

Psychology

Advanced GCE

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

Mark Scheme for January 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

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
SECTION A			
1	<p>Construct a research question for your practical project.</p> <p>The research question should be appropriate to the option chosen and be clearly worded.</p> <p>0 marks- no research question is given/ a research question is given that does not fit with any of the options</p> <p>1 mark - an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed but it is not a close fit with the option.</p> <p>2 marks - an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed but it is not clearly stated</p> <p>3 marks - an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed and it is clearly stated eg <i>Do people have an excessive fear of crime?</i></p>	[3]	<p>An example for 1 mark is a statement related to stress but not exam stress/ one of the questions from the questionnaire.</p> <p>For 2 marks the answer can be worded as a hypothesis/aim and not a question.</p> <p>For 3 marks the answer should be framed as a research question and should include all the wording of the option, (eg phobia of open spaces).</p>
2	<p>Describe the method you would use to conduct your practical project.</p> <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, a description of the questionnaire (including types of questions) with examples, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings.</p> <p>For replicability:</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p>		<p>Do not reward a procedure that is clearly unrelated to the option 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>A top band answer may include: details of the sample and how it was obtained, examples of appropriate questions. Within the top band if the questionnaire is conducted in the form of a survey, candidates should describe most of the following: where (location), when, how participants were approached and how they did the questionnaire (handed to them or read out) and if they are alone or have guidance. This is also true for the questionnaire used in an experimental method and the</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
2 cont.	<p>9-13 marks – At the top end the investigation is fully replicable. The type of sample and the way it was selected, a description of the test or questionnaire with examples, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings are all fully and clearly described.</p> <p>For the quality of the design and its feasibility: <i>The design refers to the design of the questionnaire.</i></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 a questionnaire 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 ie is a questionnaire 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>	<p>[13]</p> <p>[6]</p>	<p>details need to be clear and replicable. It is not necessary for candidates to explicitly refer to ethical considerations and should not be penalised for unethical procedures.</p> <p>The design of the questionnaire should be appropriate to the option chosen.</p> <p>No marks for a design which describes a research method that does not use a questionnaire. No marks where an opportunity sample is not used.</p> <p>The bottom band may be used for answers where the design is unclear. Top band should not be awarded for an unethical procedure/questions eg using children under the age of 16 without consent.</p>
3	<p>Outline <u>one</u> advantage of using a questionnaire in your practical project</p> <p>Advantages include that data can be easily collected from a large number of people and do not require specialists to administer them. Alternatives could be quick, cheap, easy, done on a computer, anonymous response. Also can give advantage of type of data if made relevant.</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer</p> <p>1 mark - an appropriate advantage identified</p> <p>2 marks - an appropriate advantage is identified and discussed but it lacks clarity or is not discussed in relation to the practical project.</p> <p>3 marks - an advantage is clearly understood and discussed in relation to the practical project.</p>	<p>[3]</p>	<p>For 3 marks answer must be contextualised.</p>

Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
4	(a)	<p>Explain <u>one</u> strength of using closed questions in your practical project.</p> <p>Answers could include: tends to produce quantitative data, easier to analyse data, make comparisons, replicate, easier for respondents to fill in.</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer 1 mark- appropriate strength of using closed questions identified but not explained 2 marks- appropriate strength clearly explained but not in the context of this investigation, or attempt to explain in context. 3 marks- appropriate strength clearly explained in the context of this investigation.</p>	[3]	
	(b)	<p>Explain <u>one</u> weakness of using closed questions in your practical project.</p> <p>The weakness of using closed questions is that the respondents cannot express themselves and there is no detailed qualitative data. Forced choice question not valid.</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer 1 mark- appropriate weakness of using closed questions identified but not explained 2 marks- appropriate weakness of using closed questions explained but not in the context of this investigation, or attempt to explain in context. 3 marks- appropriate weakness clearly explained in the context of this investigation.</p>	[3]	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
5	<p>Explain how using leading questions could influence the results of your practical project.</p> <p>Leading questions suggest a particular answer which biases respondents.</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer 1 mark- appropriate explanation identified but not explained. 2 marks- appropriate explanation of using leading questions lacks clarity, or attempt to explain in context. 3 marks- appropriate explanation clearly explained in the context of this investigation.</p>	[3]	References to demand characteristics must be in the context of leading questions.
6	<p>How could you ensure that your questionnaire would not cause too much distress to the participants?</p> <p>Participants are not asked for personal information about themselves or their behaviour but are asked for their attitudes. Give right to withdraw, not answer particular questions or include embarrassing questions. Obtain informed consent to participate. Confidentiality</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer 1 mark – a suggestion is made but not fully explained or in context. 2 marks- an appropriate suggestion is made and fully explained but not in context, or attempt to explain in context. 3 marks- appropriate suggestion clearly explained in the context of this investigation.</p>	[3]	Max 2 marks for answers which address distress already acquired eg debriefing

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
7	<p>Suggest a more appropriate sampling method you could have used to obtain participants for your practical project. Explain your answer.</p> <p>Candidates should have already described an opportunity sample and their alternative might be a random, stratified, self selected sample.</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer 1 mark – sampling method is identified but not fully explained or in context. 2 marks- appropriate sampling method is identified and discussed but it lacks clarity or is not discussed in relation to the practical project. 3 marks- appropriate sampling method clearly explained in the context of this investigation.</p>	[3]	
	Total	[40]	

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
SECTION B			
8 (a)	<p>Briefly outline the developmental approach to psychology.</p> <p>Candidates should outline the developmental approach. This is likely to be done by emphasising the importance of changes in behaviour through the lifespan. The description may include mention of typical areas of study including emotional and moral development and the development of thinking.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Identification of the approach which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The developmental approach may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent, expression poor. 2 marks – The main components of the approach are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to the developmental approach. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent. 3 marks – The main components of the approach are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the developmental 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 developmental approach. The candidate clearly understands the developmental 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>
(b)	<p>Describe <u>two</u> pieces of research that use the developmental approach to psychology.</p> <p>Candidates can use any piece of developmental 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: Bandura (aggression), Samuel and Bryant (children’s thinking) and</p>		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>Freud (Little Hans). Or any appropriate study from the A2 options if an appropriate link is made to the developmental approach.</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 one piece of research, a maximum of 4 marks only can be awarded.</p> <p>Do not reward evidence that does not use the developmental approach.</p> <p>Any research that investigates developmental 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>The answer must be competently structured and organised with explicit links to the developmental approach for a top band answer</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8 (c)	<p>Discuss the strengths and limitations of using the developmental approach to explain behaviour. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</p> <p>Examples as part b. Strengths may include the approach offers an explanation for individual differences at different ages, the usefulness of the research and its applications to social problems, the understanding of issues surrounding the nature –nurture debate. Candidates can give strengths of research methods if linked to the developmental approach. 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 the approach. 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 the approach. 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 the approach. 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 made relevant to the developmental approach.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the developmental 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	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional 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 the approach. 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 the approach. 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>	[12]	<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 accurately described impressive supporting evidence</p>
8	(d)	<p>Compare the developmental approach with the psychodynamic perspective. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</p> <p>Candidates may draw comparisons between the types of methods used and the types of data collected, approach to describing stages of development or may refer to issues and debates such as reductionism, determinism, ethics, usefulness, etc</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-2 marks – Explanation of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor.</p>	<p>Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the developmental approach and psychodynamic perspective without comparing them.</p> <p>Points of comparison may all be similarities, differences or both.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer will either be very brief or have a limited discussion.</p> <p>Max 2 marks for incorrect comparisons</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<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. Maximum would be 4 marks, if studies are not in the context of the approaches.</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 developmental approach and the psychodynamic perspective.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8 (e)	<p>Discuss how the developmental approach may provide evidence for the nature/nurture debate.</p> <p>Candidates may use any areas of the developmental approach to answer this question but must focus on the nature – nurture debate, eg the role of genetics versus the environment in the Farrington study of delinquency.</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 are peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is lacking detail and there is very little understanding evident. 3-4 marks – Discussion is reasonable. Range of supporting arguments is limited and has some organisation. Selection of arguments from a limited range of sources is vaguely related to the question and demonstrates some psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is inconsistent. Discussion has some detail and some understanding is evident. 5-6 marks – Discussion is very good. Range of supporting arguments is well balanced and is organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is logically related to the question and demonstrates very good psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is generally well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is good. 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 developmental approach without reference to its relevance to the nature-nurture debate.</p> <p>Do not credit evidence if it is not made relevant to the debate.</p> <p>Do not reward responses that describe evidence that refers to the nature-nurture debate but is not from the developmental 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 or points are related to studies rather than the developmental approach.</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 (from both sides of the debate) with supporting evidence.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks the candidate may have a well developed argument (from both sides of the debate) with 3 or 4 points without the use of examples. Alternatively they may take 2 or 3 arguments (from both sides of the debate) which are supported by psychological evidence from the developmental approach.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (a)	<p>Briefly outline what is meant by qualitative and quantitative data.</p> <p>Quantitative data is data where behaviour is measured in numbers or quantities. Qualitative data is data that cannot be quantified but it expresses a complete account of what people think or feel.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark- Identification of the issue which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a list). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The issue may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent Expression poor. 2 marks- 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 the issues. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent. 3 marks – The main components of the issue are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the issues. 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 the issues. The candidate clearly understands the issue in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts</p>	[4]	<p>No examples of qualitative and quantitative data 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. Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.</p>
(b)	<p>Describe <u>two</u> pieces of experimental research that collect quantitative data.</p> <p>Candidates may use any research that they have studied throughout the AS or A2 course where quantitative data has been collected eg Loftus & Palmer is experimental and collects quantitative data as estimated speeds, whereas Thigpen & Cleckley would not be credited as it's a case study. Quasi experiments and field experiments are acceptable.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-2 marks – Description is very basic (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Quantitative data may not be referred to at all.</p>		<p>Do not reward quantitative data that is not derived from experimental research.</p> <p>Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2. Do not reward experimental evidence which does not have quantitative data.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks one or two examples are given but are very basic.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression limited.</p> <p>3-4 marks – Use of psychological terminology is basic. The range of theories/studies described is limited. Description is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration/ uses of example/quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p>5-6 marks – Use of psychological terminology is mainly competent and the range of theories/studies is related to the question. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/ use of example/ quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is competent.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The range of theories/studies described is appropriate. Description is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. Quality of written communication is comprehensive.</p>	[8]	<p>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 quantitative 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 experimental examples should explicitly highlight the use of quantitative data.</p>
9	(c)	<p>Discuss the strengths and limitations of conducting experimental research which produces quantitative data. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</p> <p>Strengths may include the usefulness, ease of comparisons/analysis and reliability of findings. Limitations may include lack of descriptive, in depth data and so reducing the opportunity to explain behaviour, reductionist.</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 the issues. 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>Do not reward psychological evidence that is not experimental or does not have quantitative data. Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe experimental evidence without referring to the strengths and weaknesses of quantitative data. 7 marks max if candidates only evaluate the experimental method with no mention of quantitative data.</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</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	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 the issues. 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 the issues. 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 the issues. 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 the issues. 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>	[12]	<p>be named and the details may be inaccurate. Points may not relate to quantitative data 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> <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 accurately described impressive supporting evidence.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (d)	<p>Compare the experimental method with the self-report method. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer</p> <p>Candidates can compare on the basis of reliability, validity, reductionism, ethics, usefulness and more.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-2 marks – Explanation of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor.</p> <p>3-4 marks – Explanation of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/ studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p>5-6 marks – Explanation of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. 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>Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from experimental and self-report methods without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks. Candidates should make comparisons between methods and not studies.</p> <p>Points of comparison may all be similarities, differences or both.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer will either be very brief or have a limited discussion.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the experimental and self-report methods with well supported examples. Comparison must be explicit.</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 comparisons with supporting evidence. Comparisons must be explicit.</p>

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (e)	<p>Discuss the usefulness of psychological research that collects <i>qualitative</i> data.</p> <p>Usefulness includes the fact that qualitative data represents the true complexities of human behavior and gains access to thoughts and feelings that are not present in other kinds of data. Qualitative data is useful as it gives us explanations for behaviour, and is detailed and descriptive.</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 are peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is limited and lacking detail. 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. 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. 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>	[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 the usefulness of research producing qualitative data.</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