



OXFORD CAMBRIDGE AND RSA EXAMINATIONS

Advanced GCE

GCE PSYCHOLOGY

G543 MS

Unit 3: Options in Applied Psychology

Specimen Mark Scheme

The maximum mark for this paper is 100.

SPECIMEN

Forensic Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(a)	<p>Describe using relevant research, any two influences which explain why a person turns to crime.</p> <p>Candidates can draw on any of the three influences in the specification, upbringing, cognition, or biology to answer this question. It is expected that the candidate will cover two influences and this is how the question should be structured. If only one influence is covered, it should remain in band 3.</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]
1(b)	<p>Using the issue of reductionism, evaluate any two explanations of why a person might turn to crime.</p> <p>Here, the candidate is expected to structure their answer around the issue of reductionism. Most likely, the content will come from biological explanations but a well informed candidate may be able to argue the issue with content from the other two areas.</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>	

Forensic Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1(b) cont'd	<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]
2(a)	<p>Outline any relevant research which can inform us about how a witness should be interviewed.</p> <p>Expected content drawn from the specification is, recognising and re-creating faces by E fit (e.g. Bruce 1988). Factors influencing accurate identification (e.g. Loftus). The cognitive interview (e.g. Geiselman 1985/6). Candidates may have prepared other equally relevant research and should be credited for it as appropriate.</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>	

Forensic Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2(a) cont'd	<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]
2(b)	<p>Evaluate the methodology used to investigate the interviewing of witnesses.</p> <p>Candidates should be able to evaluate the scientific methodology used in the research in terms of its design, sample, validity, reliability, ethics and usefulness. Candidates may also choose to use determinism, reductionism and freewill to answer the question.</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]

Forensic Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3(a)	<p>Describe one approach to offender profiling.</p> <p>Candidates are most likely to draw upon Top down typology e.g. Hazelwood, Bottom up approaches such as circle theory or geographical profiling e.g. Canter or the Case study e.g. John Duffy. Candidates who have prepared other approaches should be given credit according to their merit.</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]

Forensic Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3(b)	<p>Assess the effectiveness of offender profiling.</p> <p>The candidate should clearly structure their answer around the issue of effectiveness. To do this they could look at examples of profiling in use, the extent to which it is in use today, which approaches are preferred by the police and why? They should be able to say what makes it any more effective than normal police work.</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]
4(a)	<p>Describe relevant research which informs us about how a jury reaches its verdict.</p> <p>Candidates are most likely to draw upon stages and influences on decision making (e.g. Hastie 1983), Majority influence (e.g. Asch 1953). Minority influence (e.g. Moscovici 1976, 1980, 1985) but any other relevant research should be credited.</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>	

Forensic Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4(a) cont'd	<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]
4(b)	<p>Discuss the problems of conducting research into courtroom behaviour.</p> <p>Candidates would be expected to know that live courtroom research is illegal and therefore, mock or shadow juries have to be used. These lead to problems as does a straightforward laboratory study.</p> <p>Problems could be ethics, sampling, validity, reliability, demand characteristics, mundane realism.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Health and Clinical Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5(a)	<p>Describe one technique which could be used to measure adherence to medical regimes and give an example from a research study.</p> <p>The question asks for one technique, so this must be detailed, the most common answers are going to be self report and physiological testing, the process needs to be explained together with the reason why this might be testing adherence. Any relevant research could be used to exemplify this technique.</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]
5(b)	<p>Discuss problems psychologists might have when trying to improve adherence to medical regimes.</p> <p>The problems involved are the ones involved with any behaviour change, ie, habits, rational decision making, peer pressure, people not being honest when asked if they have improved. It is important that each point is clearly linked to the task of improving adherence. Any medical regime, not just taking medication, but giving up smoking etc are appropriate.</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>	

Health and Clinical Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5(b) cont'd	<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]
6(a)	<p>Describe how biological treatments can be used to treat any one psychological disorder.</p> <p>This question requires a description of biological treatments, these include, chemicals (drugs) ECT, psychosurgery, but most likely drugs are going to be detailed as most relevant to our society. As no specific disorder is stated one disorder of the candidate's choice must be identified in order to gain full marks. General information on biological treatments is not going to gain top band marks. An understanding of what the process is actually doing ie restoring balance of neurochemicals is needed to show complete understanding of biological treatments.</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>	

Health and Clinical Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6(a) cont'd	<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]
6(b)	<p>Evaluate the use of biological treatments for psychological disorders. A straightforward evaluation, strengths and weaknesses of biological treatments, it must relate to psychological disorders, suggested evaluation points are, side effects, treating cause/symptoms, empirical evidence to support, reductionism, determinist, An argument which considers both sides of the point, is good analysis.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks – Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Health and Clinical Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7(a)	<p>.</p> <p>Explain how stress may be caused by lack of control.</p> <p>One thing that stresses your body and impacts on your health is lack of control: control at work, control of everyday life and, ultimately, control of destiny. It deals with challenges in life and how you react to resolve them. Social class is a key indicator of control, because the lower down you are in social standing, the less opportunity and training you are likely to have to influence events that impinge on your life.</p> <p>The Whitehall studies with British Civil Servants suggest it is not the high-powered executives who drop dead, it is the people below them. These are the ones who have been told what to do; they have little chance to decide how they work. Lack of control at home can have a similar effect. One of the Whitehall studies was conducted by Geer and Maisel. A total of 227 men and women aged 47-59 years were sampled from higher, intermediate and lower employment grades. Ambulatory blood pressure, ratings of stress, perceived control and happiness were measured. They concluded that job control plays an important role in modulating cardiovascular and affective responses over the working day, and these responses may contribute to increased cardiovascular disease risk. Other research may also be relevant, such as Rotter's notion of 'locus of control'.</p> <p>The weaker candidate may produce a partially flawed or partially relevant response to the question; improving to a rather generalised response to the question which is not well substantiated, or may refer to or give an account of research without using it to effectively address the question being asked. The stronger candidate may use one piece of detailed research effectively, or may provide a broader sweep of research in direct response to the question.</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>	

Health and Clinical Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7(a) cont'd	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.	[10]

SPECIMEN

Health and Clinical Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7(b)	<p>Evaluate limitations of research into causes of stress.</p> <p>Research suggesting that stress may be caused by life events (Holmes and Rahe) or daily hassles (Kanner) is limited by the fact of it being self report and so is subjective, selective and distorted in its recollection. Issues of validity and reliability, as well as ecological validity and method (laboratory-based research) may also limit findings. Reducing human characteristics to quantitative data may overlook richer information which would be gained from a more qualitative approach. Work as a cause of stress was studied by Johansson and Marmot amongst others. Whereas they claim lack of control is a part of the equation, supported by Geer and Maisel, this is in contradiction to Brady's infamous 'Executive Monkeys' study in 1958. Ethical consideration and limitations caused by extrapolation may thus be referenced. This may also call into question samples used and the usefulness of the research under consideration.</p> <p>Merely an attempt to address the question or a flawed and highly superficial identification of limitations would constitute an answer in the bottom (1-3) band. This improves to a more accurate if somewhat limited response, maybe simply stating evaluation issues without drawing a direct answer as to how this limits the research. A more direct, detailed or broader answer would constitute a better response and at the top level a more developed and/or elaborated response containing precision of explanation with better developed evaluative points and/or issues can be expected.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Few evaluative points. Range of points is sparse. No evidence of argument. Points are not organised, and are of peripheral relevance to the context of the question. Sparse or no use of supporting examples. Limited or no valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments.</p> <p>4-7 marks – Argument and organisation is limited, and some points are related to the context of the question. Limited evaluative points. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is evident and demonstrates some understanding</p> <p>8-11 marks – Some evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>12-15 marks Many evaluative points covering a range of issues. The argument is competently organised, balanced and well developed. The answer is explicitly related to the context of the question. Effective use of examples. Valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments is highly skilled and shows thorough understanding.</p>	[15]

Health and Clinical Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8(a)	<p>Describe how one method of health promotion has been used.</p> <p>This question asks for any one method which has been used in a campaign/research. A detailed description of the campaign/research such as a media campaign eg Cowpe would include methods and results, plus conclusions.</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]

Health and Clinical Psychology		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8(b)	<p>Review the effectiveness of health promotion methods.</p> <p>The answer should address how effective health promotion methods have been, this would look specifically at whether different health promotion methods such as media campaigns, fear arousal etc have proved successful in altering behaviours, but would also bring in the problems of longevity of behavioural change etc.</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 Sport and Exercise		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
9(a)	<p>Describe one theory of exercise and mental health.</p> <p>The endorphin hypothesis is indicated as a particularly appropriate response, although any other theory which directly addresses the question would be creditworthy. The endorphin hypothesis notes that exercise and sport participation results in the production of the body's own chemical which has a 'morphin-like' effect. A description of the biochemistry and its effect on mental health and behaviour is a suitable response, as is a description of the resulting effect (runner's high, euphoria, reduction in negative mood states including depression). Further, reference to wider research which is directly relevant is permissible, and the fact that it is inconsistent at best, with many studies failing to support what is an intuitively appealing theory. Other theories that may be considered include the Amine Hypothesis (that exercise is good for the functioning of neuro-transmitters), the Cognitive-Behavioural approach (exercise is good for positive thoughts and feelings and counteracting negative ones), and the Social Interaction and Distraction Hypothesis (which suggest wider benefits of exercise and sport)</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]

Psychology of Sport and Exercise		
Question Number	Question Number	Max Mark
9(b)	<p>Evaluate theories of exercise and mental health.</p> <p>These theories tend to be quite academically considered so their usefulness and application become a point for comment and debate. Meta-analyses have shown that the evidence is often mixed or inconclusive questioning the reliability of the theories. Conclusions drawn have sometimes left themselves open for alternative explanations other than those provided. Thus, validity, both internal and external, may be discussed.</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]
10(a)	<p>Outline how the social approach can explain group cohesion in sport, using an example from any study/theory.</p> <p>In considering the social psychology of sport, any literature relating to group dynamics in a sporting context is appropriate from a range of theoretical backgrounds. The specification thus indicates the Tuckman study (1965) although any other theory which directly addresses the question would be creditworthy. Tuckman famously refers to 'forming, storming, norming and performing'. Better answers would explain and/or exemplify these stages with clarity, in the context of group development. Direct and indirect intervention (Yukelson, 1997; Carron et al., 1997) or social identity theory (Tajfel, 1970) are also possible responses to the question.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	

Psychology of Sport and Exercise		
Question Number	Question Number	Max Mark
10(a) cont'd	<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(b)	<p>To what extent does the social psychology approach explain group cohesion and performance.</p> <p>There are two particular demands beyond knowledge of group cohesion, namely the introduction of its effect on performance and the extent to which an explanation is proffered. Response to either of these required insights is an indication of a stronger candidate. Limitations to either of the above in terms of evaluative issues provide fertile ground for responding to the question. Hence, methodological weaknesses may provide candidates with a competent response as may a consideration of whether social explanations are deterministic or reductionist.</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>	[10]

Psychology of Sport and Exercise		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
10(b) cont'd	<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>13-15 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]
11(a)	<p>Describe one way psychometric testing is used in sport to measure personality.</p> <p>This question is about the use of measures of personality in sport, and is restricted to psychometric testing. Cattell's 16 personality factors are indicated on the specification. Other tests include Eyesenck's EPQ or the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. It is important that candidates describe the use of the measure and not how the test was developed without reference to its application.</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]

Psychology of Sport and Exercise		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
11(b)	<p>Discuss the validity of psychometric testing, in sport.</p> <p>Validity questions to what extent a test measures what it claims to measure, in this instance personality. Difficulties of defining 'personality' highlight that it would be difficult to measure something when we cannot even agree on what that something is. Questions within the tests may be referred to by stronger candidates as part of the discussion as to whether it is personality that is actually being measured. A clear indication that aspects of the test, or taking the test, that may lead to inconsistent responses is not creditworthy as this is reliability – a clear distinction/demarcation can be expected from the strongest candidates.</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]
12(a)	<p>Describe one technique used to increase motivation in sport.</p> <p>The technique indicated in the specification is regarding the use of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, with particular reference to Ryan and Deci (2000). Intrinsic motivation refers to inner reward and ways to encourage this; extrinsic refers rewards from outside agencies, ranging from cups and medals to praise. Much work has been done in this area and may be referenced. Alternative responses may include cognitive techniques such as goal-setting or self-talk. Other parts of the specification may also be creditworthy such as Gill and Deeter's sports orientation questionnaire (SOQ) provided that they are specifically used as a direct response to the question.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	

Psychology of Sport and Exercise		
Question Number	Question Number	Max Mark
12(a) cont'd	<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>	
12(b)	<p>Discuss the problems of motivating the individual in sport.</p> <p>The most likely issue to which candidates may turn is that of individual differences. Some athletes respond better to intrinsic motivation, others to extrinsic, some have a need to achieve while others display a need to avoid failure. Research suggests that preferred type of motivation may be gender and age related, or related to whether the athlete is elite or novice. As well as individual differences the candidate may refer to the application and usefulness of research in issues of motivation. Whether an athlete is from an individualistic or collectivist culture may affect how they are best motivated so the ethnocentric nature of most of the research available may also be commented upon.</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>	[10]

Psychology of Sport and Exercise		
Question Number	Question Number	Max Mark
12(b) cont'd	<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]

SPECIAL

Psychology of Education		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
13(a)	<p>Describe a stage theory of knowledge acquisition.</p> <p>This is likely to be a description of Piagetian stages. Some candidates may describe Bruner's stages, which are regarded by some to not be stages at all.</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]
13(b)	<p>Discuss the usefulness of stage theories for teachers.</p> <p>It is intended that this question will illicit responses about the reality of using stage theory in the complex environment of a classroom. How this reflects individual differences and also different subjects area. Does stage theory reduce teaching to the ignoring the potential of young people.</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>	

Psychology of Education		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
13(b) cont'd	<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]
14(a)	<p>Describe one approach for improving students' educational engagement.</p> <p>This will potentially enable a wide variety of answers. Links to motivational theory will be acceptable here such as hierarchy of needs and attribution theory. Stronger answers will make more direct links to approaches used in the classroom such as The need for play in developing self directed activities and future academic and social success (Weikart, 1993 and High/Scope). Acknowledging emotional nature of learning (Goleman, emotional intelligence). The implications of ability grouping (e.g. Sukhnandan and Lee, 1998).</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>	

Psychology of Education		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
14(a) cont'd	<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]
14(b)	<p>Evaluate approaches to improving educational engagement. The usefulness of the above approaches can be discussed in particular in relation to individual differences. Candidates should be able to discuss the difficulty of applying psychology to educational environments. For example the role of play is held in very high esteem by psychologist, but less so in schools.</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
15(a)	<p>Describe one theory of moral development.</p> <p>This will almost certainly be a description of Kohlberg's theory although some candidates may chose to discuss Piaget or Freudian views of moral development.</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]
15(b)	<p>Discuss the methodological difficulties of researching social interactions at school.</p> <p>Typical issues discusses will relate to:</p> <p>Generalisability of findings.</p> <p>Ethical problems of researching young people</p> <p>The difficulty of controlling and manipulating the environment</p> <p>Problems of being able to observe interactions without having an impact on them</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>	

Psychology of Education		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
15(b) cont'd	<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 – Range of evaluative points is good. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is competent and understanding is good.</p> <p>13-15 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]
16(a)	<p>Describe two suggestions to facilitate the learning of a minority/ethnic group. Strategies that could be used to overcome language effects and prejudice. Inter-group tasks (Aronson et al, 1978) Role models (Klein, 1996) Positive support (Mac an Ghaill, 1988).</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>	

Psychology of Education		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16(a) cont'd	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.	[10]
16(b)	<p>Discuss the problems of attempting to enable all students to reach their educational potential.</p> <p>Individuals have multiple and diverse needs. No one education system or programme is ever likely to meet all these needs. Different children have different aspirations for academic and vocational success. The organisation of schools does not necessarily support good pedagogy, for example the impact of SAT's</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 – Range of evaluative points is good. The argument is well organised, but may lack balance or development, and is related to the context of the question. Good use of examples. Analysis (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]
Paper Total		[100]

Assessment Objectives Grid (includes QWC)

Forensic				
Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
1(a)	10			10
1(b)		15		15
2(a)	10			10
2(b)		15		15
3(a)	10			10
3(b)		15		15
4(a)	10			10
4(b)		15		15
Totals	40	60	0	100

Health and Clinical				
Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
5(a)	10			10
5(b)		15		15
6(a))	10			10
6(b)		15		15
7(a)	10			10
7(b)		15		15
8(a)	10			10
8(b)		15		15
Totals	40	60	0	100

Education				
Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
9(a)	10			10
9(b)		15		15
10(a))	10			10
10(b)		15		15
11(a)	10			10
11(b)		15		15
12(a)	10			10
12(b)		15		15
Totals	40	60	0	100

Sport and Exercise				
Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
13(a)	10			10
13(b)		15		15
14(a))	10			10
14(b))		15		15
15(a)	10			10
15(b)		15		15
16(a)	10			10
16(b)		15		15
Totals	40	60	0	100