

**GCE**

**Psychology**

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

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2017**

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2017

Abbreviations, annotations and conventions used in the detailed Mark Scheme

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

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
1	<p>The aim should follow logically from the research question and be clearly worded.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – an appropriate statement of the aim has been framed and it is clearly stated eg <i>To find out if supporters at the home ground of a football match shout more than visiting supporters.</i></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – an appropriate statement of the aim has been framed but it is not clearly stated.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – an appropriate statement of the aim has been framed but it is not a close fit with the option.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – no aim is given/ an aim is given that does not fit with any of the options.</p>	[3]	<p>An example for 1 mark is a statement related to shopping behaviour with no context.</p> <p>For 2 marks the answer can be worded as a question.</p> <p>For 3 marks the answer should be framed as a statement.</p>
2	<p>There should be a clear description of the method. Details should include the type of sample and the way it was selected, the position of the observer/observers, the observation schedule including behaviour categories and criteria and how the sampling is carried out ie time sampling, the conditions of the observation environment and timing (ie period of observation and time of day/time of year), scorings or tally and how it is recorded.</p> <p><b>For replicability:</b></p> <p><b>9-13 marks</b> – At the top end the investigation is fully replicable. The type of sample and the way it was selected, the position of the observer/observers, the observation schedule including behaviour categories and criteria and how the sampling is carried out ie time sampling, the conditions of the observation environment and timing (ie period of observation and time of day/time of year), scorings or tally and how it is recorded are all fully and clearly described.</p> <p><b>5-8 marks</b> – The choice of sample and sampling technique is appropriate but could be described more fully. The structure and organisation 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 behaviour categories, observation conditions including timing are incomplete.</p>	[13+6]	<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 refer explicitly to ethical considerations. However, candidates need to refer to type of observation e.g. naturalistic and use specialist terms such as overt/covert for top band.</p>

		<p><b>0-4 marks</b> – The description of the sample and the way it was selected is <b>brief</b> and/or <b>unclearly stated</b>. Answers do not contain much <b>structure</b> or <b>organisation</b> and it is often difficult to understand what was done. There is <b>little or no use</b> of specialist terms. Details of behaviour categories used are <b>missing</b> or <b>incomplete as</b> are details of the scoring, timing and conditions of the observation.</p> <p><b>For the quality of the design and its feasibility:</b></p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – the method is a structured observation using time sampling, should be appropriate to the research question and is pragmatic and ethical. The description is clear, coherent and detailed.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – the method should be appropriate to the research question i.e. is an observation but it is not practical [pragmatic] or ethical. The description of the procedure lacks clarity but it would be possible to conduct the investigation</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – the method should be appropriate to the research question but may not use time sampling/ be a structured observation <b>or</b> it fulfils the criteria for an observation using time sampling 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 procedure.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – the procedure described is not an observation and or is extremely unethical.</p>		<p>5-6 marks structured observation should be used and time sampling explicitly described.</p> <p>The bottom band may be used for answers where the method is unclear.</p> <p>No marks for an unethical procedure or a design which is not observational (it can be an experiment which employs the observational technique).</p>
<b>3</b>		<p>Possible answers include: lack of demand characteristics where observation is covert, it may be more ethical than studies which involve the manipulation of variables, it shows behaviour that people actually do rather than what they say they do (as in self report).</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – an advantage described clearly in the context of this practical.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – an advantage described clearly but not in the context of this practical project/ an advantage described in the context of this practical project but not clearly.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – an advantage described but not clearly.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – no or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[3]</b>	<p>No marks for advantage of time sampling</p> <p>Context needed for a 3 mark answer</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
4	<p>Any appropriate answer on reliability which must be in the context of the practical project. Answers may include appropriate reference to inter-rater reliability including use of quantitative data and operationalised behaviour categories.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – at least two points related to reliability and assessed fully in context or three points related to reliability in context but assessed more briefly.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – at least one point related to reliability in context and assessed fully.</p> <p><b>1-2 mark</b> – reliability identified and discussed briefly but not clearly.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – no or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[6]</b>	<p>If confused with validity it should not be in top band.</p> <p>Answer must be in context for top 2 bands.</p>
5	<p>Description of tally chart, bar chart or pie chart and any other appropriate table are acceptable.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – appropriate clear description given in the context of the practical investigation.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – appropriate clear description but no reference to the context of the practical investigation</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – appropriate description but brief and unclear.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – no or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[3]</b>	Diagram accepted as part of the description
6	<p>Practical difficulties could be obtaining a sample, issues of cooperation of participants, practicalities of equipment and measurement including difficulties of recording all behaviours when occurring simultaneously etc.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – a difficulty is clearly identified and explained in relation to the investigation.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – an appropriate difficulty is identified and explained but it lacks clarity in relation to the investigation.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – an appropriate difficulty is identified.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – incorrect answer.</p>	<b>[3]</b>	A 2 mark answer may be very well explained but if it makes no reference to the candidate's proposed practical it cannot get 3 marks.

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
7	<p>Event sampling is recording behaviour from the behaviour categories every time it occurs for the duration of the observation period.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – event sampling is clearly described and is in the context of the practical investigation</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – event sampling is described, but it lacks clarity/not in context.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – event sampling is identified but not in context.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – no or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[3]</b>	
8	<p><b>(a)</b></p> <p>Candidates should outline what is meant by determinism. This is the argument that we do not have free will and do not have much control over our actions as all of them are controlled by factors such as our biology or genes, or by the way we are brought up. We do not know what causes our behaviour most of the time so believe we are acting freely. Determinists therefore believe that is possible to predict behaviour by identifying the cause of behaviour.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> – The main components of the issue are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The answer is clearly related to determinism. The candidate clearly understands the issue in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – The main components of the issue are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to determinism. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – The main components of the issue are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to determinism. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Identification of the issue which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding.</p>	<b>[4]</b>	<p>No examples of psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks.</p> <p>Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.</p> <p>For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer.</p> <p>A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding.</p> <p>A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant.</p>

		<p>Determinism may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression poor.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		
	(b)	<p>Determinism can be social, cultural, biological or any influence that causes behaviour. Hence a wide range of research in Psychology can be considered deterministic. Candidates can use any piece of research where cause of behaviour is identified to answer this question. It is expected that they will draw from experimental research, but any relevant research must be given credit.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – 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><b>5-6 marks</b> – 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><b>3-4 marks</b> – 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. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – 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</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 is not deterministic.</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> <p>The answer must be competently structured and organised with explicit links to determinism for a top band answer</p>



		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. <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer		
	(c)	<p>Strengths may include replicability, high control and hence causal relationships can be established / Limitations may include lack of ecological validity, reductionist.</p> <p><b>10-12 marks</b> – 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><b>8-9 marks</b> – 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><b>6-7 marks</b> – 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> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p> <p><b>4-5 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is limited. Range of points is limited (may be positive or negative only). Points</p>	[12]	<p>Do not reward psychological evidence that is not from the physiological approach.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the physiological approach without referring to the strengths and weaknesses of the experimental method.</p> <p>Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p>At 10-12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with well described, impressive supporting evidence</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 6-7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with more limited supporting evidence.</p> <p>At 4-5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak.</p>

		<p>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><b>1-3 marks</b> – 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><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</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 method but to the specific research.</p>
	(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><b>7-8 marks</b> – 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><b>5-6 marks</b> – 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</p>	[8]	<p>Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from experimental research without comparing them.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks there should be at least two points of comparison linked with evidence from the 2 approaches.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the different use of the method with well supported examples.</p>

		<p>structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – 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><b>1-2 marks</b> – 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><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		<p>For 3-4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer will either be very brief or have a limited discussion.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(e) Ecological Validity is the degree to which the behaviours observed and recorded in a study reflect the behaviours that actually occur in natural settings. Candidates may use any areas of experimental research to answer this question but must focus on the ecological validity of the research or parts of the research eg Dement and Kleitman has low ecological validity for the artificial setting but high validity in the objective measures such as EOG for eye movement. <b>7-8 marks</b> – 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. <b>5-6 marks</b> – 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. <b>3-4 marks</b> – 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. <b>1-2 marks</b> – 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. <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.	<b>[8]</b>	Do not reward responses that describe features of experimental research without reference to its ecological validity  Do not reward responses that describe evidence that refers to ecological validity but is not experimental.  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 from experimental research.  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.  For 3-4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples.  For 1-2 marks the answer may be very brief or be very basic showing little psychological knowledge and understanding.

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (a)	<p>This debate within psychology is concerned with the extent to which particular aspects of behaviour are a product of either inherited (i.e. genetic) or acquired (i.e. learned) characteristics. Nature is that which is inherited / genetic. The nature side of the debate argues that most of our behaviour is passed to us from our parents through their DNA. They argue that environmental influences are minimal.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> – The main components of the debate are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The debate is clearly related to nature/nurture explanations. The candidate clearly understands the issue in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – The main components of the debate are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to nature/nurture explanations. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – The main components of the debate are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to nature/nurture explanations. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Identification of the debate which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a list). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Nature/nurture explanations may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression poor.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[4]</b>	<p>No examples from psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks.</p> <p>Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.</p> <p>For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer.</p> <p>A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding</p> <p>A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (b)	<p>Candidates may use any research that they have studied throughout the AS or A2 course that support the nature side of the nature-nurture debate. These are likely to be studies from the physiological approach.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – 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><b>5-6 marks</b> – 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><b>3-4 marks</b> – 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. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – 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><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[8]</b>	<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 which does not support the nature side of the nature-nurture debate. For 7-8 marks accurate description of examples should explicitly highlight the nature side of the nature-nurture debate.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the evidence may be very accurate and detailed but the nature side of the debate may not be strongly emphasised/ the nature side may be strongly emphasised but the evidence may not be detailed.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks the examples will lack detail or only one example which is fully detailed.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks one or two examples are given but are very basic.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (c)	<p>Strengths may include replicability, high control and hence causal relationships can be established / Limitations may include lack of ecological validity, reductionist.</p> <p><b>10-12 marks</b> – 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><b>8-9 marks</b> – 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><b>6-7 marks</b> – 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> <p><b>4-5 marks</b> – 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</p>	[12]	<p>Do not reward psychological evidence that does not come from the cognitive approach.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe the experimental method 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 10-12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with well described impressive supporting evidence</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 6-7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with more limited supporting evidence.</p> <p>At 4-5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak.</p>

		<p>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><b>1-3 marks</b> – 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><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</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 ethics but to the specific research.</p>
9	(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><b>7-8 marks</b> – 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><b>5-6 marks</b> – 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 experimental research without comparing them. For 7-8 marks there should be at least two points of comparison linked with evidence from the 2 approaches.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the different use of the method with well supported examples.</p>



		<p><b>3-4 marks</b> – 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><b>1-2 marks</b> – 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><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		<p>For 3-4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer will either be very brief or have a limited discussion.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (e)	<p>Ethics are the guidelines psychologists should follow when conducting research. Candidates may use any areas of experimental research to answer this question but must focus on the ethics of the research.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – 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> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – 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.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[8]	<p>Do not reward responses that describe features of experimental research without reference to its ethics</p> <p>Do not reward responses that describe evidence that refers to ethics but is not experimental.</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 from experimental research.</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> <p>For 3-4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer may be very brief or be very basic showing little psychological knowledge and understanding.</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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2017



001