

GCE

Psychology

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

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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 2015

Abbreviations, annotations and conventions used in the detailed Mark Scheme

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

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

| Section A | | | |
|-----------------|--|------|--|
| Question Number | Answer | Mark | Additional 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 is given 1 mark – an appropriate null hypothesis has been framed but it is not operationalised, OR an operationalised hypothesis is framed but it does not follow logically from the research question eg <i>There will be no significant difference in the memory between those who have lie detection training and those who don't.</i> 2 marks – an appropriate null hypothesis has been framed but it is not clearly operationalised eg <i>There is no significant difference in lie detection between those trained with photographs of the faces of suspects telling lies and those who have not been trained.</i> 3 marks – an appropriate null hypothesis has been framed and it is clearly operationalised eg <i>There is no significant difference in lie detection scored out of 10 between those trained with photographs of the faces of suspects telling lies and those who have not been trained.</i></p> | [3] | <p>Do not reward an alternate hypothesis or hypothesis that predicts a correlation.</p> <p>The word significant is not required for full marks.</p> <p>If the answer has one of the variables fully operationalised and not the other it can be given 2 marks.</p> <p>If the answer is not clearly worded it should be given 2 marks</p> |
| 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, a description of the test or training task with examples, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings.</p> | | |

| Question Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|---|-------------|--|
| | <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>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, 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:</p> <p>1-2 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question or it fulfils the criteria for a repeated measures 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>3-4 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question ie .is a repeated measures 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> | [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 description that is not a repeated measures design or not an experiment.</p> <p>The bottom band may be used for answers where the design is unclear and /or data collected is not at least ordinal level.</p> <p>3-4 marks may be given if it is not explicit that the design is repeated measures.</p> |

| Question Number | | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|------------|--|------------|---|
| | | 5-6 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question and is pragmatic and ethical. The description is clear, coherent and detailed. | [6] | |
| 3 | | One advantage would be that the experimental method gives a high degree of control over extraneous variables and so a cause effect relationship can be inferred. 0 marks – incorrect answer 1 mark - advantage identified 2 marks – advantage identified and explained 3 marks – advantage and explained in the context of this practical. | [3] | Any other creditworthy advantage is acceptable. For example the advantage of a field experiment can be high in ecological validity. |
| 4 | (a) | The reasons given will include: test of difference, using at least ordinal level data and with a repeated measures design. 0 marks – incorrect answer 1 mark – one reason clearly identified 2 marks – two reasons clearly identified but no context given 3 marks - two reasons clearly identified in the context of this practical project. | [3] | |
| | (b) | A type one error is when the null hypothesis is rejected (experimental hypothesis accepted) when in fact the difference was due to chance and the null hypothesis should have been accepted/ the experimental hypothesis should have been rejected. 0 marks – incorrect answer. 1 mark – incomplete answer, brief and unclear. 2 marks – correct answer, but not fully explained or not in the context of the practical. 3 marks – fully explained answer in context of practical. | [3] | For 3 marks the description must be in context. |

| Question Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|---|------|--|
| 5 | <p>A weakness of opportunity sampling could be that the sample is not representative of the target population and a self-selected sample could be biased. If a random sample is used it might be difficult to obtain.</p> <p>0 marks- no or irrelevant answer 1 mark- a weakness identified but not explained. 2marks – a weakness identified but not explained in the context of this practical project. 3 marks- a weakness identified and explained clearly in the context of this practical.</p> | [3] | Context needs to refer to the aim, the IV or DV |
| 6 | <p>Ethical issues can where appropriate include, informed consent, age of participants [over 16], confidentiality of the data, withdrawal, debriefing, avoiding stress, distress, harm or embarrassment to participants.</p> <p>0 marks- incorrect answer 1 mark – an appropriate ethical issue is identified 2 marks – an appropriate ethical issue is identified but it lacks clarity or the issue is not discussed in relation to the investigation. 3 marks – an ethical issue is clearly understood and discussed in relation to the investigation.</p> | [3] | A 2 mark answer may be very well described but if it makes no reference to the candidate's proposed practical it cannot get 3 marks ie it must refer to the aim, IV or DV. |

| Question Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|--|------------|---|
| 7 | <p>An alternative to using the repeated measures design is independent groups or matched pairs design.</p> <p>0 marks – irrelevant answer 1 mark – alternative design identified with no description 2 marks – alternative design identified and described but not in context 3 marks – alternative design identified and described in the context of the practical project.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total marks for question [40]</p> | [3] | Candidate may achieve 2 marks by clearly describing an alternative design in context but without naming it. |

| Section B | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|---|------|---|
| Question Number | | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
| 8 | (a) | <p>Candidates should outline the individual differences approach. This is likely to be done by referring to the differences between people such as personality, abnormality, or intelligence influencing our behaviour. They may say the individual differences approach is less about finding out the ways we are the same as one another but more about the ways we differ as individuals.</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 individual differences 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 individual differences 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 individual differences 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 answer is clearly related to the individual differences 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 Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|---|------|--|
| 8 | (b) Candidates can use any piece of individual differences research to answer this question. Research is expected to refer to the differences between people such as in their personality, abnormality, intelligence or cognition that influence our behaviour. Candidates are likely to refer to research such as Rosenhan, Griffiths, Thigpen and Cleckley, Watson and Rayner, Freud, Brunner, McGrath. Any relevant research must be given credit. 0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-2 marks – Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor. 3-4 marks – Definition of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. 5-6 marks – Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. | | Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2. Do not reward evidence that does not use the individual differences approach. Any research that investigates individual differences may be credited. If there is an imbalance in the quality between the two examples, identify the bands for the examples separately and then award a mark half way between the two. Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response. For one piece of research, a maximum of 4 marks can be awarded. Research into gender cannot be credited as an individual difference. |

| Question Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|--|------------|---|
| | <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> | <p>[8]</p> | <p>The answer must be competently structured and organised with explicit links to the individual differences approach for a top band answer</p> |

| Question Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|--|------|--|
| 8 (c) | <p>Strengths may include the study of abnormal behaviour being useful, the emphasis on individual differences enhancing our understanding of behaviour and the contributions gained from case studies. Limitations may include ethics of intensively studying individuals, limitations of qualitative data, possible misuse of findings or the limitation of samples..</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-3 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is basic. Range of points is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Points are not organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and demonstrates poor psychological knowledge. Sparse or no use of supporting examples from unit content. There is very limited or no argument arising from points. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is sparse and understanding may not be evident. 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. 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.</p> | | <p>Do not reward psychological evidence that is not from the individual differences approach. Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the individual differences approach without referring to the strengths and weaknesses. 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 Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|--|-------------|---|
| | <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p> <p>8-9 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good.</p> <p>10-12 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Range (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> | [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 well described impressive supporting evidence.</p> |
| | | | |
| 8 | <p>(d)</p> <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> | | <p>Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the individual differences approach and physiological 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 Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|---|------------|---|
| | <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 individual differences approach and physiological approach.</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 reliability and the physiological approach.</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 psychology without reference to its relevance to reliability and the physiological 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 which is reliable.</p> |

| Question Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|--|------------|--|
| 9 (a) | <p>Candidates should outline what is meant by reductionism. Reductionism reduces complex human behaviour to the simplest explanation. It is often described as an approach to understanding behaviour which focuses on one single level of explanation and ignores others.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1 mark – Identification of reductionism which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a list). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Reductionism may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression poor. 2 marks – The main components of reductionism are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to reductionism. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent. 3 marks – The main components of reductionism are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to reductionism. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good. 4 marks – The main components of reductionism are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The debate is clearly related to reductionism. The candidate clearly understands the issue 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.</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 Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|--|------------|--|
| 9 (b) | <p>Candidates can use any examples of research that are reductionist to answer this question. Laboratory experiments are relevant to this question.</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. Reductionist studies may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression limited. 3-4 marks – Use of psychological terminology is basic. The range of theories/studies described is limited. Description is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration/ uses of example/quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. 5-6 marks – Use of psychological terminology is mainly competent and the range of theories/studies is related to the question. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is 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. 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>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 reductionist.eg research that investigates multiple causes is not reductionist.</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 reductionist aspect may not be strongly emphasised/ the reductionist aspect 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 studies are deemed to be reductionist.</p> |

| Question Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|---|------|---|
| 9 (c) | <p>Strengths may include easier to study constituent parts, often using scientific methods. Weaknesses may include leaving out of important alternative explanations for behaviour, overly simplistic.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-3 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is basic. Range of points is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Points are not organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and demonstrates poor psychological knowledge. Sparse or no use of supporting examples from unit content. There is very limited or no argument arising from points. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is sparse and understanding may not be evident. 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. 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>Only reward psychological evidence that is reductionist.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe reductionist 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 relate to the specific research rather than about it being reductionist.</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 Number | | 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 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> |
| 9 | (d) | <p>Candidates may draw comparisons between the types of data collected, or may use evaluation issues such as reliability, validity, reductionism, determinism, ethics, usefulness, etc</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-2 marks – Explanation of terms and use of psychological.</p> | [12] | If more than one research method is compared credit the most effective one |

| Question Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|---|------------|--|
| | <p>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>For 3-4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the methods with well supported examples.</p> <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 Number | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|---|------------|--|
| 9 (e) | <p>Candidates may raise the following points in relation to the validity of the self report method: self report is valid as the questions have face validity and focus directly on the subject matter of the enquiry. It may lack validity if the participant may show demand characteristics and give socially desirable answers or not give enough thought to their responses.</p> <p>Candidates can argue either way for this question as long as they support their argument with relevant research.</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> | [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 self report</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> |

| Question Number | | | Answer | Mark | Additional Guidance |
|-----------------|--|--|---|------|---|
| | | | <p>7-8 marks – Explanation of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed . Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout) Quality of written communication is very good.</p> | | <p>For 7-8 marks the 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 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

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 2015

