

**GCE**

**Psychology**

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

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2014**

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

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

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
















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

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

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

© OCR 2014

Abbreviations, annotations and conventions used in the detailed Mark Scheme

Annotation	Meaning
	Blank Page – this annotation <b>must</b> be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
	Correct response
	Incorrect response
	Benefit of doubt given
	Unclear
	Not answered question
	Effective evaluation
	Attempts evaluation
	Context
	Omission
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	Good response (each plus =1 mark)
	Negative
	Use in conjunction with other annotations to highlight text
	Use in conjunction with other annotations to highlight text

Highlighting is also available to highlight any particular points on the script

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
1	<p>The hypothesis should follow logically from the research question and be operationalised so that it is clear what is being measured and how it would be measured.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed and it is clearly operationalised eg <i>There is no significant difference in score out of 10 on accuracy of flute playing between those performing alone or with an audience of 10 people.</i></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed but it is not clearly operationalised eg <i>There is no significant difference in musical performance between those performing alone or with an audience of 10 people.</i></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – 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 eg <i>There will be no significant difference between those who are with others or not in their musical performance.</i></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – no hypothesis or an alternate hypothesis is given</p>	[3]	<p>Do not reward an alternate hypothesis, a one-tailed hypothesis or a hypothesis that predicts a correlation.</p> <p>Must be a two tailed hypothesis.</p> <p>The word significant is not required for full marks.</p> <p>If the answer has one of the variable fully operationalised and not the other it can be given 2 marks.</p>
2	<p>There should be a clear description of the method. Details should include the type of sample and the way it was selected, the allocation to groups, description of the research design, a description of the test/task/procedure with examples, the conditions and timing, method of measuring observable behaviour.</p> <p><b>For replicability:</b></p> <p><b>9-13 marks</b> – At the top end the investigation is fully replicable. The type of sample and the way it was selected, the 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>At the top of the 9-13 band all the criteria in the band must be met. At the bottom of the 9-13 band the sampling method and sample are clearly described but one of the other criteria (allocation to groups, conditions of testing including timing, where, what materials, who are the audience/others, when and how) also data collected, is not fully replicable.</p> <p>It is not necessary for candidates to explicitly refer to ethical considerations for this top band.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p><b>5-8 marks</b> – 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><b>0-4 marks</b> – The description of the sample, the way it was selected and the way participants were allocated to groups is <b>brief</b> and/or <b>unclearly stated</b>. Answers do not contain much <b>structure</b> or <b>organisation</b> and it is often difficult to understand what was done. There is <b>little or no use</b> of specialist terms. Examples of materials used are <b>missing</b> or <b>incomplete</b> as are details of the scoring, timing and conditions of the test</p> <p><b>For the quality of the design and its feasibility:</b></p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – the design should be appropriate to the research question and is pragmatic and ethical. The description is clear, coherent and detailed.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – the design should be appropriate to the research question but it may not be practical [pragmatic] or ethical. The description of the procedure lacks clarity but it would be possible to conduct the investigation.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – the design should be appropriate to the research question and it fulfils the criteria for an independent groups design but does not logically follow from the research question. The description lacks clarity and it would be difficult to conduct the investigation from the description of the procedure.</p>		<p>At the top of the 5-8 band details of the sample and sampling method are not fully replicable. At the bottom of the 5-8 band one or more of the other criteria are not replicable.</p> <p>At the top of the 0-4 band there is some description of sample or sampling method. At the bottom of this band there is very little creditworthy material.</p> <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>5-6 there should be explicit use of an independent groups design and observable behaviour is measured.</p> <p>3-4 marks may be given if it is not explicit that the design is independent groups <b>or</b> that observable behaviour is being measured directly.</p> <p>The bottom band may be used for answers where the design is unclear.</p> <p>No marks for a very unethical procedure or the method is non-experimental.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance	
3	<p>One advantage would be that the experimental method has a high degree of control over extraneous participant variables/ produces reliable results/is replicable.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – advantage clearly outlined in the context of this practical  <b>2 marks</b> – advantage clearly outlined but not in context/outlined in context but not clear.  <b>1 mark</b> – advantage outlined.  <b>0 marks</b> – incorrect answer</p>	<b>[3]</b>	Any other creditworthy advantage is acceptable. Context will usually be from the IV or the DV referring to some aspect of the project.	
4	a	<p>Answers may focus on lack of order effects and ability to use the same materials in both conditions. Answers must be in the context of the practical project for top band.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – Strength explained clearly in the context of the practical  <b>2 marks</b> – Strength explained clearly but not in the context of the practical/strength explained in context but not clearly  <b>1 mark</b> – strength explained briefly but not clearly or in context.  <b>0 marks</b> – no or irrelevant answer</p>	<b>[3]</b>	Context will usually be from the IV or the DV. referring to some aspect of the project.
	b	<p>Answers may focus on individual differences interfering with the experimental effect or difficulty of obtaining participants.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – weakness explained clearly in the context of the practical  <b>2 marks</b> – weakness explained clearly but not in the context of the practical/weakness explained in context but not clearly  <b>1 mark</b> – weakness identified and discussed briefly but not clearly.  <b>0 marks</b> – no or irrelevant answer</p>	<b>[3]</b>	Context will usually be from the IV or the DV referring to some aspect of the project.

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
5	<p>An appropriate statistical test would be the Mann Whitney U test if the data is ordinal level (or Chi-squared for nominal data) and the design is independent. The fact that it is a test of difference could also be given as a reason.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – correct test identified and full reason given for choice.  <b>2 marks</b> – correct test identified but limited reasons given for choice.  <b>1 mark</b> – correct test identified but no reason given for choice.  <b>0 marks</b> – no or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[3]</b>	<p>For 3 marks, the correct test in relation to the way the data was collected in the project. It must be named and at least 2 reasons given for using this test.</p> <p>For 2 marks, the correct test must be named and 1 reason given for using this test.</p> <p>For 1 mark the correct test has to be named.</p>
6	<p>Practical issues could be difficulties of obtaining a sample, issues of cooperation of participants, practicalities of equipment and measurement, weather etc.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – an issue is clearly identified and discussed in relation to the investigation.  <b>2 marks</b> – an appropriate issue is identified and discussed but it lacks clarity or the issue is not discussed in relation to the investigation.  <b>1 mark</b> – an appropriate issue is identified.  <b>0 marks</b>- incorrect answer.</p>	<b>[3]</b>	<p>No credit for methodological issues such as sample size, design, method or ethical issues</p> <p>Context will usually be from the IV or the DV referring to some aspect of the project.</p> <p>A 2 mark answer may be clearly discussed but if it makes no reference to the candidate's proposed practical it cannot get 3 marks.</p>
7	<p>The presence of others could be presented as eg other participants, other locations or the presence of an experimenter, co-actors or observers. Alternatively number of people present could be changed.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – appropriate suggestion is clearly made in relation to the investigation.  <b>2 marks</b> - appropriate suggestion is made but lacks clarity or the idea is not discussed in relation to the investigation  <b>1 mark</b> - appropriate suggestion is identified  <b>0 marks</b>- no or irrelevant answer</p>	<b>[3]</b>	<p>A 2 mark answer may be clearly discussed but if it makes no reference to the candidate's proposed practical it cannot get 3 marks.</p> <p>Context should be from the IV or the DV referring to some aspect of the project.</p>

Section B				
Question Number		Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(a)	<p>Candidates should outline the psychodynamic perspective. This is likely to be done by explaining the focus on unconscious processes and may emphasise early childhood experiences.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> – 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 psychodynamic perspective. The candidate clearly understands the psychodynamic perspective. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – The main components of the approach are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the psychodynamic perspective. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – 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 psychodynamic perspective. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Identification of the approach which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The psychodynamic perspective may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent, expression poor.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[4]	<p>No examples of psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks.</p> <p>Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.</p> <p>For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer.</p> <p>A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding.</p> <p>A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant.</p>



Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8 (b)	<p>Candidates can use any piece of psychodynamic 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: Freud or Thigpen and Cleckley</p> <p>Psychodynamic research from A2: From Sport: Freud's instinct theory to explain aggression From Education: theories of motivation</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Definition of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	[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 psychodynamic approach.</p> <p>Any research that investigates psychodynamic 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 Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8 (c)	<p>Strengths may include the focus on personality and other characteristics that define the individual, emphasis on stability of behaviour. Limitations may include reductionism and lack of context in explaining behaviour.</p> <p><b>10-12 marks</b> – Discussion (positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Range (eg two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced. Points are competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p> <p><b>8-9 marks</b> – Discussion (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>6-7 marks</b> – Discussion (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>	[12]	<p>Do not reward psychological evidence that is not about an individual explanation</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence of an individual explanation without referring to the strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p>At 10-12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with well described, impressive supporting evidence.</p> <p>At 8-9 marks there may be only 3 strengths/weaknesses, but these will be supported by very detailed examples.</p> <p>At 6-7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with more limited supporting evidence.</p> <p>At 4-5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak.</p> <p>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 Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p><b>4-5 marks</b> – Discussion (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><b>1-3 marks</b> – Discussion (positive and negative points) is basic. Range of points is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Points are not organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and demonstrates poor psychological knowledge. Sparse or no use of supporting examples from unit content. There is very limited or no argument arising from points. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is sparse and understanding may not be evident.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
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><b>7-8 marks</b> – Explanation of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout) Quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Explanation of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Explanation of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/ studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Explanation of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is</p>	[8]	<p>Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the physiological approach and psychodynamic perspective without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks, if studies are in the context of the approaches.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks there should be at least two points of comparison linked with evidence from both the physiological approach and psychodynamic perspective.</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 3-4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer will either be very brief or have a limited discussion.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance	
8	(e)	<p>Candidates may use any areas of psychology to answer this question but must focus on individual explanations and their usefulness. Better responses will argue on both sides of the issue.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Discussion is comprehensive. Range of supporting arguments is balanced and coherently organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is explicitly related to the question and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is clear and well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Discussion is very good. Range of supporting arguments is well balanced and is organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is logically related to the question and demonstrates very good psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is generally well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Discussion is reasonable. Range of supporting arguments is limited and has some organisation. Selection of arguments from a limited range of sources is vaguely related to the question and demonstrates some psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is inconsistent. Discussion has some detail and some understanding is evident.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Discussion is basic. Range of supporting arguments is sparse or not present. There is little or no organisation. Selection of arguments is poor and is peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is lacking detail and there is very little understanding evident.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[8]	<p>Do not reward responses that describe individual explanations of behaviour without reference to its relevance to their usefulness.</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> <p>For 5-6 marks there may only be 2 or 3 points discussed without the use of examples or 1 very well developed argument with supporting evidence.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks the answer may be very brief or be very basic showing little psychological knowledge and understanding.</p>

Question Number		Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9	(a)	<p>Candidates should outline two ethical issues and hence the restrictions they place on research.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> – The main components of ethical issues are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The debate is clearly related to ethical issues. The candidate clearly understands the issue in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – The main components of ethical issues are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the ethical guidelines. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – The main components of ethical issues are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to the ethical issues. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Identification of ethical issues which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a list). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The ethical issues may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression poor.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	[4]	<p>No examples of psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks.</p> <p>For 4 marks the issues should be named and described</p> <p>Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences</p> <p>For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer/ issues may not be named.</p> <p>A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding.</p> <p>A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant.</p>



Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (b)	<p>Candidates can use any examples of research that are unethical to answer this question. It is assumed that candidates will choose research which are predominantly unethical rather than having a few ethical concerns</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – 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> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Definition of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[8]</b>	<p>Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2.</p> <p>Only reward evidence which is unethical.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks accurate description of examples should explicitly highlight the way in which the studies can be considered to be unethical.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the evidence may be very accurate and detailed but the unethical aspect may not be strongly emphasised/ the unethical aspect may be strongly emphasised but the evidence may not be detailed.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks the examples will lack detail or only one example which is fully detailed.</p> <p>For 1-2 marks one or two examples are given but are very basic.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (c)	<p>Strengths include can see natural behavior with no demand characteristics and can be carried out in natural settings giving high ecological validity. Weaknesses include lack of reliability where behaviour is missed or misunderstood. It can also be unethical if people have not given consent to being observed.</p> <p><b>10-12 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Range (eg two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced. Points are competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.</p> <p><b>8-9 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p> <p><b>6-7 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Range of points limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p>	[12]	<p>Only reward psychological research that is observational.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe observational research 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 8-9 marks there may be only 3 strengths/ weaknesses, but these will be supported by very detailed examples.</p> <p>At 6-7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with supporting evidence that is more limited/ of peripheral relevance.</p> <p>At 4-5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak.</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.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p><b>4-5 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is limited. Range of points is limited (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates limited psychological knowledge. Poor use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is sparse. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sparse. Evaluation is lacking in detail and understanding is sparse.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is basic. Range of points is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Points are not organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and demonstrates poor psychological knowledge. Sparse or no use of supporting examples from unit content. There is very limited or no argument arising from points. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is sparse and understanding may not be evident.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		<p>Points may relate to the specific research rather than about it being observational.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (d)	<p>Candidates may draw comparisons between the usefulness, practicality, quantity of the data or refer to the reliability and validity of the methods.</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Explanation of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout) Quality of written communication is very good</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> – Explanation of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> – Explanation of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The supporting examples of theories/ studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/ studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> – Explanation of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is</p>	<b>[8]</b>	<p>For 5-6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the issues with well supported examples.</p> <p>For 3-4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor. <b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.		

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9	<p data-bbox="264 244 309 276">(e)</p> <p data-bbox="409 244 1305 371">Candidates may raise any appropriate points in relation to the ethics of the case study method. They may refer to the relationship with the researcher or the invasion of privacy by studying the individual closely.</p> <p data-bbox="409 379 1305 579"><b>7-8 marks</b> – Discussion is comprehensive. Range of supporting arguments is balanced and coherently organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is explicitly related to the question and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is clear and well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is thorough</p> <p data-bbox="409 587 1305 786"><b>5-6 marks</b> – Discussion is very good. Range of supporting arguments is well balanced and is organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is logically related to the question and demonstrates very good psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is generally well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is good.</p> <p data-bbox="409 794 1305 986"><b>3-4 marks</b> – Discussion is reasonable. Range of supporting arguments is limited and has some organisation. Selection of arguments from a limited range of sources is vaguely related to the question and demonstrates some psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is inconsistent. Discussion has some detail and some understanding is evident.</p> <p data-bbox="409 994 1305 1185"><b>1-2 marks</b> – Discussion is basic. Range of supporting arguments is sparse or not present. There is little or no organisation. Selection of arguments is poor and is peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is lacking detail and there is very little understanding evident.</p> <p data-bbox="409 1257 869 1289"><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>	<b>[8]</b>	<p data-bbox="1480 379 2067 579">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> <p data-bbox="1480 619 1966 746">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 data-bbox="1480 786 1966 882">For 3-4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 994 2067 1153">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 case study method or ethics.</p>

Total marks for question [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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2014

