



GCE

Psychology

Advanced GCE

Unit **G543**: Options in Applied Psychology

Mark Scheme for June 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

FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(a)	<p data-bbox="331 360 1262 427">How might the view of the majority influence a jury when reaching a verdict?</p> <p data-bbox="331 465 1273 763">It is likely that supporting evidence will come from mainstream psychology, most probably the infamous conformity study by Solomon Asch. It is imperative that this is explicitly applied to the jury situation to provide an accurate response to the question. It is expected that detailed reference to one piece of research 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 the research reported, whereas better candidates will be explicit in direct response to the question.</p> <p data-bbox="331 801 791 831">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 869 1267 1032">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1070 1262 1301">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1339 1270 1570">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1608 1273 1839">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(b)	<p>Evaluate the application of research into what influences reaching a verdict in court.</p> <p>Whereas the injunction 'evaluate' leaves a broad sweep of issues and points to be made, the demand is that they should be explicitly linked to the application of research. Issues such as validity and determinism through social influence are appropriate, as is an evaluation of limitations of the methodology applied to the courtroom behaviour. Evidence from research into decision-making, majority influence and minority influence is likely to be provided although not exclusively so.</p> <p>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 containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. For example, identifying that laboratory based research such as Asch's study lacks ecological validity is creditworthy, but adding 'however...' in terms of the use and value of its application rendering it more ecologically valid than suggested may constitute a stronger response.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(a)	<p>Outline one piece of research into factors which influence the accurate identification of a suspect.</p> <p><i>Much research comes from Elizabeth Loftus' research, some of which courts opinion and reports what most people say they would do, such as Loftus' survey of students at Washington University, some testing this experimentally. Loftus found that people suffering stress as a result of being in a crime situation have reduced perception and memory abilities in being able to identify an assailant. When violence occurs, then accuracy of identification diminishes, possibly as a result of perceptual defence. We have a reduced ability to accurately identify people of other races. Leading questions can alter what people believe they have witnessed, as exemplified in Loftus' renowned automobile destruction study. The "Weapon Focus" was also identified by Loftus, in which she defies the statement which says "While being held at gunpoint I was so frightened I'll never forget that face", suggesting that focussing on the gun will reduce accurate identification of the person holding the gun. She tested this experimentally in laboratory based research in 1987.</i></p> <p><i>The better candidate will be able to provide a greater amount of accuracy and detail in their response, and apply the research to the context of the question, whereas the weaker candidate will provide a more general response and regurgitate a list-like response.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(a) cont	<p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	
2(b)	<p>Assess the reliability of research into interviewing witnesses.</p> <p><i>When interviewing witnesses, data collected can be clinical ie quantitative or descriptive ie qualitative. It is possible to consider strengths and weaknesses of the approaches as well as in terms of evaluative issues. For example, the depth and richness of data is superior in the qualitative approach. Quantitative data is easier to record, easier and clearer to analyse and more objective. For example, we know from Loftus' work that various factors can affect the reliability of evidence when interviewing witnesses, such as whether a weapon is present as well as the presence of stress and violence. However, some of her evidence is presented in the guise of reliable, quantitative data but is actually a number-crunch of the opinions of her students. Conversely, the cognitive interview on the surface appears less reliable, but in practice seems to produce consistency and increased success.</i></p> <p><i>An attempt to address the question or a highly superficial comparison would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response, maybe stating the two side-by-side without drawing explicit comparisons; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p>	[15]

G543

Mark Scheme

June 2011

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(b) cont	<p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3(a)	<p>What effect does the order in which testimony is presented have on persuading a jury?</p> <p><i>Does order have an effect and if so should the order take account of primacy and recency effect or should it make sense chronologically? Traditional psychology would suggest primacy effect in particular is paramount – Glanzer and Cunitz (1966) demonstrating this with memory or McAndrew (1985) quite acutely demonstrating this in an activity that teaches psychology students about the primacy effect that occurs when individuals make judgments about the ability of other people. Such studies would have to be explicitly related to the courtroom to receive credit beyond the lower band of the markscheme. Pennington and Hastie (1986, 1988) researched testimony order in the courtroom, comparing story order (chronology) with witness order (primacy effect). Although initially it appeared that primacy effect may be the main player, they eventually deemed to have shown the persuasive effect of presenting information in story order.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3(b)	<p data-bbox="331 297 1094 331">Discuss limitations of research into persuading a jury.</p> <p data-bbox="331 365 1278 902"><i>Research in this area could affect the decisions of jurors and hence the accused, cause defensiveness from jurors, show a 'Hawthorne Effect' and as such is fraught with many additional ethical difficulties beyond those which may be encountered in the normal run of conducting a piece of research. Use of mock / shadow juries is likely to form the basis of many candidate responses, particularly in terms of emotional content, the response to a real defendant and what may happen to them would not affect the mock jury in the same way. Much research data in this area is retrospective data so may be flawed in many ways from inaccuracy to distorted interpretation. Any method may counter the problems of other methods but all too easily raises issues of its own. The ethical concerns arise from the impact and implications of research in this area as well as from the conduct of the research itself. Ensuring there is no impact on the participants in the legal process is not a simple matter. Other more standard limitations also apply, such as those which are environmental, methodological or to do with samples and sampling.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 936 1262 1137"><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 discussion containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1171 791 1205">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1238 1270 1406">1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1440 1270 1574">4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1608 1257 1776">8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1809 1257 1977">12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4(a)	<p data-bbox="331 293 1161 327">Describe one piece of research into 'looking death worthy'.</p> <p data-bbox="331 362 1257 730"><i>There is a vast selection of literature which has investigated the role of race in capital sentencing, and in particular, whether the race of the defendant or victim influences the likelihood of a death sentence. In a study that is synonymous with the phrase 'looking death worthy', the likelihood of being sentenced to death is influenced by the degree to which a defendant is perceived to have a stereotypically black appearance. Controlling for a wide array of factors, it was found that in cases involving a white victim, the more stereotypically black a defendant is perceived to be, the more likely that person is to be sentenced to death. The level of detail and application of research to answer the question will determine how creditworthy the response is.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 766 791 799">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 835 1267 999">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1034 1262 1267">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1303 1270 1536">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1572 1278 1805">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4(b)	<p data-bbox="331 297 1246 360">To what extent can research into alternatives to imprisonment be considered ethnocentric?</p> <p data-bbox="331 398 1270 667"><i>Ethnocentrism, as it is now understood, was first defined in 1951. E. E. Evans-Pritchard, in the publication Social Anthropology, saw ethnocentrism as claiming or believing that one group has a privileged position over others and urged that "this ethnocentric attitude has to be abandoned if we are to appreciate the rich variety of human culture and social life". This attitude may be inadvertent rather than malicious, as with Derogowski's 2D perceivers being portrayed as less developed than their European counterparts, rather than culturally diverse.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 701 1270 1339"><i>The Smith Institute report of 2007 claims to be free from ethnocentric bias when it purports to "examine the evidence on Restorative Justice (RJ) from UK and around the world". However, closer examination of findings, finds statements such as four tests of Restorative Justice in Northumbria, Georgia, Washington and Indianapolis found reductions in recidivism after property crime whereas a fifth test, a small sample of Aboriginals in Canberra found an increase based on arrest rates. Is the "around the world" claim tokenistic, is this perpetuating the privileged position of UK/USA western values, who did the arresting and on what basis and so on? Or is this the very data we need to see where support is most needed as well as how ethnocentrically biased research can be, this showing that a so much more diverse approach is needed? We see this further in the research by Mair and May as part of the same report, which surveys over 1200 offenders on probation undertaken for the Home Office. Are these surveys couched in terms which recognise the cultural diversity and possible ethnocentric bias which could be contained therein? Finally, Eberhardt et al (2006) show how decisions made at all levels are influenced by ethnicity, even though the decision-makers may not be consciously aware of this bias.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1373 1270 1608"><i>A mere attempt to address the question or a highly superficial yes or no response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues. Note that 'To what extent' implies a degree of judgement is required.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1641 791 1675">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1709 1270 1877">1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1910 1270 2045">4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p>	[15]

G543

Mark Scheme

June 2011

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4(b) cont	<p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	

HEALTH AND CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5(a)	<p data-bbox="331 365 1182 432">Describe one piece of research into media campaigning as a method of health promotion.</p> <p data-bbox="331 465 1281 801"><i>There are various methods of promoting good health and healthy lifestyles, one of which is through media campaigns. These can aim to educate, be preventative and affect attitudes and behaviours. In this section of the specification, all points are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and this question is one such case in point seeing fear arousal as part of a media campaign. Research into using advertising as a method of health promotion has included a range of topics such as chip pan fires and use of condoms. The first of these is listed in the specification, referring to a study by Cowpe in 1989. Detail, quality of description and interpretation of evidence will typify the better response.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 835 791 869">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 902 1267 1070">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1104 1267 1339">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1373 1273 1608">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1641 1278 1877">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5(b)	<p data-bbox="331 293 1254 360">Discuss the ecological validity of research into methods of health promotion.</p> <p data-bbox="331 396 1278 725"><i>Discussions about ecological validity usually focus on whether research is high or not high in ecological validity. Most research in this area aims to be set in, or collects data from, real life settings. The discussion could therefore extend to related factors such as lack of control or the ability to generalise. The specification cites studies which provide evidence for the effectiveness of methods of health promotion. Whereas they are ecologically valid for the situation and geography in which they occur, do these factors confound the research and affect the generalisability beyond the situation of the research itself, hence questioning the evidence.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 763 1262 931"><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, extending points and/or issues.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 965 791 994">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1032 1270 1200">1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1234 1270 1368">4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1402 1254 1570">8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1603 1254 1771">12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6(a)	<p data-bbox="331 297 1241 365">Outline one piece of evidence which suggests that stress can be caused by hassles and/or life events.</p> <p data-bbox="331 398 1273 763"><i>The notion that stress is caused by life events, some of which have a more profound effect than others was measured in 1967 by Holmes and Rahe's SRRS (Social Re-adjustment Rating Scale). This was subsequently used in much research starting again in 1967 with Rahe's prediction that health change, particularly illness, may be improved through careful study of life changes in a person's recent experience. In the early 1980's, a number of pieces of research suggested 'daily hassles and uplifts' were a better predictor of mental wellbeing than life events. Researchers such as Kanner, Lazarus and deLongis collaborated to provide this alternative account of stress and how it should be measured.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 797 1273 965"><i>The better candidate will be able to provide a greater amount of accuracy and detail in their response, and apply the research to the context of the question namely what causes stress, whereas the weaker candidate will provide a more general response and regurgitate a list-like response.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 999 791 1032">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1066 1265 1234">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1267 1265 1503">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1536 1265 1771">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1805 1273 2040">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6(b)	<p data-bbox="331 293 1107 327">Evaluate the reliability of methods of measuring stress.</p> <p data-bbox="331 362 1267 730"><i>Reliability basically asks “would you get the same, consistent results if the method 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 Holmes and Rahe’s SRRS, the psychological and physiological measures employed by Johansson or the Hassles and Uplifts scale as well as other measures such as those used in the Kanner et al research, it is questionable whether all things being equal a similar result would be found on repetition of the test, due to concerns such as those listed above.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 766 1267 965"><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 data-bbox="331 1001 788 1034">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1070 1267 1234">1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1270 1267 1402">4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1438 1251 1601">8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1637 1251 1800">12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7(a)	<p data-bbox="331 297 1139 360">How might cognitive psychologists explain dysfunctional behaviour?</p> <p data-bbox="331 398 1273 633"><i>The quality of response will be determined by detail, terminology and description as well as by how well the response is applied. The better candidate will use their knowledge of psychological concepts to address the question specifically and thoroughly. 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="331 667 791 698">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 732 1267 902">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 936 1262 1171">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1205 1270 1440">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1473 1278 1709">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7(b)	<p>Assess the appropriateness of different explanations of dysfunctional behaviour.</p> <p>Assess implies some judgement as to whether or not different explanations are appropriate for explaining dysfunctional behaviour. 'Appropriateness' can be dealt with in a range of ways. For example is one explanation more suitable for helping us understand a particular disorder or condition? Is it more appropriate/fitting to explain depression within the framework of the cognitive approach (eg Becks Cognitive Theory of Depression) rather than the biological approach? Biological explanations may be considered more appropriate for explaining disorders such a schizophrenia because they are often treated with a physical intervention such as drugs. Responses may consider the strengths and weaknesses of each approach and use these to assess whether the approach provides an appropriate explanation for specific disorders or dysfunctional behaviour in general.</p> <p><i>A mere attempt to address the question or a highly superficial 'they are' or 'they aren't' constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a generally 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. Note that 'assess' implies a degree of judgement is required.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8(a)	<p data-bbox="331 297 1252 365">How could a psychological disorder (<u>either</u> affective <u>or</u> anxiety <u>or</u> <u>psychotic</u>) be treated biologically?</p> <p data-bbox="331 398 1238 600"><i>Psychotic disorders lend themselves aptly to biological treatments. Historically Schizophrenia has been treated with various forms of psychosurgery, anti-psychotic drugs or ECT. Clinical depression has arguably responded to ECT, depression and various drug treatments. However, where appropriate a wider response is possible, such as mood enhancers where affective disorder resides.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 633 1278 835"><i>Weaker responses may consist of bland generalisations and non-specific statements. The better candidate should have some specific knowledge of how the particular treatment should work on their designated disorder. For example, the release of dopamine is implicated in schizophrenia so the chemical intervention of a drug and its intended action on the neurotransmitter should be included in a better response.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 869 791 902">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 936 1267 1104">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1137 1262 1373">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1406 1270 1641">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1675 1278 1910">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8(b)	<p data-bbox="331 297 1217 365">Compare approaches to treating the disorder you referred to in part (a).</p> <p data-bbox="331 398 1281 667"><i>Different approaches have different strengths when treating mental disorders yet raise different issues, are based on differing assumptions and vary in terms of appropriateness and effectiveness for different disorders. Weaker candidates may get bogged down in the details of the various approaches without relating these to the treatment of disorders or more specifically to the nominated disorder. Better answers should therefore be specific and applied effectively, and comment on clearly drawn comparisons of competing approaches.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 701 1273 902"><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial pre-learned non-specific answers would constitute a response in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; to a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 936 791 969">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1003 1270 1171">1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1205 1270 1339">4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1373 1257 1541">8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1574 1257 1742">12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

SPORT AND EXERCISE PSYCHOLOGY

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
9(a)	<p data-bbox="331 367 976 400">How can instinct explain aggression in sport?</p> <p data-bbox="331 439 1279 1106"><i>Instinct theories are those which assume that aggression is innate. The purest response to this question would be to refer to ethologists such as Konrad Lorenz who describe aggression as “the fighting instinct in beast and man which is directed against members of same species”. Lorenz’s work and the instinct doctrine promulgated by Ardrey gained widespread popular acceptance in the 1960s. It is an adaptive model based on evolutionary theory. It is also known as a hydraulic model in that it suggests a build-up of aggressive energy in the same way that a “pressure cooker” builds-up energy. Another hydraulic theory is that of Freud who talks of an overactive id, the natural instinct of Thanatos to self-destruct being turned outwards, and over-controlled individuals building up (in pressure-cooker fashion) aggressive energy which instead of being released bit-by-bit explodes in an orgy of violence. Instinct theories are those which are distinct from social psychological theories and so may include biology to explain instinct. Chemical models of aggression may turn to testosterone levels, neurological models may look at damage around the amygdale and pre-frontal lobe or genetic models conduct studies with MZ and DZ twins. 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 1144 791 1178">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1216 1267 1375">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1413 1264 1644">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1682 1270 1912">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
9(a) cont	<p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	
9(b)	<p>Discuss nature and nurture in relation to aggression in sport.</p> <p><i>'Discuss' implies a consideration of different sides of a debate. The discussion may refer to different theoretical standpoints. Freud or Lorenz are likely references for the innate side of the debate; Berkowitz or Bandura more likely on the nurture side of the debate. Theories of aggression, or how to manage it, are both legitimate approaches to this question. A discussion as to what extent nature accounts for aggression and to what extent nurture accounts for aggression is required, the context being all important for a higher band mark.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more developed evaluative points. For example, taking the discussion beyond one or the other side, or 'it's a bit of both' onto in what way aggression is innate and/or learned with a discussion about evidence.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
10(a)	<p data-bbox="331 297 1145 365">Outline research into trait and state anxiety as a means of explaining anxiety in sport.</p> <p data-bbox="331 398 1268 869"><i>It was Spielberger who originally introduced the terms trait and state anxiety in his paper of 1966. Trait refers to a characteristic of that individual, of their personality, whereas state refers to their anxiety of a certain event, situation or circumstance. Another piece of research which could be used is Martens' SCAT test, the items concerning affective (feeling uneasy), cognitive (worrying about making mistakes) and physiological (I notice my heart beats faster) giving insight and clarity into sport competitive trait anxiety. Likewise, his CSAI-2 gives similar insight into competitive state anxiety. The expectation would be for one recommended piece of research to be provided, being thorough and reasonably detailed, however a broader answer could be equally acceptable. The level of detail, understanding, interpretation and application of research to answer the question will determine how good will be the mark awarded.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 902 790 936">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 969 1268 1137">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1171 1268 1406">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1440 1268 1675">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1709 1268 1944">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
10(b)	<p data-bbox="331 293 1082 327">Evaluate the validity of research into anxiety in sport.</p> <p data-bbox="331 360 1278 696"><i>Validity considers to what extent the research investigates what it claims to be investigating. A consideration of ecological validity is seemingly appropriate here, much of the research taking place in contrived laboratory settings whereas research in the field is also referred to. The challenge of applying the more theoretical research such as that of Fazez and Hardy, also falls under this question's demand. Validity takes many forms and can refer to the internal validity of the research being used, such as applies to the CSAI measure. A consideration of what exactly is anxiety and what are the types (eg trait and state) can also be addressed.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 730 1254 999"><i>A highly superficial 'it is quite valid' or 'it isn't very valid....' type response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response, maybe accurate but little more than identifying validity in the research; a general or broader response which comments on validity improves on this and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues as identified above which may include specific reference to types of validity.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1032 791 1066">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1099 1270 1267">1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1301 1270 1435">4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1469 1254 1637">8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1671 1254 1839">12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
11(a)	<p data-bbox="331 297 1182 360">Describe one study into the effects of an audience on sports performance.</p> <p data-bbox="331 394 1262 792"><i>The earliest piece of research in modern sports psychology was reputedly Triplett's observations of cyclists performing faster against a competitor than against the clock. He tested this by asking 10 year old boys to wind reels alone, in the presence of others and with knowledge of others performing the same task. Zajonc theorised that the mere presence of an audience produced arousal which led to the audience effect. He tested this by timing cockroaches in a cockroach run alone, against a competitor and in front of an audience on both a simple and complex task. Cottrell's evaluation apprehension theory proposed that arousal was caused due to apprehension about being evaluated by the audience, and tested this by testing the effect of blindfolding the audience, thus refuting Zajonc's "mere presence" principle.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 826 1278 920"><i>Better candidates will produce answers which are detailed, thorough and fluent showing interpretation, understanding and exemplification, for example.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 954 791 981">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1014 1267 1178">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1211 1267 1440">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1473 1273 1702">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1736 1278 1964">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
11(b)	<p>Discuss the limitations of research into the effects of an audience on sports performance.</p> <p><i>Research in this area could affect the performances of sports competitors, show the ‘Hawthorne Effect’ or demand characteristics, and as such is fraught with ethical considerations beyond those which may be encountered in the normal conduct of a piece of research. Some research data in this area involves non-human animals (Zajonc, 1969), and as such suffers with limitations of extrapolating behaviour, as well as raising the wider debate posed by evolutionary theory. Some research is lab-based suggesting better control of extraneous variables but suffers from a threat to its ecological validity, the converse being true of other research in this area (Cottrell, 1968). Other research (Schwartz and Barsky, 1977) uses retrospective data so may be flawed in ways from inaccuracy to distorted interpretation. These limitations are all open to discussion, such as Schwartz and Barsky, who are extremely thorough and precise in their research and so it may be that the suggested criticism above would not be substantiated. Ethical concerns arise from the impact and implications of research in this area as well as from the conduct of the research itself. Other more standard limitations also apply, such as those to do with the environment, methodology or participants.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated discussion containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
12(a)	<p data-bbox="331 293 1114 327">Describe one contingency theory of leadership in sport.</p> <p data-bbox="331 360 1278 931"><i>Early work by Fiedler proposed that leadership was not a matter of trait and type only, of either disposition or situation, but that leadership was contingent upon a number of factors and the dynamic between them. He also attempted to apply measures to the concepts involved in leadership. Thus, how a leader gets on with their least preferred co-worker (LPC score) provided one such measure. This theory is from mainstream psychology so would have to be applied explicitly to the sporting arena to gain credit in a higher mark band. An unpublished but oft reported work by Packianathan Chelladurai proposes a multi-dimensional model in which three sets of characteristics (situational, leader and group members) interact with different possible types of leader behaviour (required, actual and preferred) to provide consequent performance and member satisfaction. Stronger candidates will provide accounts with greater detail which appreciate the greater complexity required to provide a more accurate account of leadership in sport. Weaker candidates will struggle with the detail, oversimplify the model or fail to contextualise their response.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 965 791 999">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1032 1267 1200">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1234 1262 1469">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1503 1270 1738">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1771 1278 2007">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
12(b)	<p>Discuss individual and situational explanations of leadership and coaching.</p> <p><i>This question requires a discussion about the two explanations, possible but not necessarily in juxtaposition. Evidence from research such as that of Stogdill may point to certain innate traits being necessary for effective leadership. However, this may be challenged by others providing situational explanation such as Rice et al's research at West Point Academy or the infamous research into leadership style by Lewin Lippitt and White. Contingency models such as Fiedler or Chelladurai account for both. Evidence also suggests that coaches improve with training, hence the situational explanation is strengthened. The relative strengths and weaknesses of the explanations may be considered by the stronger candidate. Weaker responses will fail to clearly identify explanations to be discussed, fail to relate to sport or fail to 'discuss'. Generally accurate if somewhat limited pursuit of the debate will improve the mark; a more accurate and less limited response would improve the mark further.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

PSYCHOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
13(a)	<p>Describe one piece of research into variations on learning strategies.</p> <p><i>Key to this question is to appreciate the variety of ways different people learn in different situations and the diverse strategies that may be used in response to this. An attempt to conceptualise this is Curry's model. Any individual uses different strategies for any given task. How they like to engage in the learning activity is dependent on the learning environment and deals with instructional preference. How they think about the task may be affected by the learning environment; however the assimilation of information is to do with the individual and is independent of the learning environment. Bernice McCarthy (1990) proposed the 4MAT system, which places individual learning and behaviour preferences into one of four categories. Why? people (35%) learn by seeking meaning. What? people (22%) learn by thinking through ideas and seeking facts. How? people (18%) learn by testing theories and asks "How does this work?" and finally So What? people (25%) learn by trial and error and engage in self discovery. Rezler and Rezmovic (1981) developed the learning preference inventory (LPI) and suggested that individual strategies for learning maybe linked to whether tasks involved abstract or concrete concepts; whether people are working alone or in groups; and whether work is organised by the teacher or the students. Both 4MAT and LPI show that each learner uses different strategies to engage in learning activities. These strategies change to suit the learning environment, the learner selecting strategies to help them cope with the learning demands of the learning situation.</i></p> <p><i>The better response will be typified by a greater demonstration of understanding and detail, and better application to the context of the question, whereas the weaker candidate will provide a more generalised account and churn out a limited response.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/ quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
13(a) cont	<p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	
13(b)	<p>How useful is research into a personal approach to learning?</p> <p><i>The term ‘useful’ can be applied in different ways – how applicable comparing theory to practice is for one, how the research can inform teaching methods/lessons, how the research can benefit learners. The usefulness of the research could be challenged in terms of reliability, (ecological) validity, ethnocentrism, limitations of the research and so on. So a consideration of whether Curry’s Onion Model is a valid approach to explaining learning strategies or whether humans truly have multiple intelligences or if this merely provokes a broader canvass for teachers to justify diverse lesson planning would be particularly apt .</i></p> <p><i>A bland ‘it is very 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>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p>	[15]

G543

Mark Scheme

June 2011

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
13(b) cont	<p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
14(a)	<p data-bbox="331 293 1235 360">What has educational Psychology discovered about social roles and academic success?</p> <p data-bbox="331 398 1278 864"><i>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. Riley (1995) showed that young children entering mainstream education being able to label and identify letters had an 80% chance of reading age and chronological age matching. Further, those who settled early were four times more likely to succeed with early reading. In other words, appropriate behaviour and adaptation to social roles has a great impact on early educational progress and success. However adapting to wrong social behaviour by seeking approval and acceptance of a group with negative values to learning is equally a danger, with Miller (1997) suggesting strategies for overcoming this. The level of detail and application of research to answer the question will determine how much credit the response receives.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 902 791 936">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 969 1267 1137">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1171 1262 1406">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1440 1270 1675">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1709 1278 1944">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
14(b)	<p data-bbox="331 297 1153 360">Discuss difficulties when investigating student beliefs and expectations.</p> <p data-bbox="331 398 1278 936"><i>Research in this area could affect the performances of students, show the 'Hawthorne Effect' or demand characteristics, and as such is fraught with ethical considerations beyond those which may be encountered in the normal conduct of a piece of research. Research in this area involves children and as such suffers with limitations of reliability in particular. Some research is experimental, such as Seligman's "Learned Helplessness" research, suggesting better control of extraneous variables but suffers from a threat to its ecological validity as well as extrapolation, the converse being true of other research in this area. Other research uses retrospective data so may be flawed in ways from inaccuracy to distorted interpretation. These limitations are all open to discussion, such as Seligman being clearly paralleled (arguably) to human experience. Ethical concerns arise from the impact and implications of research in this area as well as from the conduct of the research itself. Other more standard limitations may also be discussed, such as those to do with the environment, methodology or participants.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 969 1262 1167"><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 discussion containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1205 791 1236">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1272 1270 1435">1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1473 1270 1603">4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1641 1257 1805">8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1843 1257 2007">12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
15(a)	<p>What can educational psychology contribute to anti-bullying strategies?</p> <p><i>Following some pioneering work in 1988 with David Lane, Delwyn Tattum, along with Graham Herbert researched and produced “Bullying: a positive response” in 1992. In it they identify carefully applied strategies, with ‘telling’ as central, to aid an effective response to bullying. The government package of 2002 (DfES) picked up on this in their “Don’t Suffer in Silence” campaign in which strategies such as raising awareness, incorporating bullying issues into teaching schemes and intervention strategies. Smith and Shu (2000) surveyed 10 years of research and practice into the effectiveness of taking action on bullying, again identifying key strategies. 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>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p>3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p>6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p>9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
15(b)	<p>Assess the effectiveness of research into student-student social interactions.</p> <p><i>The question calls for a consideration of how successful research is in explaining student-student social interactions. This could be addressed by considering strengths and weaknesses of the chosen research, or by comparing different approaches to studying student-student social interactions. This question could also be addressed by suggesting that it is hard to assess the effectiveness of methods of research into student-student social interactions because much 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 behaviours in question.</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 research into student-student social interactions as informed by comparison of specific features or issues with other methods.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16(a)	<p data-bbox="331 293 1142 327">Describe one piece of research into teacher expectations.</p> <p data-bbox="331 356 1278 824"><i>The classic study in this area is Rosenthal and Jacobson's "Pygmalion in the Classroom" which highlighted the alarming power of teacher expectations through self-fulfilling prophecies. Inadvertent expectations about race, religion, apparent class or gender may all therefore have an effect on the achievement of pupils from these groups and others. Some research has suggested that as pupils get older the effect diminishes. Brophy and Good (1974) supported the view that teacher expectations do affect student performances. Further work (Brophy and Good, 2003) reported that when teacher expectations were lower than those of their students this affected lowering expectations and less effective teaching for those students. These studies were further supported by Rubie-Davies et al (2006) who found that teachers in New Zealand who did not adjust their expectations of Maori children, the effect being to limit their performance.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 857 1238 1021"><i>It is expected that detailed reference to one piece of research would provide a response to this question. Weaker candidates may provide less specific accounts, fail to report sufficient detail or demonstrate insufficient understanding, whereas better candidates will be more detailed, explicit and direct in elaborating a response to the question.</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 1055 791 1088">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1115 1267 1279">1-2 marks – Psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description of evidence is limited, mainly inaccurate and lacks detail. There is no interpretation or explanation of the evidence in the context of the question. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Answer lacks grammatical structure and contains many spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1312 1262 1541">3-5 marks – Psychological terminology is basic but adequate. Description of evidence is generally accurate and coherent, has peripheral relevance but lacks detail. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is reasonable but interpretation of the evidence in the context of the question is poor. The answer has some structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with some spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1574 1270 1803">6-8 marks – Psychological terminology is competent and mainly accurate. Description of evidence is mainly accurate and relevant, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is good. There is some evidence of interpretation and explanation in the context of the question. The answer has good structure and organisation. The answer is mostly grammatically correct with few spelling errors.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1836 1278 2065">9-10 marks – Correct and comprehensive use of psychological terminology. Description of evidence is accurate, relevant, coherent and detailed. Elaboration/use of example/quality of description is very good and the ability to interpret/explain the evidence selected in the context of the question is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Answer is mostly grammatically correct with occasional spelling errors.</p>	[10]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16(b)	<p>Evaluate the difficulties in researching student-teacher social interactions.</p> <p><i>Research in this area could cause offence to a profession, defensiveness from individuals and unproductive responses if not reported sensitively 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. School records are often based on self-report and as such may suffer bias, demand characteristics, subjectivity and so on. Retrospective data may be flawed in many ways from inaccuracy to distorted interpretation. Samples will rarely be broad enough to be representative of all teacher-pupil relationships in all types of schools across the demographic variations and so on. 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 there is no impact on the educational development of the pupils in the study is not a simple matter.</i></p> <p><i>No more than attempting to address the question or a highly superficial response would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response; a more detailed or broader response; and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing more precise evaluative points and/or issues.</i></p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding.</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2011

