

Psychology

Advanced GCE **A2 7876**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS 3876**

Mark Scheme for the Units

January 2010

3876/7876/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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Psychology (7876)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Psychology (3876)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
2544 Psychology and Education	1
2545 Psychology and Health	14
2546 Psychology and Organisations	26
2547 Psychology and Environment	40
2548 Psychology and Sport	53
2549 Psychology and Crime	65
Grade Thresholds	75

2544 Psychology and Education

SECTION A

- 1 (a) Describe one study of learned helplessness which may explain lack of motivation in education. [6]

Likely answers:

- Seligman and Maier 1974 – study on dogs
- Maier and Seligman 1976 – human study
- Dweck 1978 – feedback on students' work and learned helplessness.

Candidates need to make the link between learned helplessness and education in order to be able to gain full credit. If no link to education, then candidates cannot receive top band.

Weaker responses will be brief, lack detail and show little lack understanding of how learned helplessness affects motivation in education.

Stronger responses will have more detail, clarity and demonstrate a sound understanding of how learned helplessness affects motivation in education.

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

(b) Evaluate explanations for a lack of motivation in education.**[10]**

Candidates are asked to evaluate explanations for a lack of motivation in education. Stronger responses will show good question focus, providing a detailed and coherent evaluation of explanations for a lack of motivation in education. Weaker responses may show superficial evaluation and fail to link explanations to an educational setting.

Likely answers:

- Research performed on animals may not be generalisable to humans as humans are more complex
- Some research on humans has supported original Seligman and Maier eg Dweck
- Some research on humans has not supported this eg Wortman and Brehm 1975
- Helps to explain the impact of environmental stressors on learning
- Potentially useful explanation to reverse or prevent poor motivation eg through use of careful feedback, increasing self-efficacy etc.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
--------------	------------------------

0 marks:	No answer or incorrect answer.
----------	--------------------------------

1-4 marks:	The answer attempts to discuss the explanations for a lack of motivation in education. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
------------	--

5-7 marks:	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some explanations for a lack of motivation in education are raised and applied in an appropriate way. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.
------------	---

8-10 marks:	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider the explanations for a lack of motivation in education. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.
-------------	--

Total marks 16 for Question 1

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

Candidates are required to focus on applications of behaviourism. Thus, answers which contain material referring entirely to behaviourist research or theory, with no educational application, can only achieve a maximum of 4 out of 6 (ie middle band). Where candidates offer distinctly more than one behaviourist application, all applications should be marked with the best response receiving credit.

Likely answers:

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

Shaping eg in terms of disruptive behaviour or in terms of teaching a skill, where rewards are given the more closely the behaviour resembles the target behaviour.

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

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

Programmed learning ie linear and branching.

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

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

Weaker responses will be brief, lack detail and show little understanding of a behaviourist application to education.

Stronger responses will clearly identify an application and relate this to appropriate psychology.

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

(b) Discuss differences between behaviourist and humanistic applications to learning. [10]

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

It is possible that some candidates may simply describe a humanist application to education with no attempt to either implicitly or explicitly draw out differences to behaviourist applications. Such answers will receive little credit.

Likely points of contrast/differences may refer to:

- Basic assumptions eg behaviourist applications treat people mechanistically (blank slate) or (black boxism) whereas:
 - Humanist applications view people as whole entities and embrace emotional aspects, phenomenology etc
- Teaching and learning styles. Behaviourist applications tend to be teacher centred whereas:
 - Humanist applications are very student centred
- Individual Differences: behaviourist applications on the whole can be argued to ignore individual differences in learners, whereas Humanism's phenomenological emphasis implies that teachers must always consider a classroom experience from that of each individual student
- Effectiveness/Ethics/implications of applications.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
--------------	------------------------

0 marks:	No answer or incorrect answer.
----------	--------------------------------

1-4 marks:	The answer attempts to discuss the differences between behaviourist and humanistic applications to learning. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
------------	--

5-7 marks:	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some differences between behaviourist and humanistic applications to learning are raised. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.
------------	---

8-10 marks:	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider the differences between behaviourist and humanistic applications to learning. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.
-------------	--

SECTION B

- 3 (a) Describe what psychologists have found out about learning and teaching styles. [10]**

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

Likely content:

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

Stronger candidates will provide a wider range of psychological evidence that is directly related to the question, weaker candidates will tend towards anecdote with little detail or rationale for their selections.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

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

Evidence (AO1)

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

Understanding (AO1)

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

Total marks 10 for question Part (a)

(b) Evaluate what psychologists have found out about learning and teaching styles. [16]

Candidates are required to evaluate research into learning and teaching styles. Stronger responses will employ a range of evaluative issues effectively to analyse the research. Evaluations will be detailed, showing a thorough understanding of the issues. Weaker responses are likely to be characterised by a lack of detail, superficial or unsubstantiated evaluations and a lack of accuracy.

Any relevant evaluative points can receive credit including:

- Implications of learning styles for teachers eg imposition of greater work load
- Implications of teaching styles for students eg improved effectiveness, labelling (positive or negative)
- Any methodological issues regarding collection of data eg problems of inventories, forced choice, self report, likert scales etc
- Determinism – some classifications of learning style suggest a pre-determined outcome for the learner. Others allow more flexibility providing a cogent framework for compelling arguments that demonstrate originality and insight into evidence.

The best answers will have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons and contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.

Range of Issues (AO2)

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

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

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

Analysis (AO2)

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

Argument Structure (AO2)

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

- (c) **Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest a study skill that could be adopted by a fourteen year-old student studying English. Give reasons for your answer.** [8]

This question is seeking to focus on the third sub-section and may elicit responses linked to general study skills. Candidates may also indicate the use of a particular perspective; a greater focus on teacher delivery, behaviourist; paying attention to cognitive features-cognitive acceleration; or considering the whole child within a humanistic viewpoint - co-operative learning.

Application (AO1/AO2)

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

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

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

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

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

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

Likely content:

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

Stronger candidates will provide a wider range of psychological evidence that is directly related to the question, weaker candidates will tend towards anecdote with little detail or rationale for their selections.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

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

Evidence (AO1)

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

Understanding (AO1)

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

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

Candidates are required to evaluate research into disruptive behaviour in school. Any evaluative points can receive credit including:

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

The best answers will have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons and contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.

Range of Issues (AO2)

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

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

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

Analysis (AO2)

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

Argument Structure (AO2)

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

- (c) **Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest how to correct the behaviour of a nine year-old who frequently gets up and walks around the classroom without permission. Give reasons for your answer.** [8]

Any suitable suggestions may be accepted.

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

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

Possible answers may be:

- Behaviourist–style strategies eg positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement, Premack principle (ie rewarding good behaviour with preferred activities such as play time, “golden time” etc), token economies etc., ignoring bad behaviour
- Cognitive–style strategies, encouraging students to understand the impact and disruption of walking around the room
- Humanist – teacher understanding why they get up and walk around. Encouraging more engagement with lesson. Democratic-class decisions about measures to correct the behaviour.

Application (AO1/AO2)

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

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

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

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

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

2545 Psychology and Health

SECTION A

- 1 (a) Describe one way in which stress has been measured. [6]

Most likely answers to this question could include the use of a self report tool such as Holmes and Rahe (1967) Social readjustment rating scale or Kanner's (1981) Hassles and Uplifts scale. Physiological methods such as blood pressure, heart rate, galvanic skin response, whether individually suggested or as a polygraph would be equally acceptable. Strong answers will offer an accurate and detailed account of how the technique described can be used to measure stress. Weaker answers will lack a clear link between the technique and the measurement of stress.

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

(b) Discuss the ethics of ways in which stress has been measured. [10]

This question requires candidates to consider the extent to which techniques used to measure stress conform to the ethical guidelines set down by the BPS. It is expected that candidates will consider more techniques to measure stress than just the techniques they considered in part (a) of this question. Better answers will illustrate clearly the aspects of several techniques to measure stress and the ways in which these comply with or contravene the different elements of the ethical guidelines. Specific points will depend very much on the techniques chosen. It is likely that weaker answers will focus on describing stress measurement techniques in greater detail without really addressing the issue of ethics. The very strongest answers will offer a balanced discussion of various methods used to measure stress and examine how various aspects of those methods impinge on the ethics of using the measure. It is likely that some candidates will consider the costs and benefits of abiding by the ethical guidelines in terms of the validity and reliability of the measure.

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

- 2 (a) Describe one study on the misuse of health services. [6]

Most likely answers will choose a study on either over or under use of the health service, for example delay in seeking treatment or reluctance to take up opportunities for health screens eg Safer *et al* or Fraser *et al*. Studies which relate to use of the health service which are derived from other sections of the syllabus, eg adherence, may be equally creditworthy provided that they are made relevant to the question. Better answers will identify a study, what was done, what was found and relate the findings to the question. Answers which simply outline a use or misuse of the health service, hypochondriasis or Munchausen Syndrome, for example, without a study will receive a maximum of 2 marks.

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

(b) Discuss the validity of studies on the use and misuse of health services. [10]

The key command of this question is to address the issue of validity. Candidates may choose to consider validity of studies in terms of whether they measure what they claim to measure by considering the methodology employed, for example self reports, observations etc. They may equally consider the ecological validity of studies. In both instances it is expected that the very best answers will consider a number of different studies and discuss the validity of these. Weaker answers are likely to describe more studies of the use and misuse of the health service with little attention to the validity of these.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks:	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks:	The answer attempts to discuss the validity of studies on the use and misuse of the health service. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
5-7 marks:	<p>The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some evaluative issues are raised and applied in an appropriate way to discuss the validity of studies on the use and misuse of the health service.</p> <p>There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.</p>
8-10 marks:	<p>The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points relating to the validity of studies on the use and misuse of the health service.</p> <p>There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.</p>

SECTION B

- 3 (a) Describe what psychologists have discovered about substance use and abuse. [10]**

Candidates can select from a wide range of material for this question. Theories of substance abuse are appropriate but a balance between theories and empirical evidence is required for the highest marks. Material relating to preventing and quitting substance abuse is also relevant here. Likely examples of empirical evidence include: Moolchan *et al*, Robinson *et al*, Lando, Dijkstra and De Vries, Townsend... Theoretical examples include: Orford, Griffiths, Prochaska.

Concepts, terminology and quality of English (AO1)

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

Evidence (AO1)

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

Understanding (AO1)

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

(b) Evaluate what psychologists have discovered about substance use and abuse. [16]

Evaluation points will depend to some extent on the material selected in part (a) and may include a consideration of how the work of psychologists has improved our understanding of why people abuse substances. Consideration of the extent to which empirical research is valid, reliable, ethical, useful etc would be relevant as would comments relating to individual differences.

The best answers will have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons and contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.

Range of issues (AO2)

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

Evidence for issues (AO2)

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

Analysis (AO2)

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

Analysis structure (AO2)

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

- (c) **Concern has been raised by the residents of a small town about solvent abuse amongst young people. Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest how the abuse of solvents by young people could be prevented. Give reasons for your answer.** [8]

The key command of this question is **preventing** substance abuse. Candidates are expected to make a suggestion of how abuse of solvents by young people in a small town can be prevented. The most appropriate answers will recognise the difference between preventing and quitting and will provide a suggestion which clearly aims to prevent young people abusing solvents. Any approach from this section of the specification would be appropriate as would approaches from other sections such as health promotion and lifestyles. Effective answers will provide a clear suggestion based on psychological evidence and supported by clear rationale. Weaker answers will tend to be less well supported by evidence, be less clearly focussed on preventing and the target of young people and solvents and will tend to be anecdotal in nature.

Application (AO2)

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

Application interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

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

4 (a) Describe what psychologists have learned about accidents. [10]

Candidates may select from a wide range of material in response to this question. Strong answers will make good use of appropriate empirical evidence and/or theory which may include some of the following: Riggio, Reason, Simpson, Liao, Fox, Paterson, Cowpe. Candidates may chose to describe research into the causes of accidents and factors affecting them, the link between personality and accident proneness and reducing and preventing accidents.

Concepts, terminology and quality of English (AO1)

0 marks: Incorrect or inappropriate material is presented.

1 mark: There is limited use of psychological terms and concepts. Spelling and sentence construction are poor; punctuation is inappropriate or largely absent.

2 marks: Appropriate terms and concepts are presented, but there is a lack of clarity. Spelling and punctuation are reasonable but there is a number of errors.

3 marks: Appropriate terms and concepts are presented and used in a confident way. Spelling is good, although there could be one or two errors. Sentence construction is good with views expressed clearly. Punctuation is appropriate.

Evidence (AO1)

0 marks: No evidence is presented.

1 mark: Some basic evidence is described which is of peripheral relevance or it is predominantly anecdotal.

2 marks: Some appropriate psychological evidence is described but there are a number of errors and it is limited in scope and detail.

3 marks: Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described. It is reasonably wide-ranging in scope and is reasonably detailed.

4 marks: Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail.

Understanding (AO1)

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

(b) Evaluate what psychologists have learned about accidents. [16]

There are many evaluative issues which can be applied to answering this question. The key question is to what extent do we understand the reasons for and how to reduce accidents as a result of Psychological research? Issues such as generalisability of studies, their ecological validity and ethical implications could all be usefully applied to the question.

The best answers will have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons and contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.

Range of issues (AO2)

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

Evidence for issues (AO2)

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

Analysis (AO2)

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

Analysis structure (AO2)

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

- (c) **A large manufacturing company has recently experienced an increase in the number of accidents in the workplace. Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest how the company could identify the causes of these accidents. Give reasons for your answer.** [8]

Candidates are expected to make a suggestion of how the causes of accidents in this particular work place might be identified. It is possible that some candidates will be expecting a question about reducing accidents; those who make a suggestion which attempts to reduce accidents will limit themselves to the bottom mark band and will only be given credit for the aspects of their answer which address identifying the causes. Strong answers will suggest how the causes could be identified, eg through self report or observation. These will be supported by relevant evidence and psychological rationale. Weaker answers will tend to be anecdotal and not directly address the question.

Application (AO2)

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

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

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

2546 Psychology and Organisations

SECTION A

- (a) 6 – AO1
(b) 10 – AO2

- 1 (a) Outline one technique used in performance appraisal. [6] [AO1]

Most likely answers will include the use of; rating scales to assess simple performances; objective measures such as quantity of outcomes, such as pupil pass rate; developmental dialogues, discussions are held on an equal basis and review previously agreed job targets (Larsen and Bang, 1993) and 360 degree feedback (Chmiel, 2000).

Stronger candidates will identify a technique similar to those above and highlight the link to psychological principles; weaker candidates are more likely to simply describe a performance appraisal technique.

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

(b) Discuss difficulties in carrying out performance appraisal. [10]

Most likely answers will consider issues of; intra and inter-rater reliability and the validity of the measure when using Rating Scales and the Halo effect may also be referred to; the effects of attribution on how causes of behaviour are interpreted; Hawthorne effect during observations. The need for appraisers to be trained to avoid errors of judgment and how 360 degree appraisal may prevent many of the errors mentioned.

Weaker candidates will tend towards anecdote whereas the stronger candidates will select a range of psychological principles and may discuss the reliability and validity issues more clearly and acknowledge that not all tasks have a similar psychological demand.

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks:	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks:	The answer attempts to discuss the difficulties in carrying out performance appraisal. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
5-7 marks:	<p>The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some relevant issues are raised and applied in an appropriate way to the issue of the difficulties in carrying out performance appraisal. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.</p> <p>The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider the difficulties in carrying out performance appraisal. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.</p>
8-10 marks:	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider the difficulties in carrying out performance appraisal. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

- 2 (a) Describe one study of group conflict. [6] [AO1]

Most likely answers will describe studies of group conflict from Social Psychology such as Sherif's Robber's Cave experiment or Tajfel's study of ingroup/outgroup discrimination in schoolboys.

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

2 (b) Discuss difficulties of investigating group conflict. [10] [AO2]

Answers may include difficulties of methodology such as representativeness of samples, social desirability, and validity of research. There could also be a discussion of issues such as reductionist research, ethics, which would be creditworthy if they remain focused on difficulties. Weaker answers will drift into less relevant issues or will not be related to group conflict. With no explicit reference to difficulties the maximum mark should be 4.

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

SECTION B**Part (a) AO1**

- 3 (a) Describe what psychologists have learned about the selection of people for work. [10]**

Candidates are likely to identify; personnel screening of knowledge/skills/attitudes, selection procedures such as psychometric testing to identify skills, aptitudes and personalities (Ability tests, psycho-motor tests and personality scaling such as Myers-Briggs). Interview procedures, such as structured/unstructured interviews and selection decisions based on job related questions and rating systems.

Stronger candidates will provide a wider range of psychological evidence that is directly related to the question, weaker candidates will tend towards anecdote with little detail or rationale for their selections.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

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

Evidence (AO1)

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

Understanding (AO1)

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

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

Part (b) AO2**3 (b) Evaluate what psychologists have learned about the selection of people for work.****[16]**

Effects of prejudice/personal experience. Stereotypes and expectations (Awonsunle and Doyle, 2001), black prefer black, white prefer white in selection procedures. Bias due to attractiveness and first impressions. Gender bias, Graves and Powell (1996), females favour females, males showed no preference. Ethnic bias (Brown and Gay, 1985) ethnic minorities with equal qualities are less likely to be selected. Issues of reliability and validity. Hunter and Hunter (1984) interviews are only effective as part of the selection procedure. Huffcutt and Arthur (1994) structured interviews are more reliable. Validity can be affected by issues such as question drift, use of unrelated questions to the job that could favour certain applicants, time constraints could cause 'snap' judgments to be made.

The best answers will have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons and contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.

Range of issues (AO2)

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

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

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

Analysis (AO2)

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

Argument Structure (AO2)

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

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

Part (c)

- 3 (c) You have been asked to advise the manager of a local hotel how to select new staff for the restaurant. Using your knowledge of psychology what you would suggest? Give reasons for your answer. [8]**

Suggestions are likely to highlight the need to identify the skills and attributes required and to set up a selection and interview process that identifies these. Better candidates may refer to the use of cut off criteria to enable suitable staff to be selected on merit.

Application (AO1/AO2)

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

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

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

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

Section B**Part (a) AO1**

- 4 (a) Describe what psychologists have learned about organisational work conditions. [10]**

Noise can cause distraction (Riggio, 1999) and ill health at work (Evans et al 1995). Intermittent noise is as distracting as loud noise (Graig, 1993), Sanders and McCormack showed noise (music) can increase concentration. Better illumination results in better performance (Sandes and McCormick, 1993). Any change in illumination caused production to increase (Mayo, 1927). Stress from repetitive work. Psychological conditions such as; social effects on performance in open plan offices (Canter, 1983) and loss of status. Stress due to overcrowding (Oldham and Fried, 1987). Credit given for general stressors. Relation of long hours worked to stress (Sutherland and Cooper, 1997). Social and domestic problems caused by shift work (Dipboye et al 1994). Flexitime lowering absenteeism (Dalton and Mesch, 1990). Negative effects of work environments can be alleviated by, organisational change, counselling, stress management, job redesign, providing flexible working hours and employee participation in decision making.

Stronger candidates will provide a wider range of psychological evidence that is directly related to the question, weaker candidates will tend towards anecdote with little detail or rationale for their selections.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

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

Evidence (AO1)

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

- 4 marks: Appropriate psychological evidence is accurately described that is wide-ranging in scope and detail.

Understanding (AO1)

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

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

Part (b) AO2**4 (b) Evaluate what psychologists have learned about organisational work conditions. [16]**

Most likely evaluation points will include, individual differences, for example tolerance to noise (Evans et al, 1995). Hawthorne effect due to social pressures when being observed (Mayo, 1927). Reductionist issues such as identifying the causes of sick building syndrome. Research design/laboratory investigation. Variety of alternative findings re; noise/light.

Weaker candidates will select fewer issues and not relate these directly to the issues of conditions of work environments.

The best answers will have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons and contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.

Range of issues (AO2)

0 marks: No material worthy of credit.

1-2 marks: The answer identifies some issues; they could have been related to the question more closely and they could have been elaborated and explained further.

3-4 marks: The answer covers an appropriate range of issues; the issues are identified, made relevant, explained and elaborated.

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

0 marks: No material worthy of credit.

1-2 marks: Some evidence is identified and an attempt is made to show its relevance to the issues.

3-4 marks: Evidence is appropriately selected to illustrate the issues and commented on effectively.

Analysis (AO2)

0 marks: No material worthy of credit.

1-2 marks: An attempt is made to provide some analysis.

3-4 marks: The answer contains some analysis most likely in the form of comparisons and contrasts; these are accurate, detailed and effective.

Argument Structure (AO2)

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

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

Part (c)

- 4 (c) You are a psychologist advising a manager of a petrol station that is open for 24 hours, 7 days a week. Suggest shift patterns the manager could use to maximise employee effectiveness. Give reasons for your answer. [8]**

Likely suggestions to improve effectiveness; allow flexibility to enable employees to control shift patterns (Dalton and Mesch, 1990); rotation of shift patterns; provide support for individuals who find work patterns difficult; match shift times to 'personality'. It is expected that stronger candidates will produce answers that reflect an understanding of the personal nature and effect of working patterns on individuals whereas weaker answers are likely to be anecdotal and not make the psychological rationale clear

Application (AO1/AO2)

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

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1)

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

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

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

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

2547 Psychology and Environment

SECTION A

- 1 (a) Describe one study into the negative effects of noise on health. [6]

Any study on negative effects of noise on health. For example, Cherek (1985) smokers; Woodson (1986) smokers and noise; Cohen et al (1969) increased blood pressure in schoolchildren in noisy environment; Lalande (1986) effect on children of noise exposure during pregnancy; Eggertsen et al (1987) hypertension. Studies on the negative effects of noise on performance or social behaviour will receive no credit. However, if answer attempts to make relevant to health it may receive some credit.

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

Total marks [6]

1 (b) Discuss difficulties of investigating negative effects of noise. [10]

Any reasonable difficulty in investigating the negative effects of noise is acceptable. For example, ethics, individual differences, ecological validity, reliability, methodology, etc.

Marks Mark Descriptor

0 marks: No answer or incorrect answer.

1-4 marks: The answer attempts to discuss the difficulties of investigating negative effects of noise. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.

5-7 marks: The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some difficulties are mentioned. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.

8-10 marks: The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total marks [10]

- 2 (a) Describe one study on the effects of crowding on social behaviour. [6]

Any study investigating the effects of crowding on social behaviour may be used. For example, Baum and Valins (1977) high density in the dorm; Baum and Greenberg (1975) friendliness in students; Stokols et al (1973) aggression; Bickman (1973) procial behaviour; Machleit et al (2000) crowded shops; Evans et al (2000) residential home crowding or Calhoun (1962) study using rats.

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

Total marks [6]

2 (b) Evaluate different methods used to investigate the effects of crowding. [10]

Any method used to investigate the effects of crowding may be considered. For example, field experiment (Lundberg 1976 or Saegert et al 1975); lab experiment (Evan 1979). Methods used in animal research may also be considered. Candidates may discuss methods with reference to issues such as ecological validity, measurement, sample, ethics etc.

Marks Mark Descriptor

0 marks: No answer or incorrect answer.

1-4 marks: The answer attempts to evaluate different methods used to investigate the effects of crowding. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.

5-7 marks: The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some points on methods used to investigate effects of crowding are raised and applied in an appropriate way. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.

8-10 marks: The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that consider different methods used to investigate the effects of crowding. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

Total marks [10]

SECTION B

- 3 (a) Describe what psychologists have found out about crowds/collective behaviour. [10]**

Typical answers may define crowds/collective behaviour and may distinguish between different types. Theoretical approaches to collective behaviour may be considered (contagion, convergence and emergent norm theories) as outlined by Turner and Killian (1972). Candidates may discuss the work of Le Bon (1879) 'mob psychology' – law of mental unity, who identified situational determinants of suggestibility, social contagion, impersonality and anonymity. Festinger et al (1952) proposed the concept of deindividuation and later work by Zimbardo on deindividuation would be relevant. Research by Marsh et al (1978) on football crowds - ritualised behaviour, Waddington et al (1987) on the miners' strike; Reicher (1984), (1985) looking at riots in Bristol may be used.

Studies on crowds in emergency situations could include Mintz (1951) 1903 Chicago theatre fire, and also lab based study (1951) on emergency situations; Donald and Canter (1992) Kings Cross fire.

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

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

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

Evidence (AO1)

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

Understanding (AO1)

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

Total marks [10]

3 (b) Evaluate what psychologists have found out about crowds/collective behaviour. [16]

Note – any evaluative point may receive credit. Candidates may use a range of issues to evaluate research, for example – how psychologists gain their evidence; individual differences; generalisation; ethics; different theories of crowd behaviour; implications. Candidates may adopt an issue by issue approach or they may evaluate study by study.

The best answers have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons or contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.

Range of issues (AO2)

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

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

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

Analysis (AO2)

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

Argument Structure (AO2)

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

Total marks [16]

- 3 (c) **A protest march is being organised in your town against the closure of the community centre. Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest how to control the crowds in order to prevent problems. Give reasons for your answer.** [8]

Mark scheme guidelines apply in that any reasonable suggestion is acceptable, eg Waddington (1987) made suggestions based on findings from the miners' strike, he also proposed 5 practical courses of action for crowd control.

Loftus outlined the use of evacuation messages designed to reduce panic. Sugiman and Misumi (1988) suggested a 'follow me', 'follow directions' approach. Candidates may also use psychological research/theory/model from any area of psychology.

Application (AO1/AO2)

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

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

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

Total marks [8]

Total Question Mark: [34] (AO1=14; AO2=20)

4 (a) Describe what psychologists have learned about architecture and behaviour. [10]

Candidates may discuss architectural determinism and theories of effects of urban living (eg overload, environmental stress, behaviour constraint and adaptation level). Research into the effects of urban living on **social behaviour** – eg Webber (1963) propinquity; Bornstein (1979) pace of life; Newman and McCawley (1977) eye contact in city or rural areas; Milgram (1977) responses to handshaking may be considered;

Also research into effects of urban living on **health** (physical and mental) – eg Goldstein et al (1990) on stress and well-being; Yip et al (2000) urban/rural differences in suicide rates. Urban renewal is an integrated series of steps taken to maintain and upgrade the environmental, economic and social health of an urban area. Studies such as Fried (1963) on residential relocation of Italian working class can be used. Housing design eg Pruitt-Igo; comparison of high rise/low rise multiple-unit residences (McCarthy et al 1978). Also research into defensible space (eg Oscar Newman).

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

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

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

Evidence (AO1)

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

Understanding (AO1)

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

Total marks [10]

Part (b) AO2**4 (b) Evaluate what psychologists have learned about architecture and behaviour. [16]**

Note: Any evaluative point can receive credit. Candidates may use a range of issues to evaluate the research, for example – Architectural Determinism, ethics, generalisation, individual or cultural differences; how psychologists gain their evidence. Candidates may adopt an issue by issue approach or they may evaluate study by study.

The best answers have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons or contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.

Range of issues (AO2)

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

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

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

Analysis (AO2)

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

Argument Structure (AO2)

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

Total marks [16]

Part (c) AO1/AO2

- 4 (c) **An old housing estate is due to be demolished and plans are being drawn up for new residential accommodation. Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest how the town planners can ensure the residents will be happy in their new environment. Give reasons for your answer.**

[8]

Mark scheme guidelines apply in that any reasonable suggestion supported by psychological evidence is acceptable. Candidates will probably draw on research into urban renewal or building design, eg Fried (1963) – Italian residents relocation; Brower (1988), Ulrich (1984) scenic view from hospital window aids recovery; communal seating (sociopetal rather than sociofugal); attractive seating areas eg plazas with fountains, trees, food stands etc. (Whyte 1974); use of communal space (Howell 1980) comparison of high rise/low rise multiple-unit residences (McCarthy et al 1978) Also research into defensible space eg Pruitt-Igoe (Rainwater 1966); Oscar Newman.

Application (AO1/AO2)

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

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1)

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

Total marks [8]**Total Question Mark: [34] (AO1=14; AO2=20)****TOTAL MODULE MARK: [50] (AO1=20; AO2=30)**

2548 Psychology and Sport

Section A

1 (a) Outline one measure of aggression in sport.

There is a variety of measures of aggression in sport, some referring to particular situations or settings, others responding to a more general assessment. The number of aggressive occurrences can be counted, as with OPTA index or counting a referee's decisions. Projective techniques, such as Rorschach ink blot tests, lend themselves to measures of unconscious aggression. Perceptions of aggression can be surveyed, such as with Bredemeier's Athletic Aggression Inventory. Behavioural measures can be taken experimentally, such as the number of electric shocks applied in Berkowitz's Environmental-Cue studies. In this case amongst others however, there must be a specific link to the sporting context.

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

(6 marks)

(b) Discuss the validity of measures of aggression in sport.

Measures tend to come from different approaches to research, such as physiological or behavioural observation. Whether it measures what it claims to measure ie aggression in sport, or whether it overlooks aspects of aggression or measures something else may be considered by this question. Validity includes considering whether a definition defines 'aggression' accurately. Many definitions restrict 'aggression' as an act directed at another living organism or even another person – is throwing a tennis racket to the ground in anger not an act of aggression? A more specific appraisal considering ecological, construct or predictive validity, for example, may also be considered.

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

(10 marks)**(Total: 16 marks)**

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

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

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

(6 marks)

(b) Discuss the limitations of research into personality and sport performance.

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

Marks	Mark Descriptor
0 marks:	No answer or incorrect answer.
1-4 marks:	The answer attempts to discuss the limitations of research which investigates personality and sports performance. The evidence and explanations are largely anecdotal and psychological concepts and terms are sparsely used. The answer is superficial and lacks detail.
5-7 marks:	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. Some points are raised and applied in an appropriate way to the limitations of research which investigates personality and sports performance. There is appropriate use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has a reasonable range of points and there is some evidence of elaboration.
8-10 marks:	The answer is appropriate to the assessment request. The answer has a good range of points that discuss the limitations of research into personality and sports performance. There is a confident use of psychological terms and concepts. The answer has an impressive range of points each of which is clearly explained and elaboration is clearly explained and elaboration is coherent and thorough.

(10 marks)

(Total: 16 marks)

Section B**3 (a) Describe research into attention and imagery in sport.**

The question asks about **research**, so theories, studies or concepts are all acceptable. The question further refers to both attention **and** imagery, however no implication is made of balance. Partial performance would receive a maximum of 8 marks. In terms of content, Nideffer's research represents the most likely response from sports psychology research. Wider research from traditional psychology is equally acceptable as long as it is specifically applied to the sporting context; Broadbent, Treisman and Kahnemann are obvious examples. Weaker responses may fail to relate such research to the sporting context. The use of imagery can refer to relaxation techniques, mental rehearsal to improve technique or mental practise during periods of injury, for example. Better candidates will contextualise their responses and be wide ranging in scope and detail.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

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

Evidence (AO1)

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

Understanding (AO1)

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

(10 marks)

(b) Evaluate research into attention and imagery in sport.

Most likely issues are ecological validity, comparing laboratory with real life studies; the relationship between theory and practice; usefulness of research to sports performers; generalisability; ethnocentrism and ethical considerations. The best answers have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons or contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.

Range of Issues (AO2)

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

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

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

Analysis (AO2)

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

Argument Structure (AO2)

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

(16 marks)

- (c) **An elite archer is finding events in her life are affecting her concentration when she is shooting in competition. Using your knowledge of psychology, how could you help her address this problem? Give reasons for your answer.**

This may be addressed with references to research into narrow and broad attention. Such references may include that of Robert Nideffer who comments on broad and narrow attention as well as developing the TAIS (Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style), or Landers, Qi and Courtet who found that low arousal led to attention being too broad, narrowing as arousal increased, but becoming too narrow if arousal was too high.

It is important for the candidate to go beyond the research and use it to make appropriate suggestions to help our elite archer.

Application (AO1/AO2)

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

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

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

(8 marks)

(Total: 34 marks)

4 (a) Describe research into leadership and coaching in sport.

Candidates may answer the above question in a number of ways. Better answers would be expected to refer to theories, studies and/or concepts of leadership and coaching. Secondly the sports aspect must be addressed. This can be achieved directly with reference to sports specific models, such as Smoll and Smith's Leadership Behaviour model (1989) or Chelladurai's Multidimensional Model of Leadership. Alternatively, reference to the application to sports of more mainstream models may be specified, such as Fiedler's Contingency model or even Lewin, Lippett and White (1939), but this must be specifically linked to sport to receive any credit beyond the minimal level. Measures, such as Smith, Smoll and Hunt's CBAS (1977) or the assessment of coach-performer compatibility such as Caron and Bennett's work (1977) may be referred to as well.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

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

Evidence (AO1)

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

Understanding (AO1)

- 0 marks: The answer is list-like with no attempt to understand what has been written; there is no use of elaboration, clarification or example.
- 1 mark: The answer demonstrates some understanding but this is sparse.

- 2 marks: The answer demonstrates good understanding. There is some clarification of terminology, occasional use of examples, some expansion of complex points. There is some coherence and a reasonable structure.
- 3 marks: The answer demonstrates explicitly applied understanding throughout. There is clarification of terminology, use of examples, expansion of complex points; the answer is coherent and well structured.

(10 marks)

(b) Evaluate research into leadership and coaching in sport.

The evaluation issues chosen will depend on the choice of content. Most likely issues are validity and reliability of measures, methodological difficulties, defining leadership, individual differences in response to leadership/coaching styles, ecological validity, ethnocentrism and generalisation. The best answers have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons or contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.

Range of Issues (AO2)

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

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

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

Analysis (AO2)

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

Argument Structure (AO2)

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

(16 marks)

- (c) You serve on your nation's Olympic Committee which has to choose a captain for its national squad for London 2012. Using your knowledge of psychology, what advice would you give the committee to help them make their choice? Give reasons for your answer.

Answers may deal with qualities of leaders/leadership (trait approach), leadership styles or modelling behaviour, for example. There can be variation on what this leader needs to achieve or what their role is considered to be. It is important that candidates link theory to practical or applicable suggestions.

Application (AO1/AO2)

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

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

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

(8 marks)

(Total: 34 marks)

(Total Paper: 50 marks)

2549 Psychology and Crime

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Outline one theory of morality and crime. [6]

Candidates could include the work of Kohlberg, Piaget, Yochelson and Samenow, Cornish and Clark and Bandura and any other relevant psychologist. Higher level responses will show a clear, detailed understanding of the theory.

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

- (b) Evaluate methods that psychologists have used to investigate morality and crime. [10]

Methods used could include story telling, moral dilemmas, interviews, using hypothetical scenarios or experiments. Problems could be validity, reliability, ecological validity, socially desirable answers etc.

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

[Total 10 marks]

Question 2

(a) Describe one type of police interview. [6]

Candidates are likely to describe the cognitive interview or the standard police interview. They may also describe interrogation. Any of these methods is acceptable. A strong response will be informed and accurate and may draw out the psychological processes at work in the interview process such as impression formation or memory and perception. A weaker response will tend towards anecdotal and lack psychological terminology.

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

(b) Discuss the effectiveness of police interviewing techniques. [10]

The accuracy of police interviewing techniques could be affected by interviewer bias or stereotyping, socially desirable answers, deliberate lying, failure of a witness's memory, pressure or fear and many other variables. The answer could be attempted from a witnesses or a suspect's viewpoint. Any reasonable point should gain credit. A strong response will confidently use psychological terminology to create a number of informed points which directly address accuracy. Weaker responses are likely to stray away from the injunction into a more general response and may be inaccurate and tend towards anecdote.

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

[Total 10 marks]

Section B**Question 3****Part (a) AO1****(a) Describe psychological research into crime – victim interaction. [10]**

Candidates can offer material from across the sub section so we might expect to see, The British Crime Survey, Police Crime statistics, Fear of Crime (Donaldson, R. 2003), PTSD, Rape Trauma Syndrome, Media influences (Heath, L. 1984) Just World Hypothesis (Lerner 1970, Rotter 1966) and Locus of Control. Any other relevant research is acceptable. The best answers will cover a range of evidence and offer clear accounts which are placed in the context of the question. Their conclusions will show that they understand how the research informs us about the experiences of victims of crime. Weaker answers will be rote –like and may not address the question directly. There will be a lack of detail and accuracy

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

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

Evidence (AO1)

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

Understanding (AO1)

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

Total 10 marks for question part (a)

Part (b) AO2**(b) Evaluate psychological research about crime – victim interaction. [16]**

Research such as that described in (a) may be evaluated with a range of issues including ecological validity, reliability, sampling, methodology, usefulness. Broader issues such as reductionism, determinism and ethics could also appear. Some candidates may choose to evaluate issue by issue, others may evaluate studies or theories in turn. Either way should gain equal credit

“The best answers will have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons and contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.”

Range of Issues (AO2)

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

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

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

Analysis (AO2)

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

Argument Structure (AO2)

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

Total 16 marks for question part (b)

Part (c)

- (c) Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest guidelines to help the police deal sensitively with the victims of crime. Give reasons for your answer. [8]**

Suggestions could include referral to a victim support scheme, sensitive interviewing and advice on avoiding further crime by preventative methods. Having an appropriate adult present or allowing a parent to be present during the interview if under 16 and protecting identity may also be suggested.

The best answers will be clearly linked to the scenario and show good understanding of how theory can be applied. They may also be able to address weaknesses of the application. Weaker answers will tend to leave out the psychology and give answers based on personal experience or anecdote.

Application (AO1/AO2)

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

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

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

Total 8 marks for question part (c)

Total Question Mark: (34) (AO1=14; AO2=20)

Question 4**Part (a) AO1****(a) Describe research into the psychology of the courtroom. [10]**

Candidates can offer material from across the section and so may include, Pennington and Hastie (1988), primacy/recency effects, (Murdock 1962), Yale model by Hovland and Yannis (1959), conformity (Asch, 1951), attractiveness (Dion, 1972), attribution, stereotyping, leadership, risky shift (jury selection and processes) Bottoms et al (2000), Goodman (1991), Saywitz (children as witnesses – various). Any recognised research that is applicable to the courtroom can be accepted. The best answers will be accurate and detailed and applied explicitly to the courtroom. These candidates will also demonstrate their understanding by explicitly applying the research evidence and conclusions to the courtroom. Weaker candidates will list evidence without understanding and may describe classic studies such as Asch without ever mentioning the courtroom.

Concepts and Terminology (AO1)

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

Evidence (AO1)

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

Understanding (AO1)

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

Total 10 marks for question part (a)

Part (b) AO2**(b) Evaluate research into the psychology of the courtroom. [16]**

The research used may be evaluated with issues including ecological validity, reliability, methodology or usefulness. Broader issues such as reductionism, determinism and ethics could also appear. Some candidates may adopt an issue by issue approach; others may evaluate each piece of research in turn. Either approach should gain equal credit.

“The best answers will have clearly defined issues linked to psychological evidence (including research, concepts or theories). Analysis may take the form of comparisons and contrasts but may also take the form of strengths and weaknesses or problems of the evidence. All types of analysis will be credited.”

Range of Issues (AO2)

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

Evidence for Issues (AO2)

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

Analysis (AO2)

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

Argument Structure (AO2)

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

Total 16 marks for question part (b)

Part (c)

- (c) **The present system of jury selection has been heavily criticised. Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest guidelines to improve jury selection. Give reasons for your answer.** [8]

Suggestions could include moving the case to another part of the country from where the crime occurred, interviewing the jury members about their ability to try the case without bias, Informing the jury about stereotyping and impression formation or attribution theory or primacy effects. In America voir dire is used and this may also be suggested.

Strong responses will be related to the scenario and be realistic. Weaker responses are likely to miss out the psychological links and rationale. Equal credit should be given for breadth and depth.

Application (AO1/AO2)

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

Application Interpretation: Reasons (AO1/AO2)

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

Total 8 marks for question part (c)

Total Question Mark: (34) (AO1=14; AO2=20)

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE Psychology 3876 7876
January 2010 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
2544	Raw	60	38	33	28	23	19	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2545	Raw	60	38	34	30	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2546	Raw	60	38	33	28	24	20	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2547	Raw	60	38	34	30	26	23	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2548	Raw	60	40	35	30	25	20	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
2549	Raw	60	37	32	27	23	19	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
3876	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7876	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

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

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3876	0	7.7	23.1	46.2	92.3	100.0	16
7876	3.3	32.7	63.1	86.9	92.7	100.0	222

238 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

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