

Psychology

Advanced GCE

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

Mark Scheme for January 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
	Positive
	Negative
	Unclear
	Attempts Evaluation
	Benefit of Doubt
	Context
	Caret Sign to show omission
	Cross
	Evaluation
	Wavy Horizontal Line
	Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question
	Not answered question
	Wavy Vertical line
	Tick

Section A			
Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>The null 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 an alternate hypothesis is given.</p> <p>1 mark - an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed but it is not operationalised, OR an operationalised statement is framed but it does not follow logically from the research question</p> <p>2 marks - an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed but it is not clearly operationalised</p> <p>3 marks - an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed and it is clearly operationalised</p> <p>e.g. <i>There will not be a correlation between self-ratings of extroversion on a 20 point scale and self-ratings of aggression on a 5 point scale.</i></p>	[3]	<p>Do not reward an alternate hypothesis or hypothesis that predicts a difference.</p> <p>A null hypothesis must be 2 tailed for full marks.</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>

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, 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 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 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> <p>For the quality of the design and its feasibility: 0-2 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question but may be an experiment or it would not result in the collection of at least ordinal data. or it fulfils the criteria for a correlation and ordinal level data but does not logically follow from the research question. The description lacks clarity and it would be difficult to conduct the</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> <p>No marks for an unethical procedure or a design which describes unrelated data rather than correlational.</p> <p>The bottom band may be used for answers where the design is unclear. If one variable is ordinal but not the other.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>investigation from the description of the procedure.</p> <p>3-4 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question ie .is a correlational design with the appropriate level of measurement 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.</p>	[6]	<p>3-4 marks Each variable should be at least ordinal (this does not need to be stated explicitly).</p> <p>5-6 marks. Both variables should be appropriate to the research aim and operationalised as at least ordinal data..</p>
3		<p>Possible answers include: there may be other intervening variables that can explain why the variables being studied are linked and so cause and effect cannot be assumed.</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer</p> <p>1 mark- a disadvantage described but not clearly.</p> <p>2marks – a disadvantage described clearly but not in the context of this practical project/ a disadvantage described in the context of this practical project but not clearly.</p> <p>3 marks- a disadvantage described clearly in the context of this practical.</p>	[3]	<p>Responses that only suggest a cause and effect between an IV and DV should not be given any marks. Generic answers not specific to correlations should not be given credit.</p>
4		<p>Any appropriate issue affecting measurement can be used eg the conditions under which it was conducted, demand characteristics, reliability and validity.</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer</p> <p>1-2 mark- issues of measurement identified and discussed briefly but not clearly.</p> <p>3-4marks – at least one point individually related to what they are measuring and described fully/ two points individually related but described more briefly.</p> <p>5-6 marks- at least two points individually related to what they are measuring and described fully/ three points individually related but described more briefly.</p>	[6]	<p>0 marks for answers unrelated to measurement of a variable</p> <p>5-6 marks should contain use of psychological terminology and should be in context of the question.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
5		<p>Participant variables could include gender, intelligence, personality characteristics, age etc These could bias the sample if they are not typical/representative of the population.</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer 1 mark- appropriate variable identified but not discussed in relation to bias in the sample 2 marks- appropriate variable identified and discussed in relation to bias in the sample but not in the context of the practical investigation/ in context but bias in sample not discussed 3marks- appropriate variable identified, discussed in relation to bias in the sample and in the context of the practical investigation</p>	[3]	No credit can be given for answers that do not refer to participant variables e.g. demand characteristics, social desirability bias, small sample etc
6		<p>Personal questions could be avoided, debriefing, avoiding stress, distress, harm or embarrassment to participants.</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer 1 mark - an appropriate suggestion is identified 2 marks - an appropriate suggestion is identified and discussed but it lacks clarity or the idea is not discussed in relation to the investigation or several suggestions are identified but not described clearly/in context. 3 marks – a suggestion is clearly made and discussed in relation to the investigation.</p>	[3]	<p>A 2 mark answer may be very well discussed but if it makes no reference to the candidate's proposed practical it cannot get 3 marks.</p> <p>For 3 marks issues raised should be explicitly related to embarrassment.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
7		<p>Alternative ways may include different methods such as experiment, observation, self report and case study. Any appropriate answer should be credited.</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer 1 mark – an alternative method is described but does not suit the research question or it lacks clarity. 2 marks - an alternative method is described in context which is appropriate, but it lacks clarity or described clearly but not in context. 3 marks - an alternative method is clearly described which is appropriate in context.</p>	[3]	0 marks for alternative designs/ways of measuring the variables e.g. matched pairs, use A-level results instead of IQ test.

Total marks for Section A [40]

Section B				
Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	(a)	<p>Candidates should outline the social approach. This is likely to be done by explaining the influence of other people on behaviour.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1 mark – Identification of the approach which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The social approach 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 approach are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to the social approach. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>3 marks – The main components of the approach are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the social approach. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.</p> <p>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 social 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
8	(b)	<p>Candidates can use any piece of social 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: Milgram (obedience), Reicher and Haslam (prison study) and Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin (subway samaritan)</p> <p>Social studies from A2: From Forensic : Disrupted families eg Farrington, learning from others –Sutherland (1939), SCoPic studies looking at pathways into crime.</p> <p>From Health: social support eg Waxler-Morrison, hassles and life events eg Kanner 1981, self-efficacy eg Bandura</p> <p>From Sport: Aggression theories eg Berkowitz (cue theory), social loafing Latane 1979, audience effects including Schwartz and Barsky 1977, apprehension (Cottrell 1968). Also in motivation – techniques – intrinsic/extrinsic – Ryan and Deci 2000.</p> <p>From Education: play eg Weikart 1993 and ability grouping Sukhnandan and Lee 1998, social roles Riley 1995, and all studies relating to student – student and student-teacher interactions. Eg Flander's interaction analysis and Brophy and Good 1974 for teacher expectation.</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.</p>		<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 social approach.</p> <p>Any research that investigates social 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>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.</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>	[8]	The answer must be competently structured and organised with explicit links to the social approach for a top band answer

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	(c)	<p>Examples as part b. Strengths may include the use of ecologically valid research, the usefulness of the research and its applications to social problems/ Limitations may include reductionism and the ethical problems of some research.</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. 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>Do not reward psychological evidence that is not from the social approach.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the social 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>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>
8	(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.</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</p>	[12]	<p>Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the social approach and individual differences approach 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>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	(d)	<p>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. 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>	[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 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 social approach and the individual differences approach.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	(e)	<p>Candidates may use any areas of the social approach to answer this question but must focus on ethnocentrism in the research, eg. the use of American participants in Milgram's study.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>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> <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>	[8]	<p>Do not reward responses that describe features of the social approach without reference to its relevance to problems of ethnocentrism</p> <p>Do not reward responses that describe evidence that refers to problems of ethnocentrism but is not from the social approach.</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> <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 the social approach.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	(a)	<p>The experimental method involves the manipulation of variable in order to find a cause effect relationship between the IV and DV. Lab experiments are reliable and replicable as they involve a high degree of control.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Identification of the debate/issue/approach which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a list). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Experimental method may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression poor. 2 marks – The main components of the debate/issue/approach are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to experimental method. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent. 3 marks – The main components of the debate/issue/approach are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to experimental method. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good. 4 marks – The main components of the issue are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The debate is clearly related to experimental method. The candidate clearly understands the issue in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.</p>	[4]	<p>No examples of experimental 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		Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	(b)	<p>Candidates may use any laboratory experiments that they have studied throughout the AS or A2 course.</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. 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>	[8]	<p>Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2.</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 experimental aspects may not be strongly emphasised/ the experimental aspects 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 experimental method is used.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	(c)	<p>Strengths may include the reliability of research findings, replicability, control and hence cause and effect can be established. Limitations may include lack of ecological validity and ethics.</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. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid.</p>		<p>Do not reward psychological evidence that is not experimental.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe experimental 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 not relate to ethics 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>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>[12]</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
9	(d)	<p>Candidates may refer to the higher degree of control in the lab and the higher ecological validity in the field experiment, higher demand characteristics in the lab than field experiments but greater reliability in lab experiments.</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.</p> <p>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. 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.</p>		<p>Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the lab and field experimental methods without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks.</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 two experimental methods with well supported examples.</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
		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.	[8]	
9	(e)	<p>Candidates may use any areas of psychology to answer this question but must focus on psychology as a science eg the use of lab experiments to carry out research, the control of variables, reliable measuring techniques, hypothesis testing to support or refute theories etc.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>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> <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>	[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 psychology as a science.</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 marks for Section B [40]

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

