



# GCE

## Psychology

Advanced GCE

Unit **G543**: Options in Applied Psychology

# Mark Scheme for January 2011

---

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 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

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

## FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(a)	<p data-bbox="331 344 1206 380"><b>Outline how brain dysfunction can explain criminal behaviour.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 416 1254 748"><i>Lower levels of activity in the pre-frontal lobes appear to be related to anti-social and aggressive behaviour, according to Raine. This may explain criminal behaviour in adolescence, a time when the final connections of these neural pathways are still forming (Blakemore and Choudhury, 2006). It is expected that detailed reference to one such study would support a response to this question, although broader reference in less detail would also be acceptable. Weaker candidates may provide less specific accounts or fail to convincingly contextualise, whereas better candidates will be explicit in direct response to the question.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 819 791 855"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 891 1267 1052"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1088 1264 1321"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1357 1273 1590"><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1626 1276 1859"><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(b)	<p data-bbox="331 271 1273 304"><b>Evaluate individual (biological) explanations of criminal behaviour.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 338 1273 909"><i>Individual (biological) explanations include brain physiology, biochemical, genetic or evolutionary explanations. These can all be used to construct an argument that criminal behaviour can be explained by individual rather than situational factors. Better candidates may consider the relative strength of some of these factors. An alternative approach to addressing this question may be to consider this side of the debate in contrast to the situational factors of family upbringing, the influence of the social environment or levels of poverty. Specific issues may be brought to bear in evaluating explanations of criminal behaviour. For example, issues about reductionism, nature-nurture or longitudinal research could be introduced, and developed as part of the discussion by stronger candidates. A poor attempt to address the question or a highly superficial type of response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 976 791 1010"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1043 1273 1211"><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1245 1273 1379"><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1413 1273 1581"><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1615 1273 1783"><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(a)	<p data-bbox="331 309 1185 371"><b>How can an upbringing in a disrupted family explain criminal behaviour?</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 409 1273 741"><i>Candidates can use one or more pieces of research to support their answers to the above question. Farrington et al's Cambridge study from 1994 is a useful reference, as are many of the updates such as Farrington and Juby's (2001) "Disentangling the link between disrupted families and delinquency" through to Farrington, Coid and Murray's (2009) three generations research. The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development was initially directed by Donald West, who collaborated fully in this long-term follow-up study. David Farrington joined the Study in 1969 and took over as Director in 1982. The studies essentially collect data from longitudinal research.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 779 1265 1043"><i>The original Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development is a prospective longitudinal survey of 411 South London males first studied at age eight in 1961. The main aims of this report are to advance knowledge about conviction careers up to age 50 and life success up to age 48, at which age 93 per cent of the males were personally interviewed. The most important childhood (age 8–10) risk factors for later offending were measures of <b>family criminality</b>, daring, low school attainment, poverty and <b>poor parenting</b>.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1081 1265 1211"><i>The level of detail and application of research to answer the question will determine how creditworthy the response is. The very best answers will explicitly identify the link between upbringing in a disrupted family and criminal behaviour.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1249 1238 1346"><i>Credit can also be given to responses using other theoretical explanations which identify the link between upbringing in a disrupted family and criminal behaviour.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1384 791 1413"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1451 1265 1615"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1653 1265 1883"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p>	[10]

G543

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(a) cont	<p><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(b)	<p><b>Evaluate the use of longitudinal research when considering upbringing as an explanation of crime.</b></p> <p><i>There are various strengths of longitudinal research. It traces development of a phenomenon over time rather than catch a moment in time which may be atypical and misses the dynamic quality of what is being observed. It can identify possible causes of an effect occurring previously. Farrington's research is a great example of longitudinal research, with new reports being produced from time to time. An often cited weakness with longitudinal research is subject attrition, which is more than merely numbers, but any significant features of those who do not remain that may distort the findings. A further disadvantage is the lack of control of confounding variables. Cause and effect is unclear, a number of possible causes during the intervening years could account for the findings of such research. Longitudinal research is expensive, cannot be modified as methodological flaws unfold and cannot be replicated. Finally, data collected will usually be susceptible to demand characteristics such as from interviews in the Peterborough Youth study however quantitative as well as qualitative data is obtainable.</i></p> <p><i>A mere attempt to address the question or a superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues that are located in the context of the question by referring to research related to upbringing as an explanation of crime.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3(a)	<p data-bbox="331 309 1198 342"><b>Describe one case study as an approach to offender profiling.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 376 1259 577"><i>The case study of John Duffy represents an approach to profiling as adopted by David Canter. Similarly, his methods have been developed, such as in the geographical profiling suggested by Dr. Kim Rossmo. Weaker responses may simply report some of the details of a case study, better responses will present these as part of the case study as an approach to criminal investigation.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 645 791 678"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 712 1267 880"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 913 1262 1149"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1182 1273 1417"><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1451 1278 1686"><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]



Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3(b)	<p data-bbox="331 309 1050 342"><b>Compare different approaches to creating a profile.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 376 1273 607"><i>Different approaches could be top-down and bottom-up, American and British (FBI and Canter), profilers such as Canter and Rossmo. Responses could be a comparison of approach, a factual comparison, a comparison of methodology or a comparison of a particular issue between two approaches. All or any of these would constitute a legitimate response. Further note that comparison invites both similarities as well as differences.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 645 1273 875"><i>An attempt to address the question or a highly superficial comparison would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response, maybe outlining two approaches side-by-side without drawing explicit comparisons; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise points and/or issues.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 949 794 983"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1016 1273 1178"><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1211 1273 1350"><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1384 1273 1545"><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1579 1273 1740"><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4(a)	<p><b>What is the effect on a jury of evidence being ruled ‘inadmissible’ in court?</b></p> <p><i>If evidence is deemed inadmissible, such as previous convictions or rumour, a judge will immediately overrule it. The jury will then be asked to disregard what they have just heard. The hope is that the jury will be able to do so. Research, however, suggests a boomerang effect (reactance theory) whereby this information becomes more important to the jury.</i></p> <p><i>In Pickel’s study, subjects listened to a mock trial in which information was overruled. If the judge ruled evidence was inadmissible and gave an explanation of why, jurors were found to pay more attention to that evidence. If the judge ruled evidence was inadmissible but gave no explanation of why, the jurors tended to ignore this evidence. Broeder also showed how inadmissible evidence can be more important and that it does have an impact on the jury and the verdict they reach. Candidates may refer to Wolf and Montgomery who found that evidence being called inadmissible had very little effect on guilty judgements being reached by the jurors. They only reacted against the instruction when the judge added, qualified or admonished in respect of the inadmissible evidence.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4(b)	<p data-bbox="331 338 1161 371"><b>Evaluate the usefulness of research into persuading a jury.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 400 1270 633"><i>Usefulness may consider benefit, appropriateness, effectiveness, application and shortcomings, including methodological limitations. Usefulness can range from value to society to application to a particular setting. This can take the form of broad general comments on principles and assumptions ie whether it convinces or not, what are the ethical implications, considering its specific application in a practical and concrete setting.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 665 1270 862"><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 data-bbox="331 931 791 965"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 999 1270 1167"><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1200 1270 1335"><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1368 1270 1536"><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1570 1270 1738"><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

## HEALTH AND CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5(a)	<p data-bbox="331 344 1235 380"><b>How can fear arousal be used as a method of health promotion?</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 416 1278 716"><i>It is believed that the fear factor can be a major contributor in changing behaviour. People tend to fear ill-health, pain and disease so this can be exploited to encourage a more healthy attitude. This was investigated as early as 1953 when Janis and Feshback considered the effect of fear arousal on dental hygiene, and more broadly by Soames Job (1988), looking at the effective and ineffective use of fear in health promotion campaigns. It appears that there is an optimal level of fear required, as described in "Fear appeals in health promotion campaigns: Too much, too little, or just right" (Hale et al 1995).</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 752 1262 952"><i>The better candidate will use psychological research and terms to address the question specifically and describe the context in which fear arousal can be used as a way to promote good health. In other words the better candidate will refer to the application rather than merely reporting the research. Thus, quality of description and interpretation of evidence will typify the better response.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1021 788 1057"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1093 1267 1256"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1292 1262 1525"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1561 1270 1794"><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1830 1278 2058"><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5(b)	<p><b>Assess the effectiveness of methods of health promotion.</b></p> <p><i>The question calls for a consideration of how successful different methods of health promotion are. This could be addressed by considering strengths and weaknesses of different methods of health promotion, or by comparing different methods.</i></p> <p><i>This question could also be addressed by suggesting that it is hard to assess the effectiveness of methods of health promotion because most research takes place in the field. Hence, it has high ecological validity but fails to control a number of extraneous variables, so we can never really know what produces the move towards healthier behaviour.</i></p> <p><i>A weak attempt to address the question or a highly superficial “this is effective and so is that....” or “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 methods of health promotion informed by comparison of specific features or issues with other methods.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6(a)	<p data-bbox="331 304 1102 338"><b>Describe one cognitive technique for managing stress.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 371 1278 640"><i>There are a number of techniques which could be referred to, some very specific and some more general. Restructuring, reappraisal, re-labelling, reframing, cognitive therapy, SIT, hardiness training and RET to name but a few. The word 'technique' can be broadly applied, referring to any practice or procedure which may be used when managing stress. The quality of response will not only be determined by detail, terminology and description, but also by how well the technique is applied to the specified context of managing stress.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 674 1278 875"><i>The better candidate will use their knowledge of psychological concepts to address the question specifically and describe the context in which cognitive techniques may be used to manage stress. In other words the better candidate will refer to the application rather than merely reporting the theory. Thus, quality of description and interpretation of evidence will typify the better response.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 943 791 976"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1010 1267 1178"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1211 1262 1447"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1480 1273 1715"><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1749 1278 1984"><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]



Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6(b)	<p><b>Discuss whether stress should be managed by treating the individual or their situation.</b></p> <p><i>The cognitive approach would suggest treating the individual by addressing their faulty or irrational thinking. The biological approach suggests treating the individual biologically, whether brain or physiologically for example. The behavioural approach, however would suggest that the environment, namely their situation is the cause of the disturbed behaviour. Another example of treating the situation is the use of social support as seen in Waxler-Morrison (2006). Hence, a management procedure based on classical or operant conditioning would be most likely to secure a desirable outcome. 'Discuss' suggests the different sides of the argument should be considered and debated.</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, Disposition, nature-nurture or determinism are all possible avenues of evaluation.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7(a)	<p data-bbox="331 304 1171 338"><b>Outline a biological explanation of dysfunctional behaviour.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 371 1262 770"><i>Biological explanations of dysfunctional behaviour, which may synonymously be described as organic, somatic or medical, include genetic, neurological, biochemical. Genetic explanations often consider concordance rates between various relatives, using evidence such as twin studies to compare monozygote with dizygote twins. Neurological explanations focus more on brain structure and functioning, such as investigating the fluid filled ventricles of the schizophrenic or damage to areas of the brain such as the pre-frontal lobe or the lateral and ventromedial hypothalamus. Physiological explanations concentrate more on electrical and chemical functioning (nervous system and endocrine system) with particular reference to neurotransmitters, for example.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 808 1198 904"><i>The better candidate will respond by using relevant information to provide a coherent explanation of dysfunctional behaviour, weaker responses will tend towards description only.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 976 788 1010"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1043 1262 1211"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1245 1262 1480"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1514 1262 1749"><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1783 1262 2018"><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]



Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7(b)	<p data-bbox="331 275 1166 342"><b>To what extent are explanations of dysfunctional behaviour reductionist?</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 376 1270 846"><i>The question involves a degree of judgement about the extent to which the biological explanation of dysfunctional behaviour, for example, is reductionist. Reductionism refers to levels of explanation which aim to understand the nature of what is complex by reducing it to that which is simpler or more fundamental; or a position that a complex system is the sum of its parts, and that an account of it can be reduced to accounts of those parts. The advantage of reductionism is that it allows us to tease out the causal factors of human behaviour, a disadvantage is that it can overlook the dynamics between the constituent parts of an explanation or, worse, omit parts of a more complex explanation. Hence, understanding the biology of dysfunctional behaviour leads to great awareness of a major aspect which predisposes some to mental adversity, but may overlook some aspects such as the influence of the social and physical environment.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 880 1270 1149"><i>A weak attempt to address the question or a highly superficial “reductionism is bad because it only considers one thing” 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. Reductionism will be considered specifically in relation to dysfunctional behaviour and in response to the ‘to what extent’ demand of the question.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1216 791 1249"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1283 1270 1451"><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1485 1270 1619"><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1653 1270 1821"><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1854 1270 2022"><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8(a)	<p><b>Outline a behavioural explanation of one disorder (<u>either</u> affective <u>or</u> anxiety <u>or</u> psychotic).</b></p> <p><i>A behavioural explanation would usually be based in classical or operant conditioning, however outlining the behavioural part of a wider explanation is equally acceptable such as social learning theory. It is important that the question is addressed specific to a given affective or anxiety or psychotic disorder.</i></p> <p><i>A better response will see the candidate identify a disorder, such as SAD, agoraphobia or schizophrenia and provide a behavioural explanation of how the condition might come about. Quality, detail and elaboration will mark out a strong response to the question. An appreciation of a particular illness and its behavioural explanation would constitute a better answer from one which gives a more general description or may not even specify a particular disorder. Such an answer would still be worthy of some credit however.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8(b)	<p><b>Compare explanations of the disorder you referred to in part (a).</b></p> <p><i>A comparison of the explanations provided from two or more of the various paradigms forms the basis for this answer. Whether a mental disorder is pathological, learned, based on a deep seated repressed conflict or borne out of disorganised and irrational thinking can all be compared as possible explanations and are central to the response. A straight comparison of the features of the explanations is one approach, another being a comparison of issues or methods, for example. Hence, a debate as to how subjective an two explanations are, or value-laden they may be, provides different ways of addressing this question.</i></p> <p><i>Compare can be similarities or differences.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a superficial possibly non-specific answer would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, an evaluation of how different explanations may work in combination, such as discussing that a physiological predisposition in a genetically vulnerable individual needs less of an environmental trigger than most.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

## SPORT AND EXERCISE PSYCHOLOGY

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
9(a)	<p data-bbox="331 344 1212 412"><b>Describe one piece of research into achievement motivation in sport.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 448 1273 882"><i>The notion of ‘Achievement Motivation’ was introduced by McClelland in 1953, following a series of works in the preceding few years, and became known as the McClelland-Atkinson model. The model, or any study to which it is related, provides an acceptable response. Further, any works may be presented which consider the measurement of the motive to achievement, from Murray’s projective testing in 1938 (from which the McClelland-Atkinson model was developed) through to present day papers. Finally any research, particularly from the discipline of sports psychology, which uses the McClelland-Atkinson model is appropriate in response to this question. Whereas better candidates will be clear, precise and cogent in the context of the question, weaker candidates may provide a confused or more general account or fail to relate their answer to the context of the question.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 954 791 981"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1016 1267 1182"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1218 1264 1451"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1487 1273 1720"><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1756 1276 1989"><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
9(b)	<p data-bbox="331 271 1155 304"><b>Evaluate the reliability of research into motivation in sport.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 338 1262 808"><i>Motivation is a concept and as such is difficult to measure. Psychology has long shied away from dealing with motivation in its wider sense, beyond its biological sense, possibly for this very reason. Hence, the whole issue of measurement is problematic. As such, the reliability of any measure proposed is central for consideration. Reliability considers to what extent the data can be trusted. To what extent can we be confident of receiving honest, unadulterated, accurate and consistent responses? Early works used projective testing (eg Murray, 1938) and this is notoriously unreliable in a number of regards. Developments in the McClelland-Atkinson model moved the measurement of motivation into the psychometric arena, which again throws up issues of reliability. Gill and Deeter's SOQ similarly uses psychometric measures, throwing up similar issues. Each researcher, however, is at pains to test and defend the reliability of their measuring tools.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 842 1262 1144"><i>No more than 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. For example, taking the evaluation beyond a statement of limitation of reliability, or defending the reliability of one or more of these measures despite current opinion.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1211 791 1245"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1279 1262 1447"><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1480 1262 1615"><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1648 1262 1816"><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1850 1262 2018"><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]



Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
10(a)	<p data-bbox="331 275 979 309"><b>Describe factors which affect arousal in sport.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 342 1273 875"><i>The work of Oxendine (1980) provides the basis for investigating factors which affect arousal in sport. The starting point is the inverted-u hypothesis, but this clearly oversimplifies the situation. Different athletes respond differently in different situations. Oxendine addresses this and wider knowledge of psychology can augment a response. The amount of arousal required for optimal performance in golf will be different to that required in rugby, therefore type of skill is one factor. A novice's performance will improve with only a low level of skill, but they can become over-aroused very easily leading to anxiety. Thus, level of expertise is another factor. A complex task provokes different levels of arousal to simple tasks. We know from elsewhere that audiences affect the arousal of sports competitors. Personality can also affect arousal, depending on whether an athlete is an introvert or extrovert. The better response will be clear and precise with good reference to psychology whereas the weaker response may be more general, be list-like or show confusion.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 949 788 983"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1016 1267 1182"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1216 1262 1451"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1485 1273 1720"><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1753 1278 1989"><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
10(b)	<p><b>Discuss the usefulness of research into arousal and sport performance.</b></p> <p><i>'Discuss' requires the candidate to appreciate different views regarding the usefulness of research into arousal and sport performance. The term 'useful' can be applied in different ways – how applicable comparing theory to practice is for one, how applicable to sports psychology a piece of mainstream research is, how useful is the research to sports performers, how useful to the sport as a whole, how beneficial on various levels is the research and so on. The usefulness of the research could be challenged in terms of reliability, (ecological) validity, ethnocentrism, limitations of the research and so on. So a discussion on how well Yerkes-Dodson applies to the sports setting, whether Lacy's research helps provide different athletes with appropriate guidance or whether Oxendine's research allows varying responses is all creditworthy.</i></p> <p><i>A bland 'it is useful because.....' or an 'it isn't very useful' type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a general or broader response which comments on the debate improves on this and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues which impact on the usefulness of the research.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
11(a)	<p data-bbox="331 309 1098 342"><b>Outline one piece of research into drug abuse in sport.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 376 1270 674"><i>There are various articles which relate to this topic. An article by Calfee and Fadale (2006) summarises the current literature regarding these ergogenic substances and details their use, effects, risks, and legal standing, with particular concern for the young athlete. Justin Green provides an excellent literary review of anabolic steroid use by young athletes (2006). Maganaris et al (2000) takes an interesting look at expectancy effect (with the use of placebos) provided by performance enhancing substances. The level of detail and application of research to answer the question will determine how creditworthy the response is.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 745 791 779"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 813 1267 976"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1010 1262 1245"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1279 1273 1514"><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1547 1278 1783"><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]



Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
11(b)	<p data-bbox="331 309 1086 376"><b>Using your knowledge of psychology, discuss ethical considerations in issues in exercise and sport.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 409 1273 913"><i>Ethical issues relating to issues in sport can be those common methodological concerns such as gaining informed consent without impacting on the results of the research, deceit, confidentiality, right to withdraw and so on. Affecting performance or wellbeing raises ethical concerns specific to the sports arena. If an athlete needs help and the sports psychologist believes they can help, such as in the case of burnout and withdrawal, are they duty bound to intervene or professionally obliged not to. Confidentiality, such as with drug abuse, may pose not only ethical but also legal dilemmas. The ethics of socially sensitive research need consideration with regard to body image in relation to sportsmen and women. A clear stance is uncertain in all of these circumstances; whereas a weaker candidate may demonstrate awareness of some of the above, the stronger candidate will appreciate the intricacies of the debate contained therein, and deal with them with evidence, example and/or other forms of elaboration.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 981 791 1014"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1048 1270 1216"><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1249 1270 1384"><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1417 1257 1585"><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1619 1257 1787"><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
12(a)	<p data-bbox="331 309 1139 342"><b>How can different levels of exercise be related to cancer?</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 376 1267 808"><i>A whole array of research has been carried out which investigates links between exercise and cancer. These include the work of Courneya who has reviewed literature related to physical exercise and quality of life following cancer diagnosis, exercise during treatment and exercise as rehabilitation. Bernstein et al (1994) investigated the relationship between exercise and the risk of cancer, suggesting that exercise may be one lifestyle factor which, if correctly modified, may contribute to the reduced risk of breast cancer in younger women. Better candidates will respond with accuracy, using one or more pieces of evidence to evidence, exemplify and/or support their responses. They will respond specifically to the wording of the question. A weaker candidate may provide a more general response, or 'churn-out' a study without explicitly addressing the question itself.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 882 788 916"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 949 1267 1115"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1149 1267 1384"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1417 1267 1653"><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1686 1267 1921"><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
12(b)	<p data-bbox="331 271 1241 338"><b>Discuss methodological difficulties of investigating exercise and pathology.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 371 1278 972"><i>The research in this area is highly sensitive and as such is fraught with many additional difficulties beyond those which may be encountered in the normal run of conducting a piece of research. Hospital records are often too clinical to identify or deal with the more human, psychological data required. Retrospective data, such as that of Bernstein et al may be flawed in many ways from inaccuracy to distorted interpretation, self-report by subjective comment, demand characteristics, social desirability and the like. Any method may counter the problems of other methods but all too easily raises issues of its own. As well as the way data is gathered, there are the ethical concerns arising from the impact and implications of research in this area as well as from the conduct of the research itself. Ensuring people suffering and in distress are not put in situations which add to their distress is not a simple matter. The methodological questions of size of sample, representativeness of sample, being able to generalise the sample, ethnocentrism and so on may also apply. Note that the question asks for a discussion about methodological difficulties, and some candidates may fall into the trap of listing difficulties rather than how to overcome them.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1005 1262 1205"><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1267 791 1301"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1335 1270 1496"><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1529 1270 1664"><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1697 1257 1859"><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1892 1257 2058"><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

## PSYCHOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
13(a)	<p><b>Outline the cognitive approaches to discovery learning.</b></p> <p><i>Cognitive psychology was challenging the whole concept of educating. In the early 1960s the notion of education moved from being more than the memorising of facts of varying difficulty towards the student challenging, engaging and problem-solving. Education evolved from learning being a function of the teacher to being a function of the learner. Learning was what the student did by interacting with what was to be learned. Bruner developed it from Piaget and Vygotsky into the principles of Discovery Learning. What further marked out Bruner was the practical application of these principles, including consideration of the curriculum impact. He talked of a ‘spiral curriculum’ whereby schools should plan to re-visit areas of previous learning where subject matter is presented at a level that matches the learner’s abilities.</i></p> <p><i>Whereas better candidates will be clear, precise and explicit in direct response to the question, weaker candidates may provide a confused or less specific account or fail to provide a coherent response which directly addresses the question.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
13(b)	<p data-bbox="331 304 1273 371"><b>To what extent can different approaches to teaching be considered scientific?</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 405 1273 909"><i>Psychology as science with regard to teaching begs the question as to whether good teaching is a matter of a thorough and systematic process or whether art, skill and individual flair or acumen form part of the equation. The former notion is supported by behaviourist principles and leads to Carroll’s “Learning for Mastery” ideas from the early sixties supported by Bloom’s taxonomy with later application to works such as Ausubel (1977). The pace of learning is determined by mastery of the previous stage. The art of teaching, however, relies on individual variables as recognised in cognitive psychology. As with any skill, practice and expertise can improve the product, but the natural talent must exist to be built upon. Humanistic psychology, and particularly the work of Rogers, can be applied from the counselling field to the classroom, as could psychodynamic principles. ‘To what extent’ suggests an element of judgement needs to be made with a statement about how scientific, or otherwise, is teaching.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 943 1273 1144"><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial “it’s scientific...” or “it’s not a science.....” type 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 data-bbox="331 1211 791 1245"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1279 1273 1447"><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1480 1273 1615"><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1648 1273 1816"><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1850 1273 2018"><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]



Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
14(a)	<p data-bbox="331 309 1241 376"><b>How can cognitive (attribution) theories of motivation be used to encourage appropriate educational behaviours?</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 409 1279 779"><i>Attributions are one's perception of cause and outcome. It is the process of giving reasons for why things happen or why people behave as they do. So pupils will explain educational success or failure by stable or unstable factors and whether they are internal or external and whether they are controllable or not. Early theory was proposed by Weiner, A response to the question must be explicitly applied to the education setting if early attribution research is used, such as that of Weiner. Other psychological phenomena come into play, such as learned helplessness – constant failure being attributed to stable, uncontrollable but internal results in a belief of lack of ability about which the pupil has shown themselves unable to change. The use of the term 'theories' in the plural</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 813 1184 947"><i>Weaker answers will be oversimplifications of attribution theory, undeveloped and with lack of contextualising. Better answers will develop, interpret and/or exemplify contextualised accounts of attribution.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1014 794 1048"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1081 1273 1249"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1283 1264 1518"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1552 1273 1787"><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1821 1279 2056"><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
14(b)	<p><b>To what extent is motivation towards appropriate educational behaviours determined?</b></p> <p><i>On the one hand, it could be argued that all behaviours are determined. The Behaviourists, particularly from a Skinnerian background, would argue that reinforcement encourages or discourages certain behaviours, making them more or less likely to occur. Supported by social psychology, it could be argued that all social behaviours including those of the classroom are determined. Further, theories of extrinsic motivation suggest external rewards encourage desirable behaviours, hence systems such as gold stars, house points, prefects and sports days are all testament to the fact that motivation in schools can be determined. On the other hand, the Humanistic approach suggests we are motivated by an innate drive to personal growth and self-improvement, with blocks to this growth needing to be overcome. We, as individuals, exercise our own free will in overcoming difficulties rather than them being determined. Likewise with psychodynamic psychology the innate drive is of sexual energy in the form of libido, the id freely following its own course. Cognitive psychology too believes in innate, predetermined states that we are free to affect individually.</i></p> <p><i>This question requires a discussion about the two sides of the debate, coupled with an element of judgement. The relative strengths and weaknesses of the debate need to be considered by the better candidate to address the 'to what extent...' part of the question as well as a consideration of whether the free-will claims are devoid of deterministic elements and vice versa. Weaker responses will fail to address the question directly and fully. Generally accurate if rather limited pursuit of the debate will improve the mark, a more accurate and less limited response would improve the mark further.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p>	[15]

G543

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
14(b) cont	<b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.	



Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
15(a)	<p><b>Describe one piece of research into the biological differences in the brain structures of boys and girls in relation to their educational potential.</b></p> <p><i>The assertion in the question could be turned around in that similarities far outweigh differences, so knowledge of each may suggest a similar approach or distinct approaches being determined by factors other than gender. Brain size, as suggested by Solms and Turnbull (2002) may suggest greater capacity to learn in males, but the assumption that size equates with 'better' is ill founded, and numerous common observations can refute the assertion. The corpus callosum in females may account for verbal cognitive and language advantage. The fewer connections in males, however, may account for superior visuo-spatial abilities.</i></p> <p><i>The better candidate will use information such as that provided to consider how each gender can be enabled to reach their educational potential. Weaker candidates may make more superficial observations, or merely reproduce research without relating it to the question. The expectation is that reference to one piece of research can support or exemplify what is being written in response to the question, although a broader response is equally acceptable.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p>	[10]

G543

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
15(a) cont	<b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
15(b)	<p><b>Discuss the limitations of research into enabling boys and girls to reach their educational potential.</b></p> <p><i>Reliability basically asks “would you get the same, consistent results if the study was replicated?” This can be extended to consider different types of reliability (such as inter-rater or test-retest) or be expanded to consider such things as mood, internal consistency, control, interpretation, standard presentation, instruction and procedure, lying and social desirability. When looking at the identification of differences in educational achievement which relate to gender as in Arnold et al (1996) or neurological measures employed by Bee (1992) , it is questionable whether all things being equal a similar result would be found on replication, due to concerns such as those listed above.</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 extended evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16(a)	<p data-bbox="331 309 1257 376"><b>How can role models enable minority ethnic groups to reach their educational potential?</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 409 1273 1014"><i>The importance of role models is regularly seen to bring about an improvement in learning and attainment. Teachers are seen positively if they encourage good writing and language skills (more so in the early years) and putting themselves out to help a student (more so in the older years). Black and African teachers who celebrate diversity are viewed particularly positively by the students. Ethnic minority students in positions of responsibility (eg prefect) also provide good models for younger students. Family members, and particularly fathers, are seen to prevent youngsters developing a poor attitude and provide guidance. An important factor to emerge was that improvement in learning and attainment is not always related solely to classroom activities, hence the importance of good role models amongst other wider support. There is an array of research related to these point, such as that of Demie, McLean and Lewis (2006). Weaker answers will be oversimplifications of the effectiveness of role models, undeveloped and with lack of contextualising. Better answers will develop, interpret and/or exemplify contextualised accounts of how role models can enable minority ethnic groups to reach their educational potential.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1048 794 1081"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1115 1273 1283"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1317 1273 1552"><b>3-5 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1585 1273 1821"><b>6-8 marks</b> – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1854 1273 2089"><b>9-10 marks</b> – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors</p>	[10]

G543

Mark Scheme

January 2011

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16(b)	<p data-bbox="331 241 1273 309"><b>Discuss the usefulness of research into enabling minority ethnic groups to reach their educational potential.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 342 1279 745"><i>'Discuss' requires the candidate to appreciate different views regarding the usefulness of research into enabling minority ethnic groups. The term 'useful' can be applied in different ways – how applicable comparing theory to practice is for one, how applicable to the classroom a piece of mainstream research is, how useful is the research to students, practitioners or managers, how useful to education as a whole, how beneficial on various levels is the research and so on. The usefulness of the research could be challenged in terms of reliability, (ecological) validity, ethnocentrism, limitations of the research and so on. So a discussion on how well research on inter-group tasks applies to the educational setting or whether work on positive support can be generalised to a range of settings is creditworthy.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 779 1279 1014"><i>A bland 'it is useful because.....' or an 'it isn't very useful' type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a general or broader response which comments on the debate improves on this and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues which impact on the usefulness of the research.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1081 794 1115"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1149 1273 1317"><b>1-3 marks</b> – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1350 1273 1485"><b>4-7 marks</b> – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1518 1273 1686"><b>8-11 marks</b> – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1720 1273 1888"><b>12-15 marks</b> – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments 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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

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

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**  
**Registered in England**  
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**



**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**