



GCE

Psychology

Advanced GCE **G543**

Options in Applied Psychology

Mark Scheme for June 2010

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

FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 1 (a) | <p data-bbox="392 331 1246 365">Outline <u>one</u> piece of research into criminal thinking patterns.</p> <p data-bbox="392 398 1267 533"><i>Candidates can draw on any research which addresses the cognitive approach to criminal thinking which may include criminal thinking patterns, criminal thinking styles, self report measures and inventories and patterns of serious criminal conduct.</i></p> <p data-bbox="392 566 1262 734"><i>Weaker answers may be anecdotal, improving to outlining criminal thinking patterns without specific reference to research. Better answers will accurately refer to a piece of research to outline criminal thinking patterns but may lack the level of precision or detail required by the best answers.</i></p> <p data-bbox="392 768 850 801">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="392 835 1246 1037">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="392 1070 1246 1305">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="392 1339 1262 1574">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="392 1608 1273 1843">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 1 (b) | <p>To what extent does the cognitive approach provide an explanation of criminal behaviour?</p> <p><i>'To what extent' implies a degree of judgement is required. The reference is to the cognitive section of the 'turning to crime' area. Whether the cognitive approach can provide a good explanation of criminal behaviour can be considered by looking at assumptions and assertions in this area, or by comparison with other approaches.</i></p> <p><i>A mere attempt to address the question or a highly superficial yes or no response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments are competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 2 (a) | <p>Describe <u>one</u> piece of research into how lies can be detected when suspects are interviewed.</p> <p><i>Candidates are expected to refer to one piece of research which addresses the above, such as Vrij (2000) or Mann et al (2004), and use this to answer the question. Research tends to be ‘in house’, only testing serving police officers and without controls. Typically, the better candidate will use research to consider how lies can be detected, the weaker candidate merely reproducing an account of research.</i></p> <p><i>More specifically, weaker responses may be anecdotal, improving to detecting lies without specific reference to research. Better answers will refer to a piece of research which accurately describes detecting lies when suspects are interviewed but may lack the level of precision or detail required by the best answers.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 2 (b) | <p>Discuss the reliability of information gained from suspects in interviews.</p> <p><i>Reliability considers to what extent the data can be relied upon to be consistent. To what extent can we be confident of receiving honest, unadulterated, accurate and consistent responses? The question requires this to be broadened out to consider interrogation and/or false confessions as well as detecting lies.</i></p> <p><i>An attempt to address the question or a highly superficial 'it is quite reliable ...' or 'it isn't very reliable....' type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. Development/elaboration could be achieved by considering more or less reliable situations, types of bias, subjectivity or mood and relating these specifically to interviewing under the umbrella of issues of reliability (hence breadth as well as depth to the answer) or by specific reference to types of reliability.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 3 (a) | <p>Describe how the attractiveness of a defendant can influence courtroom behaviour.</p> <p><i>Candidates may refer to one piece of research which addresses the above, such as Castellow (1990) or Sigall and Ostrove (1975) and use this to specifically answer the question. Alternatively, they may refer to research more generally (a number of pieces of research) or merely respond solely and directly to the precise question using psychological knowledge, terminology and subject specific language. The better candidate will consider how the attractiveness of the defendant can influence courtroom behaviour, the weaker candidate may merely reproduce an account of research.</i></p> <p><i>More specifically, weaker responses may be anecdotal improving to describing relevant research but struggling to use it to describe how the attractiveness of the defendant can influence courtroom behaviour. Better answers will use research to explain how to relate increasingly to how the attractiveness of the defendant can influence courtroom behaviour.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 3 (b) | <p>Evaluate the methodology used in research into witness appeal.</p> <p><i>Any methodology issues can be considered, whether about design, sampling, sample bias, procedural limitations or broader issues such as research methods or ethnocentrism. A breadth/depth trade-off should be allowed for depending on number of points made.</i></p> <p><i>An attempt to address the question or a highly superficial 'it was good.....' or it was limited....' type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues which evolve from the more general evaluative points.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 4 (a) | <p>Describe ‘anger management’ as a treatment programme for offenders.</p> <p><i>Candidates are expected to address the above either by reference to research or the programmes themselves (such as CALM). Typically, the better candidate will use the research to address the above question explicitly, the weaker candidate merely describing anger management or reproducing an account of the research.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 4 (b) | <p>Assess the effectiveness of offender treatment programmes.</p> <p><i>The question calls for a consideration of how good offender treatment programmes are. This could be addressed by considering anger management against other forms of treatment, or by comparing different approaches to offender treatment.</i></p> <p><i>A mere attempt to address the question or a highly superficial 'this is better than that.....' type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. Development/elaboration could be achieved, for example, by incorporating a judgement as to the effectiveness of anger management informed by comparison of specific features or issues with other methods.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

HEALTH AND CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 5 (a) | <p data-bbox="391 327 1085 360">Describe self efficacy as a theory of health belief.</p> <p data-bbox="391 394 1268 562"><i>Candidates may describe self efficacy, most notably as presented by Bandura in 1977. Whereas self efficacy as a concept is found in many areas of human experience, Bandura's paper refers to it in determining whether coping behaviour would be initiated, how much effort would be expended and how long it may endure.</i></p> <p data-bbox="391 595 1268 797"><i>Quality of response will range from irrelevant/wrong/absent, through anecdotal to rudimentary/superficial. Better answers will progress from accurate research (theory) with limited detail and limited reference to health belief through to increasing detail and application. Therefore, the explicit link to health belief will therefore typify the better candidate.</i></p> <p data-bbox="391 831 852 864">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="391 898 1246 1099">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="391 1133 1246 1368">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="391 1402 1262 1637">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="391 1671 1273 1906">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 5 (b) | <p>Discuss theoretical approaches to beliefs about health.</p> <p><i>'Discuss' implies a consideration of differing points of view, and refers to different approaches to health belief. It is possible to draw out similarities or contrasts where the comparison need not be theoretical itself, provided it is located in or drawn from theory.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial yes or no response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, locating precisely the same evaluative issue in different theoretical approaches and drawing explicit comparison or contrast will typify the better candidate.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 6 (a) | <p>Describe <u>one</u> physiological measure of stress.</p> <p><i>There are various ways of measuring stress and this question ideally would require supporting evidence for physiological measures. Terminology, evidence, level of detail and explanation of evidence in context are likely to point the way to determining the stronger answers.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 6 (b) | <p>Assess the validity of different methods of measuring stress.</p> <p><i>Validity considers to what extent the data measures what it claims to measure. To what extent can we be confident that we are defining stress accurately, precisely and fully, and that any particular measure addresses this? It is possible to refer to Selye, for example, who introduced the notion of psychological (rather than physical) stress, but only insofar as it informs a discussion about the validity of a measure of stress. Validity takes many forms and can refer to the validity of the definition and coverage of the term itself, the internal validity of the research being used, the ecological validity of whether the research is applicable to 'real world' situations, and so on. An awareness of these points is required for a top band answer as opposed to a more general commentary on validity per se.</i></p> <p><i>A highly superficial 'it is quite valid' or 'it isn't very valid....' type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response, maybe accurate but little more than identifying validity in the research; a general or broader response which comments on validity improves on this and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues as identified above which may include specific reference to types of validity.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 7 (a) | <p>Outline <u>one</u> way (eg a classification system) in which dysfunctional behaviour can be categorised.</p> <p><i>The specification suggests classification systems to categorise dysfunctional behaviour, such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual now in its revised fourth edition (DSM-IVR) or the International Classification of Diseases now in its tenth edition (ICD-10). Other ways of categorising dysfunctional behaviour would also be acceptable responses. Both an outline of the classification system, or how it is used, are acceptable ways of addressing the question. 'Using a classification system' is also an acceptable type of response but one which is more difficult to score highly on without broad and specific references.</i></p> <p><i>The better candidate will consider one way in which dysfunctional behaviour can be categorised. The weaker candidate may merely reproduce a definition, for example. More specifically, weaker responses may be anecdotal, improving to a relevant description, but struggling to use it to describe one way in which dysfunctional behaviour can be categorised. Better answers will relate increasingly to one way in which dysfunctional behaviour can be categorised.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 7 (b) | <p>Discuss limitations of diagnosing dysfunctional behaviour.</p> <p><i>There is a myriad of evaluative issues which attend to limitations encountered when diagnosing dysfunctional behaviour. These include issues of validity, reliability, ethnocentrism, and reductionism to name but a few. The differing paradigms will vary in how they attempt to diagnose dysfunctional behaviour or in what form it exists, if at all.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or highly superficial pre-learned non-specific answers would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, a discussion into the fact that there is allegedly no more than 50% agreement (reliability) between clinicians when diagnosing mental disorder, or a comparison of different approaches to the limitation in question.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 8 (a) | <p>Outline how the biological approach would explain <u>one</u> of the following disorders: affective; anxiety; psychotic.</p> <p><i>Candidates are expected to refer to one disorder and explain it from a biological perspective. Biological explanations are likely to take the form of genetic, physiological, neurological or biochemical explanations or a combination of these. Candidates may use biological explanations as part of a broader explanation, such as referring to a biological pre-disposition for example. Typically, the better candidate will use the research to EXPLAIN, the weaker candidate merely describing.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 8 (b) | <p>Evaluate different explanations of the disorder you referred to in part (a).</p> <p><i>Evaluative issues which recognise the strengths of the explanation of a disorder including issues of determinism, reductionism, science being objective, science being useful or comparison with other approaches, to name but a few.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or highly superficial pre-learned non-specific answers would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, a discussion as to whether the issue is, in fact, a strength or a weakness (reductionism), or challenging and discussing the contention that science is, in fact, objective.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

SPORT AND EXERCISE PSYCHOLOGY

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 9 (a) | <p>Describe <u>one</u> piece of research which considers personality and sport performance.</p> <p><i>There are a number of suggestions as to the impact of personality on sports performance. This 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. Research that looks at the two camps in the credulous-sceptical debate is also acceptable. Typically, weaker responses may be anecdotal or consider personality without reference to sports performance, improving to considering personality and sports performance without specific reference to research. Better answers will refer to a piece of research which accurately describes personality and sports performance but may lack the level of precision or detail required by the best answers.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 9 (b) | <p>Evaluate the usefulness of personality research into sport.</p> <p><i>Usefulness may refer to how amenable the theory is to practical application, for example. Sound methodology, ethnocentrism or validity may also be avenues where usefulness may be considered. It may also refer more specifically to the extent to which the variety of personality research identified in part (a) provides a dispositional explanation or whether a situational explanation is being overlooked.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial 'it is or it isn't' type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited consideration; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. This may be addressed by considering the extent of the dispositional as opposed to situational input, specific validity issues, issues of application or the credulous-sceptical debate.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 10 (a) | <p>Describe <u>one</u> piece of research into sport confidence.</p> <p><i>There are specific models of sport confidence, such as Vealey (1986). Whereas most models derive from the parent discipline of psychology and are leant to the sporting context, Vealey's is a sports-specific model. The injunction requires description of research, the link to sport being inherent in the research itself in the case of Vealey's research.</i></p> <p><i>Weaker responses may be anecdotal or consider personality without reference to research or sport confidence, improving to considering personality and sport confidence without specific reference to research. Better answers will refer to a piece of research which accurately describes personality and sports performance but may lack the level of precision or detail required by the best answers.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 10 (b) | <p>Discuss the relationship between self-confidence and sport performance.</p> <p><i>That a relationship exists, and one that is positive, is beyond question. But which aspects and to what extent are but two questions that could be up for debate. The specification provides for debate in terms of self-efficiency, sport confidence through sports-specific models, and the use of imagery. The relative merits of these may be open to question and judgement and so may be largely subjective. The validity of the research is a further possibility for discussion, whether concerning its application to real world sporting scenarios or the validity of its application to sport from other fields.</i></p> <p><i>An unsubstantiated, anecdotal response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a general or broader response which comments on the debate, improves on this and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and /or issues such as those referred to.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 11 (a) | <p>Describe social loafing with reference to research related to sport.</p> <p><i>The injunction demands knowledge and understanding; ‘research’ allowing for theory or study. This may be the unpublished work of Ringelmann’s tug-of-war or more modern laboratory based work of Latane. Weaker candidates may fail to describe social loafing and merely regurgitate pre-learned information. The stronger candidate will link the concept with the research.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 11 (b) | <p>Assess the validity of research into group cohesion.</p> <p><i>Validity considers to what extent the research investigates what it claims to be investigating. A consideration of ecological validity is seemingly appropriate here; much of the research has taken place in contrived laboratory experiments, although tug-of-war and 'swim meets' are also referred to. The challenge of applying the more theoretical research, such as that of Carron, also falls under this question's demand. It may also be considered whether social loafing is, in fact, an aspect of cohesion, or whether it deals with lack of cohesion. Validity takes many forms and can refer to the validity of the definition and coverage of the term itself, the internal validity of the research being used, the ecological validity of whether the research is applicable to 'real world' situations, and so on.</i></p> <p><i>A highly superficial 'it is quite valid' or 'it isn't very valid....' type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response, maybe accurate but little more than identifying validity in the research; a general or broader response which comments on validity improves on this and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues as identified above which may include specific reference to types of validity.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 12 (a) | <p>Outline <u>one</u> piece of research into body image in sport.</p> <p><i>Body image is the picture or image we have of ourselves, the point being that it may differ significantly from reality or how others see us. Loland (1998) showed that physically active people have better body images than physically inactive people. Cash (1994) produced the Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire which measures appearance, fitness and health, and how they are orientated.</i></p> <p><i>'Outline' requires a direct summary of the research, noting the 'in sport' demand if it is not explicit in the outline of the research itself.</i></p> <p><i>Weaker responses may be anecdotal, improving to outlining body image without specific reference to research. Better answers will accurately refer to a piece of research to outline body image in sport but may lack the level of precision or detail required by the best answers.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 12 (b) | <p>Discuss the ethics of conducting research into issues in exercise and sport.</p> <p><i>The ‘discuss’ command requires an evaluative response, but note that this can extract both a negative and a positive response. The ethical consideration can be about the research topic itself or about the research process. The issues may be about the moral rights and wrongs, social sensitivity or methodological considerations such as confidentiality, fully informed consent, debriefing, invasion of privacy. Greater credit will be given to answers which go beyond the established assumptions, such as debating where to draw the line between acceptable and unacceptable drug use rather than merely stating it is wrong. Intervention when athletes are struggling (burnout) or breaking the law (drug abuse) may be another area for critical consideration.</i></p> <p><i>A superficial ‘it is or it is not ethical’ type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more focussed if somewhat limited response; a general or broader response which comments on the debate improves on this and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response would be required containing more precise or developed evaluative points.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

PSYCHOLOGY OF EDUCATION

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 13 (a) | <p>Outline <u>one</u> behaviourist explanation of knowledge acquisition.</p> <p><i>Knowledge acquisition can be explained in terms of stimulus-response. Early behaviourist accounts include the pioneering work of John B Watson, whereas Operant conditioning (eg Skinner) explains how knowledge can be acquired through reinforcement. Better answers would maybe address the acquisition of more complex structures or detail behaviour shaping, for example.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 13 (b) | <p>Discuss the strengths of different theories of knowledge acquisition.</p> <p><i>'Discuss' implies a consideration of different points of view. There are different behaviourist theories as well as consideration of accounts of knowledge acquisition from alternative perspectives. No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, locating precisely the same evaluative issue in different theoretical approaches and drawing explicit comparison or contrast will typify the better candidate.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 14 (a) | <p>Outline <u>one</u> piece of research into the emotional nature of learning.</p> <p><i>The importance of acknowledging the emotional nature of learning is brought out in this section of the specification. References to emotional intelligence or the role of the amygdala in emotional learning may find their way into a response to this question. Middle band answers will generally address the question but precision and detail will identify the better responses.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 14 (b) | <p>Assess the effectiveness of strategies for encouraging educational engagement.</p> <p><i>Evaluative issues which consider the strengths of strategies into encouraging educational engagement may include issues of ethnocentrism, qualitative v quantitative data, ethical considerations, various types of validity or a comparison between approaches, amongst others.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial pre-learned non-specific answer would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| 15 (a) | <p>Outline the contribution made by humanistic psychology to personal and social development in education.</p> <p><i>Humanistic psychology suggests that we all have an innate drive to personal growth. However society and the institutions within it place blocks and obstacles to this growth. The basis of this answer is readily derived from the work of Carl Rogers (1977). He talked of unconditional positive regard to make the individual feel accepted and confident to move themselves on in their journey of personal growth. Genuineness, warmth and empathy are qualities which the facilitator needs to display while remaining non-judgemental. Rogers' 'client-centred' references translate to 'student-centred' in the context of learning, giving rise to the notion of education being centred about the learner rather than a function of the teacher. Experiential or discovery learning may also be addressed in responses to this question.</i></p> <p><i>Weaker candidates may also show confusion or outline humanistic psychology generally without relating it explicitly to personal and social development in education. Better candidates will use humanistic principles to specify personal and social development in education. The link may be rather tenuous in weaker responses or, worse, a lack of application to education.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 15 (b) | <p>Compare approaches to personal and social development in education.</p> <p><i>'Compare' may draw out contrasts as well as similarities. The specification identifies developmental stages, humanistic applications and moral development approaches to personal and social development in education, although other approaches (such as the psychodynamic approach) are equally creditworthy. These may be compared in terms of features of the application, features of the approaches (such as assumptions) or a comparison of issues, for example.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial pre-learned non-specific answer would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 16 (a) | <p>Describe <u>one</u> provision of remedial support for students with additional needs.</p> <p><i>There are a number of schemes available within the provision of remedial support. The specification refers to reading recovery and various forms of differentiation. Many surveys have been conducted which attempt to review and describe the provision of remedial support such as the OECD or the European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (EADSNE). Specific literature may also be referred to. Being explicit and the level of detail will determine how creditworthy the answer is.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p> | [10] |

| Question Number | Answer | Max Mark |
|-----------------|--|----------|
| 16 (b) | <p>Discuss ethical considerations when dealing with additional needs of students.</p> <p><i>Ethical considerations which recognise the problems of conducting research into students with additional needs include issues of social sensitivity, stigmatising, intrusion/non-intrusion, confidentiality, the nature of data collection, sampling, and other methodological pitfalls to name but a few.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial, non-specific answer would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, a discussion as to whether the ethical considerations can be debated in terms of the end justifying the means or whether there is a universally right or wrong situation, with specific references and (hypothetical) examples.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p> | [15] |

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

© OCR 2010

