

Mark Scheme for June 2011

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

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

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

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

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

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

Section A

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
1	<p>State the alternate hypothesis for your practical project.</p> <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 hypothesis 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 research question. 2 marks – an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed but it is not clearly operationalised 3 marks – an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed and it is clearly operationalised <i>e.g. There will be a significant difference in the number of items correctly recalled from a list of twenty when they are shown as pictures as opposed to words.</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 variables fully operationalised and not the other it can be given 2 marks</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
2	<p>Describe the method you would use to conduct your practical project.</p> <p>Marks are awarded for the detail and replicability of your design and for the quality of communication and the fitness of the design for purpose. 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, a description of the test or questionnaire with examples, or the observation schedule and criteria, 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 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 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 allocation to groups, a description of the test or questionnaire with examples, or the observation schedule and criteria, 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	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>For the quality of the design and its fitness for purpose:</p> <p>0 marks – irrelevant answer</p> <p>1-2 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question and it fulfils the criteria for an experiment 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>3-4 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question i.e. is a repeated measures design 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>5-6 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question and is pragmatic and ethical. The description is clear, coherent and detailed, and accurate replication of the investigation would be possible.</p>	[6]	<p>No marks for an unethical procedure or a design which describes a correlation or an independent measures design or would not result in the collection of quantitative data.</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 data is quantitative or there is a minor breach of ethical guidelines</p>
3	<p>Outline <u>one</u> advantage of using the repeated measures design in your practical project.</p> <p>Repeated measures design has the advantage of not having extraneous participant variables to interfere with the experimental effect.</p> <p>Need less participants</p> <p>0 marks – no or irrelevant answer</p> <p>1 mark – an advantage identified but not explained.</p> <p>2marks – an advantage explained 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>3 marks – an advantage explained clearly in the context of this practical.</p>	[3]	

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
4	(a)	<p>Explain <u>one</u> strength of the sampling method you would use in your practical project.</p> <p>0 marks – no or irrelevant answer 1 mark – a strength identified but not clearly. 2marks – a strength explained clearly but not in the context of this practical project/ a strength explained in the context of this practical project but not clearly. 3 marks – an advantage explained clearly in the context of this practical.</p>	[3]	<p>Most candidates will choose an opportunity sample –advantage is that participants are easy to obtain. Self selected samples have the advantage that the p's are all willing to take part and this makes the sampling method ethical. A random or stratified sample may be less biased than other sampling methods. Any appropriate strength</p>
	(b)	<p>Explain <u>one</u> weakness of the sampling method you would use in your practical project</p> <p>0 marks – no or irrelevant answer 1 mark – a weakness identified but not clearly. 2marks – a weakness explained clearly but not in the context of this practical project/ a weakness explained in the context of this practical project but not clearly. 3 marks – a weakness explained clearly in the context of this practical.</p>	[3]	<p>Self-selected and opportunity samples are often biased and random and stratified may be difficult to obtain. Any appropriate weakness</p>
5		<p>State an appropriate statistical test to analyse the data you would collect. Give the reasons for your choice. For ordinal level data, candidates will choose the Wilcoxon signed ranks test, the sign test, related T-test (reasons: ordinal level data/at least ordinal data, repeated measures design and test of difference),</p> <p>0 marks – no or irrelevant answer 1 mark – correct test identified but no reason given for choice 2 marks – correct test identified but limited reasons given for choice- 3 marks – correct test identified and full reason given for choice</p>	[3]	<p>Only Wilcoxon signed ranks, Sign test or related T-test accepted for marks.</p> <p>For 1 mark a test has to be named For 2 marks e.g. correctly name the test and give 1 reason for justification For 3 marks correctly name the test and give at least 2 reasons</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
6	<p>Briefly discuss <u>one</u> ethical issue in relation to your practical project.</p> <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 – no or irrelevant answer 1 mark – an appropriate ethical issue is identified 2 marks – an appropriate ethical issue is identified and discussed but it lacks clarity or the issue is not discussed in relation to the investigation. 3 marks – an ethical issue is clearly understood and discussed in relation to the investigation.</p>	[3]	<p>No marks if issue is not identified or explained</p> <p>For 1 mark either identify or explain the issue For 2 marks identify and explain the issue no context or issue explained in context. For 3 marks identify and explain the issue and in context.</p>
7	<p>Suggest an alternative way of measuring the dependent variable in your practical project.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to suggest an alternative way of measuring memory. Alternative ways of collecting the data would be credited e.g. number of words versus time it takes to recall</p> <p>0 marks – no or irrelevant answer 1 mark – an alternative dependent variable is described but does not suit the research question or it lacks clarity. 2 marks – an alternative dependent variable is described which is appropriate, but it lacks clarity or is not justified. 3 marks – an alternative dependent variable is clearly described which is appropriate and justified.</p>	[3]	<p>Changes to the I.V. should not be given any credit.</p> <p>Changes to the way the D.V. is recorded cannot be credited. E.g. verbal instead of writing down.</p> <p>Alternatives for measuring the dependent variable may be measured by recognition rather than free recall. Any appropriate answer should be credited.</p>
	Total	[40]	

Section B

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
8	(a)	<p>Briefly outline the physiological approach in psychology.</p> <p>Candidates should outline the physiological approach. This is likely to be done by explaining the focus on biological mechanisms and may include descriptions of ways to understand brain functions or genetic basis of behaviour. Scientific methods, reductionism and determinism may also be included in the description of the approach.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Identification of the approach which is very basic and lacks detail (e.g. a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The physiological 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 concept of the physiological approach. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent. 3 marks – The main components of approach are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the physiological 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 debate is clearly related to the physiological approach. 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.</p> <p>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	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
(b)	<p>Describe <u>two</u> pieces of research that use the physiological approach to psychology.</p> <p>Candidates may use any physiological research that they have studied throughout the AS or A2 course. Their examples may be drawn from the list below. From AS: Sperry or Dement and Kleitman or Maguire Physiological studies from A2: From Sport, Trait and State (Martens SCAT 1977), Exercise and relation to cancer, Exercise and relation to HIV(Lox, McAuley and Tucker 1995). From Health, Physiological measures of stress (Geer and Meisel 1973), biological explanation of dysfunctional behaviour (Gottesman and Shields 1991) (Ost 1992), Biological treatments, (Karp and Frank 1995) (Comer1998), From Forensic, brain dysfunction (Raine2002), genes and serotonin (Brunner 1991), evolutionary explanations (Daly and Wilson) From Education, biological differences in brain structure (Bee1992).</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-2 marks – Description is very basic (e.g. a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The Physiological approach may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression limited. 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. 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</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 physiological approach.</p> <p>Any research that investigates physiological 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> <p>The answer must be competently structured and organised with explicit links to the physiological approach for a top band answer</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>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>		
(c)	<p>Discuss the strengths and limitations of using the physiological approach to explain behaviour. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</p> <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 and lack of qualitative data.</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.</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.</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>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<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 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. 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 (e.g. two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced. Points are competently organised into approaches. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of</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> <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	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>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>		
(d)	<p>Compare the physiological approach with the cognitive approach. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</p> <p>Candidates may draw comparisons between the scientific methods of the physiological and cognitive approaches and their reductionism. They may highlight the differences in the processes studied eg brain processes compared to thinking skills.</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.</p>	[8]	<p>Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the physiological approach and cognitive approach without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks, if studies are not 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>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<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. 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 5-6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the approaches with well supported examples</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 physiological approach.</p>
(e)	<p>Discuss the usefulness of conducting research which is considered reductionist.</p> <p>Candidates should make reference to the applications of reductionist research such as treatments developed for people with disorders or strategies to reduce offending behaviour.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-2 marks – Few discussion points. Range of arguments is sparse or not present. There is little or no organisation. Selection of arguments is poor and they are peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is limited and lacking detail.</p>	[8]	<p>Max 4 marks for responses that discuss features of reductionist research without reference to its usefulness or responses that discuss evidence that is useful but not reductionist.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer may be very brief or be very basic showing little psychological knowledge and understanding.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>3-4 marks – Limited discussion. Limited range of arguments with some organisation. Arguments are vaguely related to the question and demonstrate a sound psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is limited. Discussion has limited detail and some understanding is evident.</p> <p>5-6 marks – Some discussion points. Range of limited 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 has some detail.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Many discussion points. 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 thorough.</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 the response must clearly refer to the usefulness of reductionist research. There may only be 2 or 3 points well developed without the use of examples or 1 very well developed argument with effective evidence.</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 apposite psychological evidence which is reductionist.</p>
9	<p>(a)</p> <p>Briefly outline the self-report method used in psychology.</p> <p>Candidates should outline the self report method. This involves the individual reporting on their own behavior, thoughts, feelings and attitudes. A self report may take the form of a questionnaire, interview or survey. The questionnaire (or survey) will take the form of a set of questions on a specific topic and data collected is often both qualitative and quantitative. An interview is delivered face to face or by telephone but questions are normally verbal rather than in written form. The questions may be less structured than in a questionnaire and responses will more commonly be qualitative.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[4]	<p>No examples of psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>1 mark – Identification of the method which is very basic and lacks detail (e.g. a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The self report method may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent Expression poor.</p> <p>2 marks – The main components of the method are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to the self report method. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>3 marks – The main components of the method are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the self report method. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.</p> <p>4 marks – The main components of the method are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The debate is clearly related to the self report method. The candidate clearly understands the issue/debate in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.</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</p> <p>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>
(b)	<p>Describe <u>two</u> pieces of psychological research that use the self-report method.</p> <p>Candidates can use any examples of research using the self report method 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: Thigpen and Cleckley (multiple personality), Freud(Little Hans)</p> <p>From A2: From Forensic: survey data to investigate gender related life expectancy (Daly and Wilson), survey of offenders on probation orders (Mair and May)</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 where research does not use the self report method.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>From Health :Hassles measurement (Kanner et al), Social Readjustment Rating Scale (Holmes and Rahe 1967) From Sport: Marten’s SCAT, measurement of body image anxiety (Hart et al) From Education: Interviews of boys and girls for raising boys achievement (Younger and Warrington)</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 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. 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. 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 – 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. 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</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 self report method may not be strongly emphasised/ the self report method 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 self report method was used in the research.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>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>		
(c)	<p>Discuss the strengths and limitations of using the self-report method to investigate behaviour. Using examples of psychological research to support your answer.</p> <p>Examples as part b. Strengths may include the ability to collect large amounts of data relatively quickly and cheaply which increases generalisability. Another strength is replicability and the fact that people are asked directly rather than trying to work out reasons for their behaviour. Weaknesses include the fact that responses may be biased by demand characteristics or social desirability bias. People may have difficulty choosing an answer if the forced choice does not give them an appropriate option. Another weakness may be the difficulty of analysing responses from open questions.</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 methods. 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>	[12]	<p>If the strength and weaknesses are well discussed but no supporting evidence a maximum of 5 marks can be given.</p> <p>Do not reward psychological evidence that does not use the self report method.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence that uses the self report 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 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 self report method but to the specific research.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<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 methods. 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 methods. 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. 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 methods. 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 (e.g. two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced. Points are competently organised into methods. 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.</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> <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	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.		
(d)	<p>Compare the self-report method with the observational method. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</p> <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</p>	[8]	<p>Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the self report and observational methods without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks.</p> <p>Please note that reference to research using observational techniques is acceptable as an example of the observational method</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 methods with well supported examples.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>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 – 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 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>
(e)	<p>Discuss whether it is possible to conduct ethical research when using the self-report method.</p> <p>Candidates may raise the ethical issues of deception as it may be necessary when conducting research. Psychological harm may be a problem if questions are of a personal or sensitive nature. It should be possible to avoid problems of confidentiality and privacy. Candidates may gain credit by arguing that it is possible or it isn't possible to conduct ethical research.</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.</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 ethics or the self report method.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale/Additional Guidance
	<p>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.</p> <p>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> <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 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> <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>
	Total	[40]	

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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



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

© OCR 2011