

Psychology

Advanced GCE

Unit **G544**: Approaches and Research Methods in Psychology

Mark Scheme for June 2012

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.















© OCR 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Attempts evaluation
	Benefit of doubt
	Context
	Cross
	Evaluation
	Extendable horizontal line
	Expandable horizontal wavy line
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	Not answered question
	Tick
	Development of point
	Omission mark
	Unclear
	Good use of research/supporting evidence

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>The hypothesis should follow logically from the research question and be operationalised so that it is clear what is being measured and how it would be measured.</p> <p>0 marks – no hypothesis or a null is given 1 mark – an appropriate statement of the hypothesis has been framed but it is not operationalised, OR an operationalised statement is framed but it does not follow logically from the option given eg <i>There will be a significant difference between those who have sleep and those who don't in memory.</i> 2 marks – an appropriate statement of the hypothesis has been framed but it is not clearly operationalised eg <i>There is a significant difference in memory after 8 hours sleep and after 4 hours sleep.</i> 3 marks – an appropriate hypothesis has been framed and it is clearly operationalised eg <i>There is a significant difference in number of everyday objects remembered after 8 hours sleep and after 4 hours sleep.</i></p>	3	<p>Do not reward a null hypothesis or hypothesis that predicts a correlation.</p> <p>Full credit can be given for a one or two tailed hypothesis.</p> <p>The word significant is not required for full marks.</p> <p>If the answer has one of the variable fully operationalised and not the other it can be given 2 marks.</p> <p>For 3 marks the variables must be operationalised so that the wording goes beyond the descriptions given in the option.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>There should be a clear description of the method. Details should include, where appropriate, the type of sample and the way it was selected, the allocation to groups, the matching of participants, a description of the test with examples, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings.</p> <p>For replicability: 0-4 marks – The description of the sample, the way it was selected and the way participants were allocated to groups is brief and/or unclearly stated. Answers do not contain much structure or organisation and it is often difficult to understand what was done. There is little or no use of specialist terms. Examples of materials used are missing or incomplete as are details of the scoring, timing and conditions of the test 5-8 marks – The choice of sample and sampling technique is appropriate but could be described more fully. The structure and organization of the description of the procedure is generally plausible, appropriate and fairly detailed. There is some use of specialist terms. The investigation is not fully replicable as details of materials, test conditions including timing are incomplete. 9-13 marks – At the top end the investigation is fully replicable. The type of sample and the way it was selected, the matching procedure, the allocation to groups, a description of the test or questionnaire with examples, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings are all fully and clearly described</p>	13	<p>Do not reward a procedure that is clearly unrelated to the research question chosen and may have been learnt in order to be pigeon holed into any question.</p> <p>Start at the top band and move down to find the right band to fit the candidate's response.</p> <p>It is not necessary for candidates to describe materials in full for a top band answer or explicitly refer to ethical considerations.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>For the quality of the design and its feasibility:</p> <p>1-2 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question but may be a correlation or it fulfils the criteria for a matched pairs design but does not logically follow from the research question. The description lacks clarity and it would be difficult to conduct the investigation from the description of the matching procedure.</p> <p>3-4 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question ie is a matched pairs design with the appropriate level of measurement but it is not practical [pragmatic] or ethical. The description of the matching procedure lacks clarity but it would be possible to conduct the investigation.</p> <p>5-6 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question and is pragmatic and ethical. The description is clear, coherent and detailed.</p>	6	<p>No marks for an unethical procedure or a design which describes a correlation rather than a difference.</p> <p>The bottom band may be used for answers where the design is unclear.</p> <p>3-4 marks may be given if it is not explicit that the design is matched pairs.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
3		<p>One strength would be that the matched pairs design gives some degree of control over extraneous participant variables.</p> <p>0 marks – incorrect answer 1 mark – strength identified 2 marks – strength identified and explained 3 marks – strength identified and explained in the context of this practical.</p>	3	Any other creditworthy strength is acceptable.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	(a)	<p>It means the probability of the difference/results being due to chance is less than or equal to 1 in 20 or 5%.</p> <p>0 marks – incorrect answer 1 mark – partially correct answer 2 marks – correct answer which is clearly explained</p>	2	<p>For 2 marks it needs to say less than or equal to</p> <p>Also credit when candidates state in terms of 95% or more</p>
	(b)	<p>It could be used to determine whether the null hypothesis is accepted /rejected ie that the null hypothesis (state the variables) would be rejected</p> <p>0 marks – incorrect answer 1 mark – incomplete answer, brief and unclear 2 marks – explanation lacks clarity with no context/ context with no explanation 3 marks – explanation is clear but in partial context 4 marks - fully explained answer in context of both variables</p>	4	<p>1 mark could be 'reject the null'</p> <p>For 4 marks the explanation must be in the context of both variables.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>An alternative to using the matched pairs design is repeated measures or independent groups. This should be described in the context of the practical for example using independent groups for option c requires the candidate to explain that 2 different groups of participants would be used, one drinking 5 cups of coffee before driving, the other with no cups of coffee. For repeated measures the same group of participants would be used in both conditions but would do the task at 2 different times, the first time without coffee and the second time after 5 cups of coffee.</p> <p>0 marks – irrelevant answer 1 mark – alternative design identified with no explanation 2 marks – alternative design identified and explained but not in context 3 marks – alternative design identified and explained in the context of the practical project.</p>	3	1 mark If an alternative is identified but a different alternative described

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>Ethical issues can where appropriate include, informed consent, age of participants [over 16], confidentiality of the data, withdrawal, debriefing, avoiding distress, harm or embarrassment to participants.</p> <p>0 marks- incorrect answer 1 mark – an appropriate ethical issue is identified 2 marks – an appropriate ethical issue is identified and addressed but it lacks clarity or the issue is not discussed in relation to the investigation 3 marks – an ethical issue is clearly understood and addressed in relation to the investigation.</p>	3	A 2 mark answer may be very well described but if it makes no reference to the candidate's proposed practical it cannot get 3 marks.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p>Answers are mostly likely to refer to participant variables such as intelligence, age, cognitive ability etc but any appropriate extraneous variable is acceptable.</p> <p>0 marks – inappropriate answer 1 mark – an extraneous variable identified but no suggestion for its control. 2 marks – an extraneous variable identified and suggestion for its control made but not in the context of this practical. 3 marks – an extraneous variable identified and suggestion for its control discussed in the context of this practical.</p>	3	Participants may identify a variable that was controlled through the matching procedure.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8 (a)	<p>Candidates should outline the cognitive approach. This is likely to be done by referring to mental processes such as memory, language, perception, attention etc. They may say the cognitive approach compares the human mind to a computer.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Identification of the approach which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The cognitive approach may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression poor. 2 marks – The main components of the approach are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to the cognitive approach. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent. 3 marks – The main components of the approach are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the cognitive approach. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good. 4 marks – The main components of the approach are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The answer is clearly related to the cognitive approach. The candidate clearly understands the approach in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.</p>	4	<p>No examples of psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks.</p> <p>A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant.</p> <p>A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding. For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer.</p> <p>Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Candidates can use any piece of cognitive research to answer this question. It is expected that they will draw from the list below but any relevant research must be given credit.</p> <p>From AS: Loftus and Palmer (eyewitness testimony), Baron–Cohen (autism), Savage–Rumbaugh (language in chimps), Samuel and Bryant (conservation), Griffiths (gambling).</p> <p>From A2:</p> <p>From Forensic: criminal thinking patterns eg Yochelson and Samenow, social cognition eg attribution of blame (Gudjonsson), cognitive interview technique (Geiselman), cognitive skills programme eg Friendship.</p> <p>From Health: managing stress eg Meichenbaum, use of cognitive therapy eg Beck, or RET.</p> <p>From Sport: use of imagery in sport performance.</p> <p>From Education: differences in cognitive styles eg Riding and Raynor, discovery learning eg Bruner, attribution theory of motivation eg Weiner</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor.</p> <p>3-4 marks – Definition of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.</p>	8	<p>Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2.</p> <p>Do not reward evidence that does not use the cognitive approach.</p> <p>Any research that investigates cognitive processes may be credited.</p> <p>If there is an imbalance in the quality between the two examples, identify the bands for the examples separately and then go half way between the two.</p> <p>Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p>For one piece of research, a maximum of 4 marks only can be awarded.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p>5-6 marks – Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</p>		<p>The answer must be competently structured and organised with explicit links to the cognitive approach for a top band answer</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p>Examples as part b. Strengths may include the accuracy of measurement, the use of equipment, the high levels of control and replicability, applications to treatment etc. Limitations may include reductionism, lack of qualitative data, lack of validity of measures.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-3 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is basic. Range of points is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Points are not organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and demonstrates poor psychological knowledge. Sparse or no use of supporting examples from unit content. There is very limited or no argument arising from points. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is sparse and understanding may not be evident. 4-5 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is limited. Range of points is limited (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates limited psychological knowledge. Poor use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is sparse. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sparse. Evaluation is lacking in detail and understanding is sparse 6-7 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Range of points limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited.</p>	12	<p>Do not reward psychological evidence that is not from the cognitive approach.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the cognitive approach without referring to the strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p>At 1-3 marks the points are very basic and the psychological knowledge poor. For example the study may not be named and the details may be inaccurate. Points may not relate to the approach but to the specific research.</p> <p>At 4-5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak.</p> <p>At 6-7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with more limited supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p> <p>8-9 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p> <p>10-12 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Range (eg two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced. Points are competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>		<p>At 8-9 marks there may be only 3 strengths/ weaknesses, but these will be supported by very detailed examples.</p> <p>At 10-12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with well described impressive supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(d)	<p>Candidates may draw comparisons between the types of methods used and the types of data collected, or may use evaluation issues such as reductionism, determinism, ethics, usefulness, etc</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-2 marks – Explanation of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor. 3-4 marks – Explanation of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/ studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. 5-6 marks – Explanation of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	8	<p>Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the cognitive approach and behaviourist perspective without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks, if studies are in the context of the approaches.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer will either be very brief or have a limited discussion.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the approaches with well supported examples.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>7-8 marks – Explanation of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</p>		<p>For 7-8 marks there should be at least two points of comparison linked with evidence from both the cognitive approach and the behaviourist perspective.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(e)	<p>Candidates may use any areas of psychology to answer this question but must focus on determinism and free-will. Determinism is the principle that all human behaviour results from internal or external causes. The argument can be supported by any of the approaches although biological and behavioural are most likely to be offered. Credit should be given for candidates who offer suggestions as to how free-will plays a part in more humanistic perspectives.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-2 marks – Discussion is basic. Range of supporting arguments is sparse or not present. There is little or no organisation. Selection of arguments is poor and is peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is lacking detail and there is very little understanding evident. 3-4 marks – Discussion is reasonable. Range of supporting arguments is limited and has some organisation. Selection of arguments from a limited range of sources is vaguely related to the question and demonstrates some psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is inconsistent. Discussion has some detail and some understanding is evident. 5-6 marks – Discussion is very good. Range of supporting arguments is well balanced and is organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is logically related to the question and demonstrates very good psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is generally well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is good.</p>	8	<p>Do not reward responses that describe features of psychology without reference to its relevance to determinism and/or free-will. Max 4 marks for answers not addressing both determinism and free will.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer may be very brief or be very basic showing little psychological knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks there may only be 2 or 3 points discussed without the use of examples or 1 very well developed argument with supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>7-8 marks – Discussion is comprehensive. Range of supporting arguments is balanced and coherently organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is explicitly related to the question and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is clear and well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>		<p>For 7-8 marks the candidate may have a well developed argument with 3 or 4 points without the use of examples. Alternatively they may take 2 or 3 arguments which are supported by psychological evidence which is deterministic.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	(a) Candidates should outline what is meant by snapshot studies. Snapshot studies are quick and do not involve repetition of measurement. They do not occur over an extended period of time such as longitudinal studies and do not take into account changes in behaviour over time. 0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Identification of snapshot studies which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a list). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Snapshot studies may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression poor. 2 marks – The main components of snapshot studies are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to snapshot studies. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent. 3 marks – The main components of snapshot studies are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to snapshot studies. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good. 4 marks – The main components of snapshot studies are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The debate is clearly related to snapshot studies. The candidate clearly understands the issue in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.	4	No examples of psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks. Comparisons with longitudinal research are acceptable. A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant. A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Candidates can use any examples of research that are snapshot to answer this question. Laboratory experiments are relevant to this question</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Description is very basic (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Snapshot studies may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression limited.</p> <p>3-4 marks – Use of psychological terminology is basic. The range of theories/studies described is limited. Description is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration/ uses of example/quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p>5-6 marks – Use of psychological terminology is mainly competent and the range of theories/studies is related to the question. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/ use of example/ quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is competent.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The range of theories/studies described is appropriate. Description is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Quality of written communication is comprehensive.</p>	8	<p>Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2.</p> <p>Only reward evidence which is snapshot.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks one or two examples are given but are very basic.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks the examples will lack detail or only one example which is fully detailed.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the evidence may be very accurate and detailed but the short, snapshot aspect may not be strongly emphasised/ the snapshot aspect may be strongly emphasised but the evidence may not be detailed.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks accurate description of examples should explicitly highlight the way in which the studies are deemed to be snapshot.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p>Examples as part b. Strengths may include practicality of research over short period giving instant results, replicability possible. Weaknesses may include lack of validity of results to reflect behavior over time, no understanding of changes over time.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is basic. Range of points is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Points are not organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and demonstrates poor psychological knowledge. Sparse or no use of supporting examples from unit content. There is very limited or no argument arising from points. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is sparse and understanding may not be evident.</p> <p>4-5 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is limited. Range of points is limited (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates limited psychological knowledge. Poor use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is sparse. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sparse. Evaluation is lacking in detail and understanding is sparse.</p> <p>6-7 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Range of points limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content.</p>	12	<p>Only reward psychological evidence that is clearly not longitudinal research.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe snapshot evidence without referring to the strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p>At 1-3 marks the points are very basic and the psychological knowledge poor. For example the study may not be named and the details may be inaccurate. Points may relate to the specific research rather than about it being snapshot.</p> <p>At 4-5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak.</p> <p>At 6-7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with more limited supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p> <p>8-9 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p> <p>10-12 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Range (eg two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced. Points are competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p>		<p>At 8-9 marks there may be only 3 strengths/ weaknesses, but these will be supported by very detailed examples.</p> <p>At 10-12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with well described impressive supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(d)	<p>Candidates may draw comparisons between the types of data collected, or may use evaluation issues such as reliability, validity, reductionism, determinism, ethics, usefulness, etc</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-2 marks – Explanation of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor. 3-4 marks – Explanation of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/ studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. 5-6 marks – Explanation of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	8	<p>For 3-4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one well-made point of comparison between the methods with well supported examples.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>7-8 marks – Explanation of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout) Quality of written communication is very good. appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout) Quality of written communication is very good.</p>		<p>For 7-8 marks the points can all be differences and the balance in the answer may be between different points made. There should be at least 2 differences with supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(e)	<p>Candidates may raise the following points in relation to the usefulness of longitudinal research: longitudinal research is useful where the effect of some treatment or programme is to be followed through and results compared to a control group, useful as there are no participant variables and development of specific individuals is recorded.</p> <p>Candidates can argue either way for this question as long as they support their argument with relevant research.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Explanation of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor.</p> <p>3-4 marks – Explanation of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/ studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p>5-6 marks – Explanation of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation.</p>	8	<p>For 1-2 marks the answer may be very brief or be very basic showing little psychological knowledge and understanding and there may little mention of longitudinal research.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks there may only be 2 or 3 points discussed without the use of examples or 1 very well developed argument with supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Quality of written communication is good</p> <p>7-8 marks – Explanation of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</p>		<p>For 7-8 marks the candidate may have a well developed argument with 3 or 4 points without the use of examples. Alternatively they may take 2 or 3 arguments which are supported by psychological evidence.</p>

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2012

