correctly identified behaviours as given above</p>		<i>The question only asks for behaviours to be identified, so no elaboration is required.</i>
(b)	<p>Most likely answer:</p> <p>Because participants had been 'labelled' as mentally ill, their behaviour was interpreted in the light of that label.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg because participants were in a psychiatric ward.  <b>2 marks</b> – Clear description of why participants' behaviour was labelled as abnormal as outlined above or other appropriate answer.</p>	<p>[1+1] [2]</p> <p>[2]</p>	<i>Any appropriate suggestion which may explain why the behaviours were labelled abnormal should be credited.</i>

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
15	<p>Any two from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Eve White</u>: neat, colourless, demure, conservative, honest, serious, conscientious, anxious etc</li> <li>• <u>Eve Black</u>: mischievous, childish, egocentric, vain etc</li> <li>• <u>Jane</u>: mature, sensible, capable, interesting etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Partial or vague answer eg identification of personality only, only one characteristic mentioned eg Eve White was neat.  <b>2 marks</b> – Clear and full description of the named personality based on the descriptions given above.</p> <p><b>NB: Names need not be identified but the distinct personalities must be clear.</b></p>	[2+2] [4]	<p><i>At least TWO characteristics should be given for the <u>named</u> personality to gain full marks. If in doubt refer to pages 141-142 in the original study.</i></p> <p><i>Answers focussed largely on IQ/ memory/ EEG results should not be credited.</i></p>
<b>Section A Total</b>		<b>[60]</b>	

Section B			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
16 (a)	<p>Most likely answers:</p> <p>Griffiths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there would be no difference between the skill levels of regular and non-regular fruit machine gamblers</li> <li>• regular gamblers would produce more irrational verbalisations than non-regular gamblers</li> <li>• regular gamblers would report themselves as being more skill-oriented than non-regular gamblers</li> <li>• ‘thinking aloud’ participants would take longer to complete the task than ‘non-thinking aloud’ participants</li> <li>• other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>Dement &amp; Kleitman:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is a significant association between REM and reported dreaming</li> <li>• there is a significant positive correlation between the estimate of time spent dreaming and the measurement of REM sleep</li> <li>• there is a significant association between the pattern of eye movement and reported dream content</li> <li>• other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>Loftus &amp; Palmer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• vehicle speed estimates are influenced by the wording of questions asked</li> <li>• leading questions influence subsequent expectations about the likely consequences of an event</li> <li>• leading questions influence memory</li> <li>• other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – One vague experimental hypothesis is stated. Statement is basic and lacks clarity. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p>	[2]	<p><b>Generic guidance:</b> Responses to all parts of this question must be clearly and accurately related to the chosen study.</p> <p><i>The statement must make it clear which hypothesis is being referred to. The IV and DV do not need to be specifically identified to gain full marks.</i></p> <p><i>D&amp;K: the adjective ‘significant’ need not be mentioned to gain 2 marks</i></p> <p><i>Examples of vague/partial answers: gamblers produce more irrational verbalisations, people dream more in REM, leading questions influence memory.</i></p> <p><i>Answers referring to aims only should not be</i></p>

Section B			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<b>2 marks</b> – One clear experimental hypothesis is stated. Statement is appropriate and expression is clear. Psychological terminology is used appropriately. Good understanding is evident.		<i>credited. The question is clearly about hypotheses.</i>
<b>16 (b)</b>	<p><b>Sample:</b></p> <p>Griffiths: 60 participants, mean age 23.4 years. Half were regular gamblers (29 males, 1 female) and half were non-regular gamblers (15 males, 15 females), drawn from Devon/UK</p> <p>Dement &amp; Kleitman: 9 adults (7 male, 2 female), 5 of whom were studied intensively, all from USA</p> <p>Loftus &amp; Palmer: Experiment 1 = 45 students (5 groups of 9 participants each). Experiment 2 = A new group of 150 students (3 groups of 50 participants each). All drawn from (an American) university</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Sample is identified, with little or no elaboration.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of selected sample is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of selected sample is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good eg numbers, ages, genders, target population.  <b>Weakness – most likely answers will refer to:</b></p> <p>Griffiths: Sample size, gender imbalance, drawn from Devon, therefore not generalisable.  Dement &amp; Kleitman: Sample size, drawn from America, therefore not generalisable.  Loftus &amp; Palmer: All participants were students, drawn from</p>		<p><i>Examples of how to allocate marks:</i></p> <p><i>1 mark – mere identification of weakness eg L&amp;P: all students</i></p> <p><i>2 marks – description of weakness is basic eg L&amp;P: all were students so one can't generalise the results</i></p> <p><i>3 marks – description of weakness is accurate and its implication have been developed eg L&amp;P: this was a limited sample as all participants were students. Students may not be representative of the population as a whole so the results are of limited generalisability.</i></p>

Section B			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>America, therefore not generalisable.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Peripherally relevant weakness is identified, with little or no elaboration eg generalisability; weakness identified but not contextualised  <b>2 marks</b> – Appropriate weakness chosen. Description of weakness is basic and lacks detail.  <b>3 marks</b> – Appropriate weakness is chosen. Description of weakness is accurate and has elaboration. Weakness supports description of sample eg adults, students, ethnicity etc.</p>	<p><b>[3+3]</b>  <b>[6]</b></p>	<p><i>Examples of how to allocate marks:</i></p> <p><i>1 mark – mere identification of weakness eg L&amp;P: all students</i>  <i>2 marks – description of weakness is basic eg L&amp;P: all were students to one can't generalise the results.</i>  <i>3 marks – description of weakness is accurate and its implications have been developed eg L&amp;P: this was a limited sample as all participants were students. Students may not be representative of the population as a whole so the results are of limited generalisability.</i></p>
<b>16 (c)</b>	<p>Likely answers:</p> <p>Griffiths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• total plays: total number of plays made during play session</li> <li>• total time: total number of minutes played during one play session</li> <li>• play rate: total number of plays made per minute during a play session</li> <li>• end stake: total winnings in number of 10p pieces once a play session was over</li> <li>• wins: total number of wins during a play session</li> <li>• win rate (time): total number of minutes between each win during a play session</li> <li>• win rate (plays): total number of plays between each win during a play session</li> <li>• other appropriate answer.</li> </ul>		<p><i>Quantitative measures in this study must relate to the hypotheses.</i></p>

Section B			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>Dement &amp; Kleitman:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• number of dreams recalled after awakenings in REM and NREM sleep</li> <li>• accuracy of dream length when awakened after 5 or 15 minutes of REM sleep</li> <li>• other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>Loftus &amp; Palmer: Experiment 1 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The average speed estimates for each of the 5 verbs</li> <li>• The accuracy of speed estimates for the 4 staged crashes</li> </ul> <p>Experiment 2 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mean estimate of speed for participants given the verb smashed or hit</li> <li>• The number of YES/NO responses to the critical question, 'Did you see any broken glass?'</li> <li>• other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – One quantitative measure is identified, no real link to chosen study and with little or no elaboration.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of quantitative measure is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of quantitative measure is accurate, is elaborated and clearly linked to the study. Understanding is good.</p>	<p><b>[3+3]</b> <b>[6]</b></p>	<p><i>Guidance for allocating marks:</i>  1 mark – very vague identification of an appropriate quantitative measure eg Griffiths: number of plays, D&amp;K: number of dreams recalled, L&amp;P: speed estimates.  2 marks – Griffiths: total plays, D&amp;K: number of dreams recalled in REM, L&amp;P: average speed estimates for the car crashes.  3 marks – full outline as given in the mark scheme.</p>

Section B			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
16 (d)	<p><b>Strength (most likely answers):</b></p> <p>For all three studies, answers are likely to refer to general strengths of quantitative data eg allows identification of patterns of behaviour, can calculate averages, can show dispersion, results easy to analyse, allows comparisons between groups/individuals; supported with evidence from the chosen study.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Strength of quantitative data is identified, not linked to chosen study and with little or no elaboration.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of strength of quantitative data is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. Answer is linked to the study.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of strength of quantitative data is accurate, has elaboration and is clearly linked to the study. Understanding is good.</p> <p><b>Weakness (most likely answers):</b></p> <p>For all three studies, answers are likely to refer to general weaknesses of quantitative data eg gives no explanation for why the behaviour occurred, loses 'richness', is fairly superficial; supported by evidence from the chosen study.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Weakness of quantitative data is just identifiable, not linked to chosen study and with little or no elaboration.  <b>2 marks</b> – Description of weakness of quantitative data is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. Answer is linked to the study.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of weakness of quantitative data is accurate, has elaboration and is clearly linked to the study. Understanding is good.</p>	[3+3] [6]	<p><i>A generic strength of quantitative data should be identified, clearly explained and demonstrated through an appropriate example from the chosen study.</i></p> <p><i>If there is no reference to the chosen study then 1 mark maximum.</i></p> <p><i>A generic weakness of quantitative data should be identified, clearly explained and demonstrated through an appropriate example from the chosen study.</i></p> <p><i>If there is no reference to the chosen study then 1 mark maximum.</i></p>
16 (e)	<b>Most likely answers:</b>		<b>Read the whole answer through carefully</b>

Section B			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>Griffiths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>regular gamblers had playing rate of 8 gambles per minute</li> <li>non-regular gamblers had a playing rate of 6 gambles per minute</li> <li>14 regular gamblers managed to 'break even' (60 gambles)</li> <li>10 regular gamblers stayed on the machine until they lost all the money</li> <li>7 non-regular gamblers broke even</li> <li>2 non-regular gamblers stayed on the machine until they lost all the money</li> <li>Regular gamblers who 'thought aloud' had a lower win rate in number of gambles than non-regular gamblers</li> <li>Regular gamblers made significantly more irrational verbalisations (14%) than non-regular gamblers (2.5%);</li> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p>Dement &amp; Kleitman:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>more dreams were recalled from REM than NREM sleep (152:11)</li> <li>less dreams were recalled in NREM sleep than REM sleep (149:39)</li> <li>there were significantly more correct estimates of length of REM than incorrect estimates (92:19)</li> <li>there were more wrong estimates of dream length after 15 minutes of REM and 5 minutes of REM (13:6)</li> <li>there was a strong association between pattern of REMs and the content of dreams (with examples)</li> <li>other appropriate answer.</li> </ul>		<p><b>first and check against the marking bands before allocating marks.</b></p> <p><i>Examples of band allocations in relation to Griffiths:</i></p> <p><i>3 marks – regular gamblers had a higher playing rate than non-regular gamblers, and regular gamblers made more irrational verbalisations than non-regular gamblers (two vague but correct results).</i></p> <p><i>6 marks - regular gamblers had playing rate of 8 gambles per minute whilst non-regular gamblers had a playing rate of 6 gambles per minute; regular gamblers who 'thought aloud' had a lower win rate in number of gambles than non-regular gamblers; and regular gamblers made significantly more irrational verbalisations (14%) than non-regular gamblers (2.5%).(three accurate results).</i></p> <p><i>8 marks - regular gamblers had playing rate of 8 gambles per minute whilst non-regular gamblers had a playing rate of 6 gambles per minute; regular gamblers who 'thought aloud' had a lower win rate in number of gambles than non-regular gamblers; and regular gamblers made significantly more irrational verbalisations (14%) than non-regular gamblers (2.5%);14 regular gamblers managed to 'break even' (60gambles) whilst 7 non-regular gamblers broke even.(accurate description of results with few omissions)</i></p>

Section B			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>Loftus &amp; Palmer: Experiment 1 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The average speed estimates in mph were faster for those who had the verb smashed than those with the verb contacted (40.8:31.8)</li> <li>Participants were not able to accurately estimate speed in the 4 staged crashes eg in film 1 actual speed was 20 mph, average estimated speed by participants was 37.7 mph.</li> </ul> <p>Experiment 2 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The average speed estimates in mph were faster for those who had the verb smashed than those with the verb hit (10.46:8.00)</li> <li>More participants who had the verb smashed reported seeing broken glass than either participants with the verb hit, or the control group (16:7:6)</li> <li>Overall, most participants correctly reported seeing no broken glass 121/150</li> <li>Other appropriate answer.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1-3 marks</b> – Description of results is very basic and lacks detail (eg one or two general statements are identified). Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. The answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.  <b>4-6 marks</b> – Description of results is accurate. Some omissions. Detail is good. Some understanding is evident. Fine details occasionally present, but often absent. 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.  <b>7-8 marks</b> – Description of results is accurate. Very few or no</p>		<p><b>MAXIMUM OF 4 MARKS IF ONLY ONE RESULT IS CONSIDERED</b></p>
		[8]	

<b>Section B</b>			
<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>Additional Guidance</b>
	omissions. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. Understanding is very good. Fine details may be added (such as numbers, or specific aspects). Expression and use of psychological terminology is good. The answer is competently structured and organised. The answer is grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.		

Section B			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
(f)	<p><b>Changes to study (most likely answers):</b></p> <p>For all three studies changes can refer to any one aspect of research methodology eg sample, sampling method, materials, measurement, controls, procedure etc. but should be supported by a consideration of implications arising from the suggested change eg ecological validity, reliability, validity, ethics, representativeness, generalisability.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1-2 marks</b> – One change identified but with little or no expansion. One implication may be identified.  <b>3-4 marks</b> – One change suggested with expansion and/or explanation. Suggestion is increasingly clear and understanding is good. There may be analysis of suggested changes. Implications of change considered and explained.</p> <p><b>Effect on results:</b></p> <p>Any feasible effect on results may be credited but the suggestion should be supported by appropriate psychological theory.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1-2 marks</b> – Discussion of the effects of the suggested changes is sparse, with very little if any analysis or argument. Effect on results may be identified. Understanding of effects just discernible.  <b>3-4 marks</b> – Discussion of suggested changes is good, with effective analysis and competent argument. Effect on study is explained rather than just identified. Understanding of effects is good. Expression and use of psychological terms is good.</p>	[4+4] [8]	<p><i>The suggested change must be <u>appropriate and practical</u>. In L&amp;P suggestion of presenting participants with a real car crash cannot be credited whereas reference to a staged/retrospective accident can be.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate should not merely suggest an appropriate change but also suggest how the change could be effected and its implications.</i></p> <p><b>NO MORE THAN 2 MARKS CAN BE GAINED IF THE CHANGE IS NOT <u>CLEARLY LINKED TO THE CHOSEN STUDY</u>.</b></p> <p><i>The effect on results must be clearly explained in relation to the chosen study.</i></p> <p><b>NO MORE THAN 2 MARKS CAN BE GAINED IF THE AFFECTS ARE NOT <u>CLEARLY LINKED TO THE CHOSEN STUDY</u>.</b></p> <p><i>If more than one change is suggested, identify with a TICK the one credited.</i></p>
<b>Section B Total</b>		<b>[36]</b>	

Section C				
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance	
17 (a)	<p><b>Likely answer:</b> Individuals differ in their behaviour and personal qualities so not everyone can be considered 'the average person'.</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]	<p><b>Generic guidelines:</b> Answers throughout must be clearly linked and referenced to the selected approach.</p> <p><i>The assumption must be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>linked to the actual approach</i></li> <li>• <i>linked to behaviour.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Although candidates are most likely to refer to Thigpen and Cleckley, a clear well described generic answer should be credited. For a full answer the description should be supported by either a specific detail from a known study and/or an appropriate generic example.</i></p>	
(b)	<p>Answers are most likely to refer to the findings of psychological tests effected by Thigpen and Cleckley in their attempt to establish that she had more than one personality, therefore suggesting that everyone is different.</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>Likely studies for comparison include:</b> Thigpen and Cleckley, Rosenhan, Griffiths.</p>			

Section C			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p><b>Similarity:</b></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to sample, methodology, results, ethics.</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.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p> <p><b>Difference:</b></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to sample, methodology, results, ethics.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration, topic of each study is merely stated.  <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>[3+3]</b> <b>[6]</b></p>	<p><i>Guidance for allocating marks:</i></p> <p><i>1 mark – an appropriate similarity/difference between two appropriate studies is merely identified.</i></p> <p><i>2 marks – An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from an appropriate study.</i></p> <p><i>3 marks – An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from two appropriate studies.</i></p>

Section C			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
(d)	<p><b>Strengths may include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- allows psychologists to learn more about human behaviours because all behaviours, not just average ones, are studied</li> <li>- allows psychologists to measure differences between individuals in qualities such as personality, intelligence, memory etc.</li> <li>- studies may be high in ecological validity as they often take place in real life environments</li> <li>- allows both qualitative and quantitative/qualitative data to be gathered.</li> </ul> <p><b>Weaknesses may include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- techniques used are not fully objective and therefore open to bias</li> <li>- it creates divisions between people because individuals are identified as being 'different'</li> <li>- it is difficult to define and measure individual qualities such as personality, intelligence etc</li> <li>- ethical concerns, generic to the approach, may be raised.</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.</p>		<p><i>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength/weakness.</i></p> <p><i>The supporting evidence/explanation must actually support the identified strength/weakness ie be appropriately contextualised.</i></p> <p><i>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</i></p> <p><i>Candidates do not have to follow the old PEC format. Any strength/weakness can be supported by two or more pieces of appropriate evidence.</i></p>

Section C			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <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>	[12]	<p><b>NB: NO MORE THAN 6 MARKS CAN BE AWARDED IF THE CANDIDATE HAS NOT PROVIDED 2 APPROPRIATE STRENGTHS AND 2 APPROPRIATE WEAKNESSES</b></p>
18 (a)	<p><b>Likely answer:</b> Many important influences on behaviour come from a part of the mind individuals have no direct awareness of, the unconscious.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Assumption is identified. Description is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p><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]	<p><b>Generic guidelines:</b> Answers throughout must be clearly linked and referenced to the selected perspective</p> <p><i>The assumption must be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>linked to the actual approach</i></li> <li>• <i>linked to behaviour.</i></li> </ul>

Section C			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
(b)	<p>Answers are likely to refer to the way Freud linked his psychoanalytic theory relating to infant sexuality to the development of phobic behaviour.</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]	<p><i>Although candidates are most likely to refer to Freud, a clear well described generic answer should be credited. For a full answer the description should be supported by either a specific detail from a known study and/or an appropriate generic example.</i></p>
18 (c)	<p><b>Likely studies for comparison include:</b>            Freud, Bandura, Thigpen and Cleckley</p> <p><b>Similarity:</b></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to sample, methodology, results, ethics.</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.  <b>3 marks</b> – Description of similarity is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p> <p><b>Difference:</b></p> <p>Answers are likely to refer to sample, methodology, results, ethics.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.  <b>1 mark</b> – Difference is identified, with little or no elaboration.</p>	[3+3] [6]	<p><i>Guidance for allocating marks:</i></p> <p><i>1 mark – an appropriate similarity/difference between two appropriate studies is merely identified.</i>  <i>2 marks – An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from an appropriate study.</i>  <i>3 marks - An appropriate similarity/difference is identified and supported by <u>relevant</u> evidence from two appropriate studies.</i></p>

Section C			
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p><b>2 marks</b> – Description of difference is basic and lacks detail. Some understanding may be evident. Expression is generally poor.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – Description of difference is accurate and has elaboration. Understanding is good.</p>		
18 (d)	<p><b>Strengths may include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– allows psychologists to suggest causes of mental disorders</li> <li>– allows psychologists to suggest why individuals behave in ways they cannot easily explain or understand.</li> <li>– Allows collection of qualitative data</li> </ul> <p><b>Weaknesses may include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– studies which take this approach often use unrepresentative samples</li> <li>– methodology may not be objective and therefore open to bias</li> <li>– the perspective is based on concepts that are difficult to test and verify scientifically</li> <li>– ethical concerns, generic to the perspective, may be raised.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>		<p><i>The candidate must make it clear why their suggestion is a strength/weakness.</i></p> <p><i>The supporting evidence/explanation must actually support the identified strength/weakness ie be appropriately contextualised.</i></p> <p><i>Read through the mark bands carefully before allocating marks.</i></p> <p><i>Candidates do not have to follow the old PEC format. Any strength/weakness can be supported by two or more pieces of appropriate evidence.</i></p> <p><b>NB: NO MORE THAN 6 MARKS CAN BE AWARDED IF THE CANDIDATE HAS NOT PROVIDED 2 APPROPRIATE STRENGTHS AND 2 APPROPRIATE WEAKNESSES.</b></p>

<b>Section C</b>			
<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>Additional Guidance</b>
	<p><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.</p> <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>	[12]	
<b>Section C Total</b>		[24]	
<b>Paper Total</b>		[120]	

## G543 Options in Applied Psychology

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
1 (a)	<p><b>Outline a biological explanation of why males commit more crimes than females.</b></p> <p><i>Candidates can draw on any research which addresses a Biological account of why males commit more crimes than females. The specification refers to evolutionary explanations such as Daly and Wilson (1988). Neurological explanations relating to brain function are also acceptable, as are physiological explanations referring to chemical explanations for example. Weaker candidates may provide broader or less specific accounts, whereas better candidates will be explicit in direct response to the question.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
1 (b)	<p><b>To what extent does the biological approach provide an explanation of criminal behaviour?</b></p> <p><i>The Biological approach includes brain physiology, biochemical, genetic or evolutionary explanations. Many issues may be brought to bear in evaluating the extent to which the Biological approach provides an explanation of criminal behaviour. The Biological approach is often given in conjunction with other approaches and this may point to a partial value. It could be argued that it alone can account for criminal behaviour whereas others may argue that it misses the whole point of ‘humanness’ such as cognitions, or an innate drive to personal growth or physical gratification. Comparison with other approaches may provide a useful approach to the “To what extent...” demand.</i></p> <p><i>A mere attempt to address the question or a highly superficial “It does” or “It doesn’t” type of response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
2 (a)	<p><b>Describe the cognitive interview.</b></p> <p><i>The Cognitive interview was put forward by researchers such as Geiselman and Fisher. It was a response to the police interviews of abrupt, questioning/interrogation style which seemed to lead to much omission; the cognitive interview encourages the witness to re-visit the context, being asked about sounds, the weather and other contextual cues as well as the directly relevant facts. Witnesses are encouraged to say everything whether they think it is relevant or not. They are asked to consider other perspectives, of time and other people.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
2 (b)	<p><b>Discuss the qualitative and quantitative approaches to collecting information when interviewing witnesses.</b></p> <p><i>When interviewing witnesses, data collected can be clinical ie quantitative or more descriptive ie qualitative. It is possible to consider strengths and weaknesses of the approaches as well as in terms of evaluative issues. For example, the depth and richness of data is superior in the qualitative approach. Quantitative data is easier to record, easier and clearer to analyse and more objective.</i></p> <p><i>An attempt to address the question or a highly superficial discussion would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response, maybe simply stating the two side-by-side without any link or continuity; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
3 (a)	<p><b>Describe the bottom up approach to creating a profile.</b></p> <p><i>Offender profiling is commonly used in crimes such as paedophilia, rape, murder as well as satanic and ritualistic crime. There are two types of offender profiling: the 'top-down' approach which the American profilers use and the 'bottom-up' approach which is used in the UK. The 'bottom-up' approach takes the evidence and data and builds up a pattern piece by piece until a feasible conclusion is reached. It seeks out consistencies in offender behaviour, usually from the crime scene and victims' accounts. David Canter is one of Britain's foremost profiling experts, such as his work with former detective constable Rupert Heritage on developments in offender profiling.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
3 (b)	<p><b>Assess the reliability of offender profiling.</b></p> <p><i>Reliability refers to the consistency that exists in the data, whether all things being equal the same test would produce the same findings at another time, or whether two or more researchers (observers) would record the same data. So in terms of creating a profile, would any two profilers produce the same profile, and hence suspect, given the same information or would their different interpretations colour the suggested outcome? Could other factors confound the outcome, particularly cognitive factors such as those suggested by Loftus?</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, specifying inter-rater reliability or test-retest reliability, or breaking 'reliability' per se into demand characteristics, social desirability, accuracy due to other factors would all suggest a better quality of response.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
4 (a)	<p><b>Identify the link between imprisonment and suicide.</b></p> <p><i>The link between imprisonment and suicide, particularly in young offenders, is well established and the better candidate will clearly identify this link with reference to research such as Dooley, 1990. Better answers will be marked by elaboration, quality and/or example, as well as explicit application of evidence. The weaker candidate may make general or bland statements which lack detail or specific references.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
4 (b)	<p><b>Evaluate the usefulness of research into the psychological effects of imprisonment.</b></p> <p><i>The question asks the candidate to evaluate usefulness. This can refer to how well the research can be applied, how the research is useful to the individual or the use of the research on a societal level. It may be useful in considering the prison situation and roles, depression and suicide risk of prisoners and planned behaviours once freed from jail.</i></p> <p><i>No more than an attempt to address the question or a superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. Development/elaboration could be achieved, for example, by incorporating a discussion on how useful or not some research is.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

## HEALTH AND CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
5 (a)	<p><b>Describe one way to measure non-adherence to medical advice.</b></p> <p><i>Candidates may refer to any way in which non-adherence can be measured. The specification identifies a physiological approach (Lustman, 2000). Any other approach or research is also a legitimate response to this question. The better candidate will refer to one <b>way</b> to measure non-adherence to medical advice, in other words they will refer to the application rather than merely reporting on the measure itself. Thus, quality of description and interpretation of evidence will typify the better response.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
5 (b)	<p><b>Assess the reliability of research into non-adherence to medical advice.</b></p> <p><i>'Reliability' refers to consistency, in this instance it can refer to the consistency of the body of research available, of the application of measures producing consistent outcomes or consistency between practitioners and researchers (such as inter-rater reliability). Candidates may draw on reasons for non-adherence, measures of non-adherence or ways to improve adherence.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, respondents to a self report measure may lie or distort the truth as examples of social desirability as well as being affected by feelings of guilt or expectation.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
6 (a)	<p><b>Describe one piece of research which considers work as a source of stress.</b></p> <p><i>Research refers to anything from psychological literature such as theory, study, model, measure etc. There is a wealth of research from occupational psychologically which looks at work as a source of stress. The specification suggests Johansson 1978 but others such as Marmot (1999) looking at the social determinants of health or Cox et al (1984) on the experience and effects of stress in teachers are equally acceptable. Better answers will be marked by elaboration, quality and/or example, as well as explicit application of evidence.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
6 (b)	<p><b>Discuss problems of conducting research into the causes of stress.</b></p> <p><i>Issues which recognise problems when conducting research into the causes of stress include sampling, usefulness, reliability, validity, ethical considerations. The demand is to <b>discuss</b> problems, which suggests the candidate must go beyond merely identifying the problems and comment, discuss or debate them.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial, non-specific answer would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, questioning the samples used in terms of representativeness, considering whether work-related stress is typical of other forms of stress, the difficulties if reliably measuring stress, devising and using tests which successfully identify stress ie validity, methodological limitations of the research and so on.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
7 (a)	<p><b>Outline a cognitive technique for managing stress.</b></p> <p><i>The cognitive approach challenges irrational thinking and inappropriate behaviours by encouraging reality testing and reviewing with the client. Most techniques are based in Ellis' RET. Beck is another name often associated with earlier cognitive approaches to treatment, although much of Beck's work centred around depression – if referred to in response to this question then particular application to stress would need to be made. Specific techniques which candidates could use may include Meichenbaum's Stress Inoculation Training or Kobasa's Hardiness training.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
7 (b)	<p><b>Compare techniques for managing stress.</b></p> <p><i>'Compare' implies a similar analysis in different contexts, and may draw out contrasts as well as similarities. The specification identifies cognitive, behavioural and social approaches to managing stress, although other approaches (such as medical or humanistic) are equally creditworthy. These may be compared in terms of features of the techniques, features of the approaches (such as assumptions) or a comparison of issues, for example.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial pre-learned non-specific answer (such as describing two techniques independently without even implying a comparison) would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a somewhat limited response; to a more specific attempt to compare; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative comparison.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
8 (a)	<p><b>Describe the characteristics of a psychotic disorder.</b></p> <p><i>A better response will see the candidate identify a psychotic disorder, such as schizophrenia, and describe its characteristics. The quality, detail and elaboration of the simple statement 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 from one which gives a more general description or may not even specify a particular disorder. Such an answer would still be worthy of some credit however.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
8 (b)	<p><b>Evaluate difficulties when identifying characteristics of psychological disorders.</b></p> <p><i>Evaluative issues where the difficulties when identifying characteristics of mental disorders include issues of reliability, validity, cultural relativism, medical science as being objective, science being useful or comparison with other approaches such as the view of Szasz and Laing as opposed to the medical model, to name but a few.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial pre-learned non-specific answer would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, an evaluation of whether it is useful (appropriate and applicable) or discussion of the lack of consistent characteristics in any particular disorder, or characteristics common to a range of disorders making diagnosis precarious.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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 shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

## SPORTS AND EXERCISE PSYCHOLOGY

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
9 (a)	<p><b>Outline a multidimensional approach to anxiety in sport.</b></p> <p><i>Whereas unidimensional approaches were espoused from Yerkes-Dodson through to Martens' early SCAT test, Spielberger (1970) proposed that two separate needed to be tested through his TAI and SAI (trait and state anxiety inventories), culminating in a recognition of the multidimensional approach to anxiety. Martens' CSAI-2 considered somatic anxiety, self-confidence and cognitive anxiety, splitting his previous notion of state anxiety into somatic state anxiety and cognitive state anxiety. Finally, Fazy and Hardy also use a multidimensional approach to explain the contingencies which lead to catastrophe.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
9 (b)	<p><b>Evaluate the validity of research into anxiety in sport.</b></p> <p><i>Are we actually testing for ‘anxiety’ when we ask a battery of impersonal questions? There is debate over what is, and what constitutes ‘anxiety’, so testing it is inevitably problematic. As well as internal validity there is debate as to how accurately an artificial test response translates to the experience of the sports field. Other forms of validity, such as face validity or concurrent validity, may also be considered.</i></p> <p><i>A highly superficial ‘it is quite valid ....’ or ‘it isn’t very valid....’ type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response, maybe accurate but little more than identifying validity in the research.; a general or broader response which comments on validity improves on this and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues as identified above which may include specific reference to types of validity.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
10 (a)	<p><b>Describe <u>one</u> piece of research into self-efficacy in sport.</b></p> <p><i>Self-efficacy was introduced by Albert Bandura (1977) and deals with self-confidence in a particular context. His original research looked at those who were struggling to function in life but has been readily applied to other contexts such as occupational psychology and sport psychology. It is essential that better answers contain specific application to the sporting arena. The level of detail will also determine the creditworthiness of the response.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
10 (b)	<p><b>Assess the usefulness of research into self confidence and sport performance.</b></p> <p><i>Assess implies that some degree of judgement is required. A judgement of how useful the research is, of how well it works in the sports setting is called for. Is Bandura's research applicable or do we need a sports specific model such as Vealey's? How useful is the research – does Bandura's research translate well to a sports setting and how well does imagery help the athlete?</i></p> <p><i>A bland 'it is useful because.....' or 'it isn't very useful' type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a general or broader response which comments on the debate improves on this and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing comparison of contributions from various literature, more precise evaluative points and/or issues such as usefulness.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
11 (a)	<p data-bbox="392 327 1155 360"><b>Describe one piece of research into coaching in sport.</b></p> <p data-bbox="392 394 1278 629"><i>Coaching Effectiveness Training was investigated by Smith, Smoll and Curtis, or a system for measuring coaching behaviour known as CBAS (Coaching Behaviour Assessment System) was proposed by Smith, Smoll and Hunt. Carron and Bennett looked into coach-athlete dyads as an indication of coach-athlete compatibility. Responses should refer to coaching as opposed to leadership and relate specifically to sport.</i></p> <p data-bbox="392 730 852 763"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="392 797 1246 999"><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.</p> <p data-bbox="392 1032 1246 1267"><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.</p> <p data-bbox="392 1301 1262 1536"><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.</p> <p data-bbox="392 1570 1278 1805"><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
11 (b)	<p><b>To what extent is quantitative or qualitative research preferable when studying leadership and coaching in sport.</b></p> <p><i>When studying coaching in sport, data collected can be clinical ie quantitative or from more descriptive accounts of the coach-performer relationship ie qualitative. Comparisons can be between features of the approaches as well as in terms of evaluative issues. So the depth and richness of data is superior in determining the relationship in the qualitative approach. Quantitative data is easier to record, easier and clearer to analyse and more objective. Note that this section includes leadership, so any research from literature about leadership is equally creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>An attempt to address the question or a highly superficial comparison would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response, maybe stating the two side-by-side without drawing explicit comparisons; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
12 (a)	<p><b>Describe one theory linking exercise and mental health.</b></p> <p><i>There is a range of literature identifying the link between exercise and mental health, from Cognitive-Behavioural explanations through to more physiological explanations such as cardiovascular and endorphin hypotheses. Physical health has been researched, as reported by the Health Education Authority, as having links to specific disorders. The responses to the question may broaden to include benefits in <u>coping</u> with illness or positive self-concept, for example.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
12 (b)	<p><b>Discuss the relationship between exercise and mental health.</b></p> <p><i>'Discuss' suggests a presenting of sides of a debate, or a considerations of the pros and cons of a debate. In general there are a range of benefits, and types of benefits, to mental health from partaking in exercise, as suggested by Leith and Taylor. It could be in the form of feeling good and getting a physical high, such as explained by the endorphin hypothesis, or a consideration of a different mood profile as proposed by Morgan. Is there, however, a value judgement occurring in pronouncing these as all good? Excessive exercise can be part of the repertoire of behaviours associated with Bulimia Nervosa. Is the question too broad and should we consider different forms of exercise? Challenging the methodology of the evidence is another appropriate way of discussing the relationship in terms of what can, and cannot, be said.</i></p> <p><i>A superficial 'it's good to exercise because.....' would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more focussed if somewhat limited response; a general or broader response which comments on the debate improves on this and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response would be required containing more precise or developed evaluative points.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

## PSYCHOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
13 (a)	<p><b>What are the implications of ability grouping for encouraging educational engagement?</b></p> <p><i>Evidence suggests little is to be gained from ability grouping in schools. Some research suggests there may be some gain for more able students, but this comes at a price for less able students. These students are at risk of making less progress and possibly developing anti-school attitudes. Streaming would also imply that educational ability is relatively fixed across ages, which is unlikely to be the case. Better answers will be aware of detail and address the question specifically, referring to the encouragement of educational engagement, whereas weaker candidates may blandly churn-out some less detailed research which lacks reference to the specifics of the question.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
13 (b)	<p><b>Discuss ways of encouraging educational engagement.</b></p> <p><i>The specification suggests play, emotional intelligence (EI) and ability grouping as different ways of encouraging educational engagement. Each has their supporters and each their critics. 'Discuss' suggests that where there is contention or controversy it needs to be explored. Debate over how each contributes to educational engagement, how it should be measured, its political correctness and so on are all features where candidates can demonstrate an awareness of two sides of a debate and comment accordingly.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial answer would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
14 (a)	<p><b>Outline the importance of developing positive self-esteem in encouraging appropriate educational behaviours.</b></p> <p><i>Self esteem may refer to a personal sense of worth or worthiness. Self esteem may consider beliefs about oneself, emotions and is a relatively enduring personality trait. Theory is developed from Humanistic psychology – we find it in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and in the work of Carl Rogers. At a time of identity and personal growth it is important that the self esteem of the learner is protected. The link between self esteem and appropriate educational behaviours must be explicitly drawn. Better answers will explain and interpret in context, and be marked by quality and appropriate detail.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
14 (b)	<p><b>Assess the extent to which the research into student beliefs and expectations about appropriate educational behaviours is ethnocentric.</b></p> <p><i>Assess involves a degree of judgement about the extent to which the research may be considered ethnocentric. Much research has been conducted in the USA and Western Europe and so the context is limited and possibly unrepresentative of the cultural universal. Studies of black Afro-Caribbean school performance are still contextualised in a western framework. An individualistic mentality rather than a collective one is overrepresented in psychology as a discipline, for example.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial answer would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, going beyond the notion that because research is conducted in USA/Western Europe it is necessarily bad and lacks value to any culture except the majority culture.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
15 (a)	<p><b>Describe a strategy to deal with bullying in schools, referring to psychological research.</b></p> <p><i>A number of schools have developed anti-bullying policy based on psychological research. The Pembroke School, for example, puts forward a thorough policy document giving guidance and support to all parties involved. It acknowledges the work of Delwyn Tatum and Graham Herbert of the Cardiff Institute of Higher Education. Any such examples may be used in response to this question. Better answers will explain and interpret in context, and be marked by quality and appropriate detail.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
15 (b)	<p><b>Evaluate difficulties of investigating social interactions between students.</b></p> <p><i>Self-report measures suffer particularly with challenges to their reliability. Respondents are very vulnerable to social desirability. Demand characteristics, lack of eloquence, mood or simply lying can all reduce reliability of the measure. Individual differences can also present difficulties when trying to draw conclusions about social interaction. Interactions can be positive or negative, warm or cold, vary with race, vary with gender, vary with age and so on.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial pre-learned non-specific answer would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
16 (a)	<p><b>Outline how individual support could be used when dealing with additional needs of students.</b></p> <p><i>When dealing with additional needs, individual support in a variety of forms may be considered. Many general awareness or anecdotal responses may be provided, but better candidates will make specific reference to psychological research, such as Bloom (1984). Better answers will show quality and detail, explaining and interpreting in context.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark
16 (b)	<p><b>Discuss methodological issues when investigating dealing with additional needs of students.</b></p> <p><i>Sampling issues may lead us to beg the question about generalising our findings. A sample can be limited in terms of gender, race, age and so on rendering it less representative of the wider population. However, the better candidates may wish to consider whether a breadth of age, for example, is necessary for making comment upon additional needs. Further, what is the target population and what bearing this may have on how restrictive a sample can get away with being.</i></p> <p><i>No more than an attempt to address the question or a superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. Development/elaboration could be achieved, for example, by incorporating a discussion on how useful or not some research is.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p>	[15]

## G544 Approaches and Research Methods in Psychology

SECTION A			
Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
1	<p><b>State the null hypothesis for your practical project.</b></p> <p>The hypothesis should follow logically from the research question and be operationalised so that it is clear what is being measured and how it would be measured.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – no hypothesis or a hypothesis which is not a null is given.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed but it is not operationalised, OR an operationalised statement is framed but it does not follow logically from the research question eg: <i>There is no difference between men and women in what they forget.</i></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed but it is not clearly operationalised eg <i>There is no difference between men and women in the details of clothing that they forget.</i></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed and it is clearly operationalised eg: <i>On a rating of 0 to 5, where 0 is remember nothing and 5 is remember all details of clothing, there is no difference between men and women in the details of clothing that they forget.</i></p>	[3]	<p><b>Do not reward</b> an alternate hypothesis or correlational hypothesis.</p> <p>The word significant is not required for full marks.</p> <p>If the answer has one of the variable fully operationalised and not the other it can be given 2 marks.</p> <p><b>Do not reward</b> if the Null hypothesis is one tailed and the variables are not fully operationalised.</p>

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2	<p><b>Describe the method you would use to conduct your practical project.</b></p> <p>Marks are awarded for replicability and appropriateness. There should be a clear description of the method. Details should include, where appropriate, the type of sample and the way it was selected, the allocation to groups, a description of the test or questionnaire with examples, or the observation schedule and criteria, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings.</p> <p><b>For replicability and appropriateness:</b></p> <p><b>0-4 marks</b> – The description of the sample, the way it was selected and the way participants were allocated to groups is <b>brief</b> and/or <b>unclearly stated</b>. Answers do not contain much <b>structure</b> or <b>organisation</b> and it is often difficult to understand what was done. There is <b>little or no use</b> of specialist terms. Examples of materials used are <b>missing</b> or <b>incomplete</b> as are details of the scoring, timing and conditions of the test.</p> <p><b>5-8 marks</b> – The choice of sample and sampling technique is appropriate but could be described more fully. The structure and organization of the description of the procedure is generally plausible, appropriate and fairly detailed. There is some use of specialist terms. The investigation is not fully replicable as details of materials and test conditions, including timing, are incomplete.</p> <p><b>9-13 marks</b> – At the top end the investigation is fully replicable. The type of sample and the way it was selected, the allocation to groups, a description of the test or questionnaire with examples, or the observation schedule and criteria, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings are all fully and clearly described.</p>	<b>[13]</b>	<p><b>Do not reward</b> a procedure that is clearly unrelated to the research question chosen and may have been learnt in order to be pigeon holed into any question.</p> <p>Start at the top band and move down to find the right band to fit the candidate's response.</p> <p>It is not necessary for candidates to describe materials in full for a top band answer or explicitly refer to ethical considerations.</p> <p>Where the candidate describes a repeated measures procedure, a maximum of <b>8/13</b> marks may be awarded.</p>

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2	<p><b>Continued</b></p> <p><b>For the quality of the design and its feasibility:</b>  <b>0 marks</b> the design is not appropriate to the research question and/or is not an independent measures design, or describes an unethical procedure.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – the design would not result in the collection of at least ordinal data. <b>or</b> it fulfils the criteria for an experiment and ordinal level data but does not logically follow from the research question or it is not practical [pragmatic].</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – the design should be appropriate to the research question ie is an independent measures design with the appropriate level of measurement.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – the design should be appropriate to the research question and is pragmatic and ethical.</p>	[6]	<p><b>No marks</b> for an unethical procedure/ correlational design matched pairs or repeated measures.</p> <p>The bottom band may be used for answers where the design is unclear.</p>
3	<p><b>Give an advantage of using an alternative experimental design in this practical project.</b></p> <p>Repeated measures or matched pairs design with the advantage of not having extraneous participant variables to interfere with the experimental effect.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> Inappropriate design</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – alternative given with no or limited description of the advantage.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – alternative named and advantage clearly explained in the context of this investigation.</p>	[3]	<p><b>Do not reward</b> a response that refers to the independent measures design or an alternative <b>method</b>.</p> <p>1 mark for brief description of advantage.</p> <p>2 marks for full description of advantage, which may not be in the context of this practical.</p>

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
4	<p><b>Assess the validity of your investigation in measuring the dependent variable.</b> Validity could include reference to face validity, external validity, internal validity and control of variables and/or may refer to ecological validity</p> <p><b>0 mark</b> no reference to validity of the dependent variable.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – incomplete understanding of validity.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – concept of validity in relation to measuring the dependent variable is understood but not fully explained or one point fully explained in this context.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – two or more points explained in relation to the validity of measuring the dependent variable in this context.</p>	[6]	<p><b>Do not reward</b> a response that is unrelated to validity.</p> <p><b>Do not reward</b> a response that is unrelated to the measurement of the dependent variable.</p> <p>Maximum 4 marks if the candidate only discusses ecological validity.</p>
5	<p><b>Outline how you could select a sample which would be representative.</b> Candidates may propose a complex sampling technique to achieve a stratified or random sample. Any appropriate method is acceptable.</p> <p><b>0 mark</b> – the sample may be described, with no indication of how the sample was obtained.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – sampling method identified <b>or</b> described with no explanation of how it would be representative.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – sampling method identified <b>and</b> described, but a limited explanation of how it would be representative.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – sampling method identified <b>and</b> described fully with a detailed explanation of how it would be representative.</p>	[3]	<p><b>Do not reward</b> a sample with no indication of how it was obtained.</p>

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
6	<p><b>What ethical issues would you consider in designing your study?</b></p> <p>Ethical issues can, where appropriate, include informed consent, age of participants [over 16], confidentiality of the data, withdrawal, debriefing, avoiding stress, distress, harm or embarrassment to participants.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – ethical issues named only.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – an appropriate ethical issue is identified and described but lacks clarity or context.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – one appropriate ethical issue is identified and discussed in relation to the investigation/or more than one issue is clearly understood and discussed but not in context of the investigation.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – more than one ethical issue is clearly understood and discussed in relation to the investigation.</p>	[3]	A 2 mark answer may be very well described but if it makes no reference to the candidate's proposed practical it cannot get 3 marks.
7	<p><b>Suggest <u>one</u> idea for possible future research related to your practical project.</b></p> <p>Answers are mostly likely to refer to using a different method which may be a correlation, case study or self report method. However, an alternative experiment using different variables or a different sample may also be appropriate.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - original suggestion is reworded or is impractical or unethical.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – a future piece of research is described but does not suit the research question or it lacks clarity.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – a future piece of research is described which would appropriately investigate the research question, but it lacks clarity or is not justified.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – a future piece of research is described which would appropriately investigate the research question and it is justified.</p>	[3]	<b>Do not reward</b> a response that rewords the original suggestion eg larger sample.

SECTION B			
Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(a)		
	<p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology, briefly outline the cognitive approach to psychology.</b></p> <p>Candidates should outline the cognitive approach. This is likely to be done by referring to mental processes such as memory, language, perception, attention etc. They may say the cognitive approach compares the human mind to a computer.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Identification of the approach which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The cognitive approach may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression is poor.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – The main components of the approach are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to the cognitive approach. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – The main components of approach are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the cognitive approach. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> – The main components of the approach are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The debate is clearly related to the cognitive approach. The candidate clearly understands the issue/debate in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.</p>	[4]	<p>The brain and associated biological processes are irrelevant to this approach.</p> <p>No examples of psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks.</p> <p>A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant.</p> <p>A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding for example emphasis on computer processes with no link to the cognitive approach.</p> <p>For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer. For example it may describe the cognitive approach in terms of mental processes without giving examples such as memory.</p> <p>Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.</p>

Question Number		Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(b)	<p><b>Describe <u>two</u> pieces of research that use the cognitive approach to psychology.</b></p> <p>Candidates can use any piece of cognitive research to answer this question. It is expected that they will draw from the list below but any relevant research must be given credit.</p> <p><b>From AS:</b> Loftus and Palmer (eyewitness testimony), Baron–Cohen (autism), Savage–Rumbaugh (language in chimps).</p> <p><b>From A2:</b>            From Forensic: criminal thinking patterns eg Yochelson and Samenow, social cognition eg attribution of blame (Gudjonsson), cognitive interview technique (Geiselman), cognitive skills programme eg Friendship.            From Health: managing stress eg Meichenbaum, use of cognitive therapy eg Beck, or RET.            From Sport: use of imagery in sport performance (Feltz &amp; Landers)            From Education: differences in cognitive styles eg Riding and Raynor, discovery learning eg Bruner, attribution theory of motivation eg Weiner.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example and quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Definition of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>		<p><b>Do not reward</b> more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2.</p> <p><b>Do not reward</b> evidence that does not use the cognitive approach.</p> <p>Any research that investigates cognitive processes may be credited.</p> <p>If there is an imbalance in the quality between the two examples, identify the bands for the examples separately and then go half way between the two.</p> <p>Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p>For one piece of research, a maximum of 4 marks only can be awarded.</p>

Question Number		Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(b)	<p><b>Continued</b></p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The range (two) of theories/studies described is taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The range (two) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	[8]	<p>If two parts of the same research are described eg Loftus and Palmer Experiment 1 and 2, a maximum of 4 marks only can be awarded.</p> <p>The answer must be competently structured and organised with <b>explicit</b> links to the cognitive approach for a top band answer</p>
8	(c)	<p><b>Discuss the strengths and limitations of using the cognitive approach to explain behaviour. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</b></p> <p>Examples as part b. Strengths may include the accuracy of measurement, the use of equipment, the high levels of control and replicability, applications to treatment etc/Limitations may include reductionism, lack of qualitative data, lack of validity of measures.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		<p><b>Do not reward</b> psychological evidence that is not from the cognitive approach.</p> <p><b>Do not reward</b> parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the cognitive approach without referring to the strengths and weaknesses.</p>

Question Number		Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(c)	<p><b>Continued</b></p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is basic. Range of points is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Points are not organised into approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and demonstrates poor psychological knowledge. Sparse or no use of supporting examples from unit content. There is very limited or no argument arising from points. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is sparse and understanding may not be evident.</p> <p><b>4-5 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is limited. Range of points is limited (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates limited psychological knowledge. Poor use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is sparse. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sparse. Evaluation is lacking in detail and understanding is sparse.</p> <p><b>6-7 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Range of points limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised into approaches. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p>		<p>Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p>At 1-3 marks the points are very basic and the psychological knowledge poor. For example the study may not be named and the details may be inaccurate. Points may not relate to the approach but to the specific research.</p> <p>At 4-5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak.</p> <p>At 6-7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with more limited supporting evidence.</p>

Question Number		Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(c)	<p><b>Continued</b></p> <p><b>8-9 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into approaches. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>10-12 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Range (eg two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced. Points are competently organised into approaches. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>	[12]	<p>At 8-9 marks there may be only 3 strengths/ weaknesses, but these will be supported by very detailed examples.</p> <p>At 10-12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with well described impressive supporting evidence.</p>
8	(d)	<p><b>Compare the cognitive approach with the behaviourist perspective. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</b></p> <p>Comparisons <b>should</b> be between the approach/perspective and <b>not</b> between the cited studies.</p> <p>Candidates may draw comparisons between the types of methods used and the types of data collected, or may use evaluation issues such as reductionism, determinism, ethics, usefulness, etc.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		<p><b>Do not give full credit</b> for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the cognitive approach and behaviourist perspective without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks, if studies are in the context of the approaches.</p>

Question Number		Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(d)	<p><b>Continued</b></p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Explanation of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Explanation of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Explanation of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Explanation of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	[8]	<p>For 5-6 marks the candidate needs to give <b>at least one point</b> of comparison between the approach/perspective with well supported examples.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks there should <b>be at least two points</b> of comparison linked with evidence from both the cognitive approach and the behavioural perspective.</p>

Question Number		Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(e)	<p><b>Discuss the features of the cognitive approach that support the view that psychology is a science.</b></p> <p>Features should be drawn from the cognitive approach and <b>not</b> from the supporting evidence. Candidates may use any areas of cognitive approach to answer this question but must focus on psychology as a science eg the use of lab experiments to carry out research, the control of variables, reliable measuring techniques, hypothesis testing to support or refute theories etc.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Discussion is basic. Range of supporting arguments is sparse or not present. There is little or no organisation. Selection of arguments is poor and they are peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is lacking detail and there is very little understanding evident.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Discussion is reasonable. Range of supporting arguments is limited and has some organisation. Selection of arguments from a limited range of sources is vaguely related to the question and demonstrates some psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is inconsistent. Discussion has some detail and some understanding is evident.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Discussion is very good. Range of supporting arguments is well balanced and is organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is logically related to the question and demonstrates very good psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is generally well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Discussion is comprehensive. Range of supporting arguments is balanced and coherently organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is explicitly related to the question and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is clear and well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>	<b>[8]</b>	<p><b>Do not reward</b> responses that describe features of the cognitive approach without reference to its relevance to psychology as a science.</p> <p><b>Do not reward</b> responses that describe evidence that refers to psychology as a science but is not from the cognitive approach.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer may be very brief or be very basic showing little psychological knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks there may only be 2 or 3 points discussed without the use of examples or 1 very well developed argument with supporting evidence.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks the candidate may have a well developed argument with 3 or 4 points without the use of examples. Alternatively they may take 2 or 3 arguments which are supported by psychological evidence from the cognitive approach.</p>

Question Number		Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
9	(a)	<p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology, briefly outline what is meant by ecological validity.</b></p> <p>Candidates should outline the concept of ecological validity. This is likely to be done by referring to research using everyday situations so that behaviour is natural. This may be described in terms of the setting/ the nature of the task/ the sample used.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Identification of the issue which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Ecological validity may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent Expression poor.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – The main components of the issue are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to the concept of ecological validity. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – The main components of the issue are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to ecological validity. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> – The main components of the issue are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The candidate clearly understands the issue in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.</p>	<b>[4]</b>	<p>No examples of psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks.</p> <p>A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant.</p> <p>A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding.</p> <p>For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer. For example it may describe ecological validity in terms of everyday settings without being explicit about the nature of validity.</p> <p>Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in 2 or 3 sentences</p>

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (b)	<p><b>Describe examples of high ecological validity from any two pieces of psychological research.</b></p> <p>Candidates may use any research that they have studied where ecological validity is high. For example, from the AS course students may use Piliavin and should explain how the ecological validity was high as it was conducted in a natural setting.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Description is very basic (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Ecological validity may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression limited.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Use of psychological terminology is basic. The range of theories/studies described is limited. Description is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration/uses of example/quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Use of psychological terminology is mainly competent and the range of theories/studies is related to the question. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is competent.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The range of theories/studies described is appropriate. Description is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Quality of written communication is comprehensive.</p>	<b>[8]</b>	<p><b>Do not reward</b> more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2.</p> <p><b>Do not reward</b> evidence that does not have high ecological validity.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks one or two examples given but are very basic.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks the examples will lack detail or only one example which is fully detailed.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the evidence may be very accurate and detailed but the ecological validity may not be strongly emphasised/the ecological validity may be strongly highlighted but the evidence may not be detailed</p> <p>For 7-8 marks accurate description of examples should <b>explicitly</b> highlight the way in which the research has high ecological validity.</p>

Question Number		Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
9	(c)	<p><b>Discuss the strengths and limitations of conducting psychological research where ecological validity is low. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</b></p> <p>Strengths may include the accuracy of measurement, the use of equipment, the high levels of control and replicability etc. Limitations may include reductionism, lack of qualitative data, lack of application to treatment etc</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is basic. Range of points is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Points are not organised into issues. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and demonstrates poor psychological knowledge. Sparse or no use of supporting examples from unit content. There is very limited or no argument arising from points. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is sparse and understanding may not be evident.</p> <p><b>4-5 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is limited. Range of points is limited (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates limited psychological knowledge. Poor use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is sparse. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sparse. Evaluation is lacking in detail and understanding is sparse.</p>		<p><b>Do not reward</b> psychological evidence that does not have low ecological validity.</p> <p><b>Do not reward</b> parts of the answer that simply describe evidence with low ecological validity without referring to the strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p>At 1-3 marks the points are very basic and the psychological knowledge poor. For example the study may not be named and the details may be inaccurate.</p> <p>At 4-5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak.</p>

Question Number		Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
9	(c)	<p><b>Continued</b></p> <p><b>6-7 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Range of points is limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised into issues. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p> <p><b>8-9 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into issues. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>10-12 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Range (eg two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced. Points are competently organised into issues. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>	[12]	<p>At 6-7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with more limited supporting evidence.</p> <p>At 8-9 marks there will be at least 3 strengths/weaknesses with well described [you may want to think of this as appropriate] evidence.</p> <p>At 10-12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with well described impressive [it may be useful to think of this as apposite] supporting evidence.</p>

Question Number	Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (d)	<p><b>Compare the ecological validity of laboratory experiments with the ecological validity of field experiments. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</b></p> <p>Lab experiments are usually low in ecological validity because they: take place in artificial lab conditions, this may produce unnatural behaviour and they have a high degree of control over variables which means they are more replicable.</p> <p>Field experiments are usually high in ecological validity as they: take place in the participant's own natural environment, so behaviour may be more natural and there is less control over variables so the study is more difficult to replicate.</p> <p>Examples may show difference in controls, settings, replicability and behaviour.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Few discussion points. Range of arguments is sparse or not present. There is little or no organisation. Selection of arguments is poor and they are peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is limited and lacking detail.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Limited discussion. Limited range of arguments with some organisation. Arguments are vaguely related to the question and demonstrate a sound psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is limited. Discussion has limited detail and some understanding is evident.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Some discussion points. Range of limited arguments is well balanced and is organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is logically related to the question and demonstrates very good psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is generally well developed. Discussion has some detail.</p>	<b>[8]</b>	<p><b>Do not give full credit</b> for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the lab experiments and field without comparing the ecological validity of them. Maximum would be 4 marks, if studies are in the context of ecological validity.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer will either be very brief or have a very limited discussion.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks this discussion may focus on the difference between high and low validity only but with well described examples/more points of comparison with less detailed examples.</p>

Question Number		Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
9	(d)	<p><b>Continued</b></p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Many Discussion points. Range of supporting arguments is balanced and coherently organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is explicitly related to the question and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is clear and well developed. Discussion is detailed and thorough.</p>		For 7-8 marks the points can all be differences and the balance in the answer may be between different points made. There should be at least 2 differences with supporting evidence.
9	(e)	<p><b>Discuss the usefulness of field experiments in psychology.</b></p> <p>The argument may include the field experiments providing evidence for generalisability and validity of the research, and hence increase usefulness.</p> <p>Practical applications of field experiments may include suggestions from the following research:            From AS: Piliavin study support for arousal cost reward model of helping behaviour, Rosenhan (sane in insane places), Griffiths (gambling)            From Forensic: field experiment of cognitive interview validates technique, Field experiment using police officers confirms ability of police to detect lies.            From Health: funhaler effective for children with asthma.            From Sport: comparing different training regimes on sports performance.            From Education: learning styles research in the classroom.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Discussion is basic. Range of supporting arguments is sparse or not present. There is little or no organisation. Selection of arguments is poor and they are peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is lacking detail and there is very little understanding evident.</p>		For 1-2 marks there may be very little mention of field experiments or of their usefulness.

Question Number		Expected Answer	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
9	(e)	<p><b>Continued</b></p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Discussion is reasonable. Range of supporting arguments is limited and has some organisation. Selection of arguments from a limited range of sources is vaguely related to the question and demonstrates some psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is inconsistent. Discussion has some detail and some understanding is evident.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Discussion is very good. Range of supporting arguments is well balanced and is organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is logically related to the question and demonstrates very good psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is generally well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Discussion is comprehensive. Range of supporting arguments is balanced and coherently organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is explicitly related to the question and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is clear and well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>		<p>For 3-4 marks the candidate may not always be focused on the question and some of the arguments may not be appropriate to field experiments/usefulness.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the discussion will be good but not comprehensive and will not provide the variety of sources of a top band answer.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks the candidate may discuss either the theoretical usefulness and/or the practical usefulness of field experiments. This can be achieved by raising 3 or 4 points without the use of examples. Candidates can also achieve the top band with 2 points, but the points are supported by appropriate psychological evidence.</p>
<b>Section B Total</b>			<b>[40]</b>	

# Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE Psychology H168 H568  
January 2010 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	82	73	64	56	48	0
	UMS	140	112	98	84	70	56	0
G543	Raw	100	62	54	46	38	31	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
G544	Raw	80	57	50	44	38	32	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	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	9.9	28.7	58.7	82.1	93.5	100.0	1332

## 1332 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums/index.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 2010

