

GCE 2005
January Series



Mark Scheme

Psychology A Specification

PYA3 Social Psychology and Research Methods

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General

QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION (QoWC)

2 marks	The work is characterised by clear expression of ideas, a good range of specialist terms and only few errors in grammar punctuation and spelling that detract from the clarity of the material.
1 mark	The work is characterised by reasonable expression of ideas, the use of some specialist terms and errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling that detract from the clarity of the material.
0 marks	The work is characterised by poor expression of ideas, limited use of specialist terms, errors and poor grammar, punctuation and spelling and legibility which obscures the clarity of the material.

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES ONE, TWO AND THREE

AO1	Assessment objective one = knowledge and understanding of psychological theories, terminology, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner.
AO2	Assessment objective two = analysis and evaluation of psychological theories, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner.
AO3	Assessment objective three = design, conduct and report psychological investigation (s) choosing from a range of methods, and taking into account the issues of reliability, validity and ethics, and collect and draw conclusions from the data.

SECTION A – SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

1

Total for this question: 30 marks

1 (a) Outline two explanations of why people yield to minority influence. (3 marks + 3 marks)

Marking criteria

There are several explanations for why people yield to the minority: the snowball effect (as a few people move towards the minority slowly more and more also follow this path); the dissociation model (social cryptoamnesia); the theory of social impact (strength, number + status, immediacy). The latter could be presented as one explanation or subdivided into several explanations.

Informational social influence is also an explanation for minority influence (those with more knowledge or greater status provide information).

Moscovici distinguished between compliance and conversion and suggested that it is through conversion that the minority can influence the majority. People are most likely to yield to the minority when it is:

- Consistent (i.e. consistent in its opinions)
- Flexible (i.e. not unbending, rigid and dogmatic)
- Committed (i.e. focused, enthusiastic and has invested in its views)

Candidates may present these as separate explanations (and provide detail by referring to research support) or may bundle them together as an aspect of a person’s behaviour.

Marking allocation

For each explanation

3 marks	Explanation is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate may offer a detailed and accurate explanation of why people yield possibly using psychological terminology, or with reference to explicit theory or study.
2 marks	Explanation is limited . It is generally accurate but less detailed . For example, the candidate may offer a less detailed but generally accurate explanation of why people yield.
1 mark	Explanation is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, merely identifying a condition (e.g. consistency).
0 marks	Explanation is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may offer an explanation of why people yield to majority influence) or the explanation is incorrect .

1	(b) Outline findings of research into majority influence (conformity).	(6 marks)
----------	--	-----------

Marking criteria

There are several studies that candidates may offer, although it is likely that they will choose those on the specification (e.g. Sherif, Asch, Zimbardo). However, it is important that candidates focus on the *findings* of such research; they will not receive credit for describing the procedures or the conclusions. The term research includes both theory and/or studies; candidates may receive credit for either approach.

The actual findings will depend on the studies offered. For example, Asch found that on 32% of the critical trials naïve participants conformed. It is also acceptable for candidates to outline the findings Asch obtained from the variations to his original research (e.g. the results of manipulating group size, the presence of a supportive colleague etc.) Zimbardo's study is creditworthy, since it can be seen as a study of conformity (to social roles).

Candidates may report several findings from one study or may refer to a number of studies or theories; either of these approaches is acceptable.

Marking allocation

6-5 marks	Outline of findings of research into conformity is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate has described a range of findings in detail.
4-3 marks	Outline of findings of research into conformity is limited . It is generally accurate but less detailed . For example the candidate has only described a few findings.
2-1 marks	Outline of findings of research into conformity is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed .
0 marks	Outline of findings of research into conformity is inappropriate (for example, the candidate has offered an outline of findings of research into obedience) or the description is incorrect .

- | | | |
|----------|--|-------------------|
| 1 | (c) Consider whether the procedures used in social influence research (theories and/or studies) can be justified. | <i>(18 marks)</i> |
|----------|--|-------------------|

Marking criteria

AO1 credit is given for the description of the procedures from studies into social influence.

AO2 credit is given to the effectiveness of the justification..

Since no one particular form of social influence is specified in the question, candidates are free to choose from a range of studies, although Milgram and Zimbardo are likely to be the most popular ones. Candidates may offer an argument condemning research such as this, and/or may also offer a position defending these studies as well.

Thus candidates could argue that the means never justifies the ends and that no matter how important the research unethical procedures are never acceptable. They could consider the criticisms made by psychologists such as Baumrind, that Milgram’s procedures were unnecessarily cruel to his participants, that they were not protected sufficiently and they suffered harm. (Savin similarly criticised Zimbardo’s study.)

Candidates could focus on the positive consequences of these studies. They could argue that these studies radically changed our perception of obedience. They demonstrated that we all have the capacity to obey orders, not merely a disturbed minority. Milgram set out to test the hypothesis that ‘Germans are different’; in fact he showed that they are no different from the rest of the world. Zimbardo’s research had a considerable impact on the training of prison warders in this country.

Candidates may introduce further theories/studies as a form of commentary/evaluation. The degree to which candidates use this material as part of a critical commentary, rather than simply *describing* alternatives, will constitute the *effectiveness* of the evaluation and hence the number of marks awarded for **AO2**.

Marking allocation**AO1**

6-5 marks	Description of procedures used in social influence research is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate may offer a detailed and accurate account of the main procedures from one or more specific studies.
4-3 marks	Description of procedures used in social influence research is limited . It is generally accurate but less detailed . For example, the candidate may mention some procedures but in less detail.
2-1 marks	Description of procedures used in social influence research is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, only a few procedures are mentioned in little detail.
0 marks	Description of procedures used in social influence research is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may offer findings of research into social influence) or the description is incorrect .

AO2

12-11 marks	There is an informed commentary on the justification of the research and reasonably thorough analysis of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an effective manner, within the time constraints of answering this part of the question.
10-9 marks	There is a reasonable commentary on the justification of the research and slightly limited analysis of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an effective manner.
8-7 marks	There is a reasonable commentary on the justification of the research but limited analysis of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a reasonably effective manner.
6-5 marks	There is a basic commentary on the justification of the research with limited analysis of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a reasonably effective manner.
4-3 marks	There is superficial commentary on the justification of the research and rudimentary analysis of relevant psychological material. There is minimal interpretation of the material used.
2-1 marks	Commentary on the justification of the research is just discernible (for example, through appropriate selection of material). Analysis is weak and muddled . The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the problem it addresses.
0 marks	Commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant to the problem it addresses.

2

Total for this question: 30 marks

2	(a) Explain two ways in which people resist obedience.	<i>(3 marks + 3 marks)</i>
----------	---	----------------------------

Marking criteria

There are several reasons why people might resist obedience.

- Being made to feel responsible for their actions; the autonomous shift.
- The presence of a disobedient role model.
- Education; those who are already aware of Milgram’s findings show the ability to resist.
- Reactance; when people feel their freedom is being threatened by the authority figure; they are more likely to disobey.
- Situational factors or individual differences are also reasons why some people can resist obedience.
- Absence of legitimate authority; if people do not see the person as having legitimate authority they are less likely to obey.

Marking allocation

For each reason

3 marks	Explanation of the reason why people might resist obedience is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate may offer an accurate and detailed account of how the presence of a disobedient role model might overcome all the binding factors that usually produce an obedient response.
2 marks	Explanation of the reason why people might resist obedience is generally accurate but less detailed . For example, the candidate may offer a less detailed account of how the presence of a disobedient role model might overcome all the binding factors that usually produce an obedient response.
1 mark	Explanation of the reason why people might resist obedience is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, the candidate may present a basic account of how the presence of peers might lead to disobedience.
0 marks	Explanation of the reason why people might resist obedience is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may offer a factor that leads to <i>increased</i> obedience) or the outline description is incorrect .

- | | | |
|----------|---|------------------|
| 2 | (b) Describe some of the ways in which psychologists deal with ethical issues that may arise in psychological research. | <i>(6 marks)</i> |
|----------|---|------------------|

Marking criteria

This question asks candidates to explain how ethical issues in general are dealt with by psychologists. The question does not specify which particular ethical issues are required, so candidates are free to interpret the question in their own way. Candidates may offer a descriptive account of how psychologists deal with specific ethical issues (e.g. by explaining the current BPS guideline on the use of dealing with deception) or with more general strategies such as the role of ethical committees. Candidates could also suggest the use of alternative methods to avoid ethical issues; e.g. don't conduct an experiment but use a role-play instead.

Candidates may also choose to describe how specific psychologists (e.g. Milgram) have dealt with specific ethical issues in their research.

As the question asks for *ways* of dealing with ethical issues in the plural, candidates should describe at least two. Candidates who describe only one way should receive a maximum of 4 marks. Note that there is a depth/breadth trade off in this question. More ways will mean less depth and this is entirely appropriate.

Marking allocation.

6-5 marks	Description of some of the ways in which psychologists deal with ethical issues is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate may have provided a detailed account of the nature and use of various ethical guidelines in psychological research.
4-3 marks	Description of some of the ways in which psychologists deal with ethical issues is limited . It is generally accurate but less detailed . For example, the candidate may have provided a less detailed account of the nature and use of ethical guidelines in psychological research. Or the candidate has offered an accurate and detailed description of <i>one</i> way of dealing with ethical issues.
2-1 marks	Description of some of the ways in which psychologists deal with ethical issues is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, the candidate may have provided a basic account of the use of ethical guidelines in psychological research. Or the candidate has offered a generally accurate but less detailed description of <i>one</i> way of dealing with ethical issues.
0 marks	The description is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may have described methodological techniques that have nothing to do with ethical issues) or the description is incorrect .

2 (c) Outline and evaluate research (theories **and/or** studies) into minority influence. (18 marks)**Marking criteria**

AO1 credit is given for the description of research into minority influence.
AO2 credit is given for the evaluation of such research.

There are several studies that candidates might outline but the most likely ones are those mentioned on the specification. Moscovici et al (1969) investigated the effect a minority of 2 confederates had on a majority of 4 naïve participants. They found that under certain conditions the minority could influence the majority. Clark (1994) used the classic film “Twelve Angry Men” to investigate minority influence. Clark & Maas (1990) looked at the size of the group being influenced; Moscovici & Nemeth (1974) also looked at group size.

It is also possible to make a case for Asch’s experiments to be relevant here. The naïve participant in fact belongs to a rather large majority (i.e. people outside the experiment who if asked would answer correctly – the rest of society). Thus the confederates are a very small minority (people who give the wrong answer). If a candidate makes such a case then Asch’s work can be credited. However, the case must be made explicitly.

Theories are also creditworthy as **AO1** e.g.

- Dual process model; compliance or conversion.
- Social impact model (Latane & Wolf 1981)
- Theory of social cryptoamnesia, dissociation model.

The commentary can consider the methodologies used in the studies e.g. most are laboratory based (lack ecological validity, demand characteristics, gender bias in Moscovici etc.). Ethical issues such as deception can also be considered as can the practical application of such research e.g. minority views often result in better decision-making.

Since a lot of research compares majority and minority influence, any answers that include the former should not be ruled out. Candidates might make a case for the inclusion of such material as **AO2**.

Candidates may introduce further theories/studies as a form of commentary/evaluation. The degree to which candidates use this material as part of a critical commentary, rather than simply *describing* alternatives, will constitute the *effectiveness* of the evaluation and hence the number of marks awarded for **AO2**.

Marking allocation**AO1**

6-5 marks	Description of research (theory and/or studies) into minority influence is both accurate and detailed . For example, the candidate may offer a detailed and accurate account of one study or a less detailed account of several studies into minority influence.
4-3 marks	Description of research (theory and/or studies) into minority influence is generally accurate but less detailed . For example, the candidate may outline one or more theories into minority influence.
2-1 marks	Description of research (theory and/or studies) into minority influence is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example the candidate may outline the procedures of a study of minority influence.
0 marks	The description of research (theory and/or studies) into minority influence is inappropriate (for example, the candidate has described research which was not concerned with minority influence) or the description is incorrect .

AO2

12-11 marks	There is an informed commentary on research into minority influence and reasonably thorough analysis of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an effective manner, within the time constraints of answering this part of the question.
10-9 marks	There is a reasonable commentary on research into minority influence and slightly limited analysis of relevant psychological material, which has been used in an effective manner.
8-7 marks	There is a reasonable commentary on research into minority influence but limited analysis of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a reasonably effective manner.
6-5 marks	There is a basic commentary on research into minority influence with limited analysis of relevant psychological material, which has been used in a reasonably effective manner.
4-3 marks	There is superficial commentary on research into minority influence and rudimentary analysis of relevant psychological material. There is minimal interpretation of the material used.
2-1 marks	Commentary on research into minority influence is just discernible (for example, through appropriate selection of material). Analysis is weak and muddled . The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the problem it addresses.
0 marks	Commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant to the problem it addresses.

SECTION B – RESEARCH METHODS**3****Total for this question: 30 marks**

Research has found that people who fail to solve a problem become less motivated and as a result are less successful in solving similar problems in the future. A teacher decided to investigate this topic using anagrams as the problem to be solved. He created two lists of anagrams. One list contained anagrams that could be solved (the success list). For example the letters TBLAE can be rearranged into the word TABLE. The other list (the failure list) contained anagrams that were impossible to solve (i.e. sets of letters that could not be rearranged to form words).

In the first stage of the investigation the teacher divided his class into two groups. One group received the list with anagrams that could be solved (the success group) and the other group received the list that could not be solved (the failure group).

In the second stage, later in the week, he gave **all** the students a new list of 20 anagrams, all of which could be solved. He then recorded the number of words solved by each student. The results are displayed in **Table 1** below.

Number of anagrams solved correctly by success group	Number of anagrams solved correctly by failure group
16	18
15	15
17	9
16	12
9	8
12	7
17	4
16	6
	9
	13
<i>Mean Score: 14.75</i>	<i>Mean Score: 10.10</i>

Table 1: Number of anagrams correctly solved in the second stage

Mark scheme for question 3

Where the word **one** appears in a question, positive marking **does not** apply and only the first answer is credited.

3	(a) (i) Give an experimental/alternative hypothesis for this study.	(2 marks)
	(ii) State whether your hypothesis is directional or non-directional.	(1 mark)
	(iii) Explain why you have chosen a directional or non-directional hypothesis.	(2 marks)

AO3

(i) A possible directional hypothesis might be:

- The success group are likely to solve more anagrams than the failure group.

A possible non-directional hypothesis might be:

- There will be a difference in the number of anagrams solved between the success and failure groups.

(The IV is success/failure; the DV is number of anagrams solved.)

2 marks	The hypothesis is both accurate and detailed . For example as given above.
1 mark	The hypothesis is basic, lacking detail , and may be muddled and/or flawed . For example, there will be a difference in the number of anagrams solved.
0 marks	The hypothesis is inappropriate (for example, the candidate may describe the aim) or the hypothesis is incorrect .

(ii) For the direction of their hypothesis:

1 mark	The statement of direction is correct .
0 marks	The statement of direction is incorrect .

(iii) They could explain why they chose a directional hypothesis by saying that previous research has found this difference and so the teacher might expect to find a similar difference. Or they could explain the choice of a non-directional hypothesis by arguing that he is not sure what to expect and feels safer selecting a non-directional hypothesis (the previous research is not very convincing?) Simply stating that it is directional because the direction of difference is predicted gets zero marks.

For the explanation of the direction:

2 marks	Explanation of the direction of their hypothesis is both accurate and detailed . For example as given above.
1 mark	Explanation of the direction of their hypothesis is brief or muddled .
0 marks	No explanation of direction or incorrect explanation of the direction.

There is a 'follow' through in this question; if (ii) is wrong then (iii) will not receive credit.

3	(b) Explain what is meant by a null hypothesis.	<i>(2 marks)</i>
----------	---	------------------

AO1

A null hypothesis is the assumption that there is no difference in the population that the samples have been taken from in terms of the variables being tested. It is a statement that there is no difference between the two groups or the two conditions.

There is no need for answers to be contextualised, but candidates may use the study as way of elaborating their answer.

For the explanation:

2 marks	The explanation is both accurate and detailed . For example, there is no difference between the two groups and any difference found will be due to chance, (i.e. some elaboration).
1 mark	The explanation of a null hypothesis is brief or muddled . For example, there is no difference/relationship/correlation, (i.e. no elaboration).
0 marks	No explanation or incorrect explanation of a null hypothesis.

3	(c) The teacher used an independent groups design. Give two advantages of choosing an independent groups design instead of using a repeated measures design.	<i>(2 marks + 2 marks)</i>
----------	---	----------------------------

AO2

Advantages of independent groups design:

- No order effects: unlike a repeated measures design where the participants do both parts of the experiment and might get bored or practised.
- Same material can be used for each condition: as the participants only take part in one or other of the groups the same material can be used, unlike a repeated measures design where two sets of material must be produced.
- Participants are unlikely to guess the aim/hypothesis; since they only take part in one of the conditions, unlike the repeated measures design where the participants do both parts and are more likely to be able to guess the aim.

There is no need to contextualise the answer.

For each advantage:

2 marks	The advantage of independent groups design is both accurate and detailed . For example as given in points above.
1 mark	The advantage of the independent groups design is brief or muddled . For example, no order effects.
0 marks	No advantage is given or incorrect advantage given.

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 3 | (d) Give two factors that the teacher might have considered when making up the lists of anagrams.
<i>(2 marks + 2 marks)</i> |
|----------|--|

AO3

The possible factors could include:

- Length of word; all the words should be of a similar length.
- Type of word e.g. nouns, adjectives etc. as some words are easier to recognise.
- Frequency of word in language; all the words should be as common as each other.
- Familiarity of words for this age group; the words should be familiar to the age group being tested.
- Length of list (i.e. number of words; he used 20 words but a longer list might become boring).
- Difficulty of words; if they are too difficult then no one will be able to solve any of the anagrams.

For each factor:

2 marks	Accurate and detailed criterion. For example, an identification of a factor or a brief explanation.
1 mark	Brief or muddled criterion. For example, muddled identification of factor alone.
0 marks	No factor or incorrect factor.

3	(e) (i) The teacher used volunteers from his class as participants. Identify one other way in which a sample of participants might have been selected. <i>(1 mark)</i>
	(ii) Give one disadvantage of this method of sampling you identified in part (i). <i>(2marks)</i>

(i) AO3 + AO2

The teacher might have randomly chosen his students, or he could have used a systematic method (e.g. every other student receives the success list.) or an opportunity sample.

For the identification of sampling method:

1 mark	The identification of sampling method is accurate .
0 marks	The identification of sampling method is incorrect .

(ii) AO2

The disadvantage given must relate to the method of sampling offered in (i), however it does not need to be contextualised. A disadvantage of a random sample is that it does not guarantee a completely representative sample; it is possible that only one ‘type’ of participant is selected. Using a convenience/opportunity sample may result in the sample being biased; one group may contain the same ‘type’ of people.

For the disadvantage:

2 marks	The disadvantage is both accurate and detailed . For example, an opportunity sample might not be representative of the target population.
1 mark	The disadvantage is brief or muddled . For example, an opportunity sample may be biased.
0 marks	No disadvantage is given or incorrect disadvantage.

3	(f) Name one measure of dispersion that could be used to describe the data in Table 1 . Explain why this would be a suitable measure. <i>(1 mark + 2 marks)</i>
----------	--

AO3

The two measures of dispersion on the specification are, standard deviation and the range and it is likely that candidates will offer one of these.

The range is an easy measure of dispersion to calculate.

Standard deviation, unlike the range, takes into account all the values in the group and is therefore a more precise measurement.

For the measure of dispersion:

1 mark	The identification of the measure of dispersion is accurate .
0 marks	The identification of the measure of dispersion is incorrect .

For the explanation:

2 marks	The explanation is both accurate and detailed . For example the standard deviation, unlike the range, takes into account all of the values.
1 mark	The explanation is brief or muddled . For example, the range is easy to calculate.
0 marks	No explanation is given or incorrect explanation.

3	(g) (i)	Identify one ethical issue that the teacher should have considered.	(1 mark)
	(ii)	Explain how he might have dealt with this ethical issue.	(2 marks)

(i) AO1 + AO3

There are several ethical issues that the teacher should have considered:

- Deception (of the failure group)
- Informed consent
- Right to withdraw
- Confidentiality
- Protection from harm.

For the identification of the ethical issue:

1 mark	The identification of the ethical issue is accurate .
0 marks	The identification of the ethical issue is incorrect .

(ii) The way the candidate explains how the teacher deals with the ethical issue will depend on the issue identified in (i). For example he may deal with deception by thoroughly debriefing the students, telling them all about the aims of the study and giving them the option to withdraw their results from his study (a form of retrospective informed consent). He could deal with informed consent by asking permission from the Head Teacher and from the students’ parents, by sending them a letter describing the procedures in the study and asking them to sign and return it to him.

Debriefing is not an ethical issue. However, it is a way of dealing with an ethical issue and can thus receive credit in (ii).

For the way of dealing with it:

2 marks	The explanation is both accurate and detailed . For example, by debriefing the participants by telling them all about the study and answering their questions.
1 mark	The explanation is brief or muddled . For example simply saying that he would get permission from parents; or he would debrief them.
0 marks	No explanation is given or incorrect explanation.

3	(h) (i) Summarise the findings of the investigation.	<i>(3 marks)</i>
	(ii) What conclusion(s) can be drawn from these findings?	<i>(3 marks)</i>

AO3**(i) Possible findings:**

- Participants in the success group solved on average more anagrams than those in the failure group.
- There is a wide range of individual differences in the failure group, with one participant only solving 4 anagrams but another solving 18.
- The range in the failure group (14) was twice as large as in the success group (7).
- The participant who solved the most anagrams (18) was in the failure group.

There is a depth/breadth trade off here; a candidate could offer a few findings in detail or several but in less detail.

For the findings:

3 marks	Accurate and detailed summary of two or more findings in detail.
2 marks	The findings are generally accurate but less detailed . One finding is given in detail or several but in less detail.
1 mark	Brief or muddled summary of the findings.
0 marks	No summary or incorrect summary.

(ii) Possible conclusions:

- People who have experienced failure the first time do not do as well the second time they attempt a similar task.
- The experience of failure does not affect all people in the same way
- Success at a task the first time encourages people to do well at the second attempt.

The conclusions must be linked to the findings. However, as candidates often have difficulty in separating findings (what the data show) from conclusions (what the data mean) if findings are given in (ii) they can be exported to (i) and similarly conclusions in (i) can be exported to (ii)

For the conclusions:

3 marks	Accurate and detailed conclusion(s) as given above. One conclusion in detail or two or more in less detail.
2 marks	The conclusions are generally accurate but less detailed .
1 mark	Brief or muddled conclusions.
0 marks	No conclusions or incorrect conclusion.

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY
ASSESSMENT GRID: January 2005**

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3
1 (a)	6	-	
(b)	6	-	-
(c)	6	12	-
Total for Question 1	18	12	
2 (a)	6	-	-
(b)	6	-	-
(c)	6	12	-
Total for Question 2	18	12	
3 (a)	-	-	5
(b)	2	-	-
(c)	-	4	-
(d)	-	-	4
(e)	-	2	1
(f)	-	-	3
(g)	1	-	2
(h)	-	-	6
Total for Question 3	3	6	21
QoWC	2		
Total for unit	39	30	21