

# OCR

Oxford Cambridge and RSA

**A Level Psychology**

**H567/01** Research methods

**MARK SCHEME**

**Duration: 2 hours**

**MAXIMUM MARK 90**

**This document consists of 22 pages**

**PREPARATION FOR MARKING ON-SCREEN**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant and training packages for on-screen marking: *scoris assessor Online Training* and the *OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the Instructions for On-Screen Marking and the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to scoris and mark the **required number** of practice responses and the **required number** of standardisation responses.

**MARKING INSTRUCTIONS – FOR MARKING ON-SCREEN AND FOR PAPER BASED MARKING**

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the scoris 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the scoris messaging system, or by email.
5. **Crossed Out Responses**  
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

**Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions**

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)

**Multiple Choice Question Responses**

When a multiple choice question has only a single, correct response and a candidate provides two responses (even if one of these responses is correct), then no mark should be awarded (as it is not possible to determine which was the first response selected by the candidate).

When a question requires candidates to select more than one option/multiple options, then local marking arrangements need to ensure consistency of approach.

### **Contradictory Responses**

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

### **Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only one mark per response)**

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. (The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)

### **Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth two or more marks)**

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

### **Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)**

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. Award No Response (NR) if:

- there is nothing written in the answer space.

Award Zero '0' if:

- anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).

Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.

8. The scoris **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**  
If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the scoris messaging system, or e-mail.
9. For answers marked by levels of response:
- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
  - To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

10. These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

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

## Section A: Multiple choice

Question	Answer
1	B
2	A
3	A
4	A
5	D
6	B
7	A
8	A
9	B
10	A
11	B
12	D
13	D
14	C
15	A
16	D
17	A
18	B
19	A
20	A

## Section B: Research design and response

Write an appropriate research aim for the study. [2]			
Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
21	Something like ... <i>The aim was to investigate what people do on a long journey</i> Or, <i>to investigate if there are differences in the behaviour of people of different ages whilst on a long journey</i>	<b>Max 2</b>	-Context = journey (including modes of transport – e.g. car, bus, plane, train etc), and/or any relevant related behaviours from the candidates suggested behavioural categories)  -Accept answers relating to an overall aim (e.g. <i>to investigate what people do on a long journey</i> ) or ones with a more specific focus (e.g. <i>to investigate if there are differences in the behaviour of people of different ages whilst on a long journey</i> ) etc
	Clearly written aim	<b>2</b>	
	Attempt to write aim	<b>1</b>	
	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	<b>0</b>	-For 2 marks, as a guide look for the ‘what’ (is being studied) and ‘where’ (e.g. mode of transport, such as train or car, or, just referring to a ‘journey’).  Example 2 mark response <i>To investigate if people read or text more whilst on a train, or</i> <i>To see what kind of behaviours people engage in to pass the time whilst on a journey</i>  -Some example 1 mark responses ... <i>To investigate boredom</i> <i>To investigate people on trains</i>  -Cap at 1 mark if worded as a question <i>(e.g. will people read more on a train or use at their phones?)</i>

**Explain how you would use the naturalistic observation method to conduct this research. Justify your decisions as part of your explanation.**

**In your answer, the required features that you must refer to are:**

- **participant or non-participant observation**
- **behavioural categories**
- **time or event sampling**
- **how data will be recorded during the observation**

**You should use our own experience of practical activities to inform your response. [15]**

<b>Question 22</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
------------------------	---------------	--------------	-----------------

\*The mark scheme is a little different when it comes to this question. What you are being **driven** by is the left hand column of the grid ('details of the required features (RFs)'). That is always your starting point and 'locator' for the appropriate mark band before considering the other two columns ('justification of decisions made' and 'reference to own practical work').

Level of response	Details of required features (RFs) included	Justification of decisions made	Reference to own practical work	Additional guidance
<b>Good</b> 12-15 marks	- <b>All 4</b> required features (RFs) addressed  -Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of <i>each</i> feature in context  - <b>Good</b> evidence of <b>application</b> of required features in context	- <b>Appropriate justification</b> of all decisions and <i>some</i> is contextualized  -Well developed line of reasoning that is clear and logically structured	- <b>Explicit</b> reference to own practical work and clear links between own work and the planned research for each required feature. e.g. specific mention of aim or procedural features  -For top band (good) 12 marks if just one RF linked, 13 marks if two, 14 marks if three and 15 if all four are linked  -If there is no explicit clear link between own practical work and <i>any</i> of the 4 required features caps the mark at 11 maximum.	-Context = journey (including modes of transport – e.g. car, bus, plan train etc), and/or any relevant related behaviours from the candidates suggested behavioural categories)  <b>RF1</b> To be regarded as having been 'addressed' there must be some description, and not just naming/stating 'participant', or 'non-participant obs' will be used. If observation technique incorrectly named, then counts as not addressed (e.g. claiming participant obs is used but actually describing non-participant)  <b>RF2</b> Sufficient here to identify / name the behavioural categories to be used (whether presented as a list or in a table)  <b>RF3</b> To demonstrate understanding must provide a definition, or must be a clear distinction between event and time sampling (e.g. for event sampling making it clear that each time every behaviour from the behavioural categories occur they are recorded and over what total time period – the entire journey, first half-an-hour etc). For time sampling if just saying for example 'record behaviour every 10 minutes' without explaining for how long (e.g. just at that moment, or for 30 seconds) at that interval = limited response here. If sampling named incorrectly, then counts as not addressed (e.g. claiming event sampling is used but actually describing time sampling)  <b>RF4</b> It is appreciated there may be some overlap here with what has already been discussed in relation to some of the other RFs already addressed. Typical responses here may include: ref to where the observer(s) will be positioned and what they will be doing whilst observing; use of a tally chart / system; covert or overt recordings; use of video etc
<b>Reasonable</b> 8-11 marks	- <b>All 4</b> required features addressed  -Reasonably accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of <i>each</i> feature  -At least <b>three</b> applications of required features in context  If <b>three</b> required features are addressed in detail and justified in context and explicit links made to own practical work award 9 marks	- <b>Some</b> appropriate <b>justification</b> of decision related to all four required features (8 marks if only three required features justified)  -There was a line of reasoning evident with some structure		
<b>Limited</b> 4-7 marks	- <b>Two</b> of the required features addressed in context  - <b>Limited application</b> of required features <b>OR</b> three or all four required features referred to but in a limited way (in context or not)  If one required feature addressed in detail and justified in context and explicit links made to own practical work award 4 marks	- <b>Attempt</b> to justify decision(s) but weak  -Evidence of some structure, but weak		
<b>Basic</b> 1-3 marks	- <b>One</b> of the required features addressed - <b>Weak application</b> of required features  <b>OR</b> more than one of the required features referred to but in a very brief and/or basic way	- <b>None</b> , or if present very weak		

Describe two things that may influence the inter-rater reliability of this study. [6]				
Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance	
23	Possible answers could include: clarity of behavioural categories; whether behavioural categories discussed / agreed beforehand; where observers are positioned; number of observers etc	<b>Max 6</b>	<p>-Context = journey (including modes of transport – e.g. car, bus, plan train etc), and/or any relevant related behaviours from the candidates suggested behavioural categories)</p> <p>-Accept answers that relate to things that would make inter-rater reliability low or high (or both)</p> <p>-Remember, inter-rater reliability is not the extent to which if the study was repeated the same findings would be obtained. It is concerned with the ability of two or more observers to look out for and record the same behaviours in the same way.</p> <p>-Nothing creditworthy for ref to the influence of situational variables, such as the time of day, length or journey or the number or types of people on the train in different carriages etc</p>	
	For each thing referred to that may influence inter-rater reliability			
	Clear, detailed response in context	<b>3</b>		
	Clear, detailed response but not in context	<b>OR</b> attempt in context		<b>2</b>
	Brief and/or weak attempt to describe something that may influence inter-rater reliability (whether in context or not)			<b>1</b>
	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information			<b>0</b>

Outline one strength and one weakness of using the naturalistic observation method in this study. [6]				
Question	Answer		Marks	Guidance
24	Strengths could include: participants likely to be unaware they are being observed; no restrictions on participants behaviour; sampling more natural behaviour; increased validity etc		<b>Max 6</b>	-Context = journey (including modes of transport – e.g. car, bus, plan train etc), and/or any relevant related behaviours from the candidates suggested behavioural categories)  -Lack of control over extraneous variables and the impact these could have on the findings is creditworthy here  -Re ethics and the use of 'consent'. Some ethical considerations are creditworthy, but using the issue of lack of 'consent' as a weakness is not really appropriate if the planned research is described as occurring in a public place – e.g. a train. Consent IS creditworthy as a strength in fact, where the point could be made that as it is a public place direct formal consent is not required.
	Weaknesses could include: recording data can be problematic; demand characteristics / social desirability IF people realise / become aware of being watched; ethical considerations etc			
	Clear, detailed outline of strength / weakness in context		<b>3</b>	
	Clear, detailed outline of strength / weakness but not in context	<b>OR</b> attempt to outline strength / weakness in context	<b>2</b>	-Reference to research not being replicable on its own without any elaboration (e.g. influence of an extraneous variable) is not creditworthy
	Brief and/or weak attempt to outline strength / weakness (whether in context or not)		<b>1</b>	-Example 1 mark responses could include just saying something like ...
The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		<b>0</b>	-High in ecological validity as a natural environment (coach journey) -strength is more natural behaviour can be observed -participants don't know they're being observed no control over extraneous variables  2 mark example High in ecological validity as a natural environment (coach journey) so common behaviours will be observed	

Describe two ways you would address the ethical consideration of 'responsibility' in relation to this study. [6]				
Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance	
25	Under the new (2015) BPS (British psychological Society) ethical considerations 'responsibility' in general refers to the general care of participants. More specifically it includes: <b>protection of participants</b> (ensuring participants are not harmed (mentally or physically); and <b>debrief</b> (informing participants about how and why the research was done afterwards (and sharing findings, need for deception if any used etc)	<b>Max 6</b>	-Context = journey (including modes of transport – e.g. car, bus, plan train etc), and/or any relevant related behaviours from the candidates suggested behavioural categories)  -Both points could be about (different) aspects of the same thing – e.g. two points about protection for harm in some way	
	Clear, detailed description in context	<b>3</b>		
	Clear, detailed description but not in context	<b>OR</b> attempt in context <b>2</b>		
	Brief and/or weak attempt to describe how to address the ethical consideration of 'responsibility' (whether in context or not)	<b>1</b>	-Responses referring to ethical considerations in general (e.g. deception, or keeping data anonymous etc) without explicit reference to how this could relate to 'responsibility' (e.g. protection of participants in some way) are not creditworthy	
	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	<b>0</b>	-Some example 1 mark responses ... <i>Debrief participants</i> <i>Ask if pps happy for their data to be used</i>  -If a candidate just identifies 'protection' and/or and 'debrief' then award 1 mark	

## Section C: Data analysis and interpretation

Calculate the mean rating of the importance of physical appearance for being in love given by males. Write your answer to two significant figures. [3]					
Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance	
26	(a)	157/20 = 7.85 The mean is 7.85, so to two significant figures = 7.9	<b>Max 3</b>	-Remember to check table of data presented in the question as some candidates may have written their answer here  2 mark = 157/20 = 7.85 (as not to two SFs)	
		Mean correctly stated to two significant figures with all workings shown	<b>3</b>		
		Mean correctly stated to two significant figures but with no workings shown	<b>OR</b> workings shown but mean not written to two significant figures		<b>2</b>
		Mean only stated but not to two significant figures			<b>1</b>
		The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information			<b>0</b>

Calculate the median rating of the importance of physical appearance for being in love given by females. [2]					
Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance	
26	(b)	1,1,2,3,3,3,3,3,3,3,4,5,5,5,5,5,6,6,7,7,9 The median is 4.5	<b>Max 2</b>	-Remember to check table of data presented in the question as some candidates may have written their answer here	
		Median correctly stated with workings shown	<b>2</b>		
		Median correctly stated but with no workings shown	<b>OR</b> workings shown without answer being stated		<b>1</b>
		The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information			<b>0</b>

What is the mode for the importance of physical appearance for being in love given by females? [1]				
Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
26	(c)	1,1,2, <b>3,3,3,3,3,3</b> ,4,5,5,5,5,6,6,7,9 The mode is 3	<b>Max 1</b>	-Remember to check table of data presented in the question as some candidates may have written their answer here
		Mode correctly stated	<b>1</b>	
		The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	<b>0</b>	

What is the range for the rating of the importance of physical appearance for being in love given by males and females. Show your workings. [4]				
Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
27	(a)	Males range = 5 (10-5) Females range = 8 (9-1)	<b>Max 4</b>	If not clear what refers to male and female (i.e. if just figures presented) cap 2  - *If a candidate has calculated the range overall (across males and females combined) correctly, and shown workings can be awarded 4 marks. For example, If some lack of clarity in either the labelling of what the figure presented refers to and/or the calculations cap at 2
		*Also accept answers from the alternative calculation for the range that includes +1 Males range = 6 (10-5(+1)) Females range = 9 (9-1(+1))		
		*Combined males & females (10-1) = 9 (or +1 = 10)		
		For each calculation of the range (i.e. for males and females) ...		
		Range correctly stated with correct workings shown	<b>2</b>	
		Range correctly stated but with no workings shown	<b>OR</b> correct workings shown without answer being stated or answer wrongly stated	<b>1</b>
		The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		<b>0</b>

Outline one conclusion from the calculation of the range for the rating of the importance of physical appearance for being in love given by males and females. [3]					
Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance	
27	(b)	For example... Females (range = 9) vary more than males (range = 6) in how much they think the importance of physical appearance is for being in a relationship. Males are more consistent, suggesting men are of the same or similar opinion that appearance does matter in terms of forming relationships than females.	<b>Max 3</b>	-Context = love (and things 'love related')  -Note: a conclusion is an interpretation of a finding (here the interpretation of the range). It is not creditworthy just to state findings again on their own  -Nothing creditworthy for conclusions based on other descriptive statistics (e.g. the mean), or incorrectly interpreting the range as an indicator average rating (e.g. claiming that females regard appearance as more important than males)  1 mark example <i>There is more variation in females than males scores</i> 2 mark example <i>There is more variation in females than males scores about physical appearance</i> Example 3 marks <i>Males are more consistent, suggesting men are of the same or similar opinion that appearance does matter in terms of forming relationships than females.</i>	
		Accept any other appropriate conclusion.			
		Clear outline of conclusion in context			<b>3</b>
		Attempt in context			<b>2</b>
		Attempt but not in context			<b>1</b>
The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	<b>0</b>				

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance																											
28	(a)	The answer presented as the $X^2$ value will vary slightly depending on how many decimal places are used at different stages of the calculation. Therefore ... accept the overall $X^2$ answer as anything between 5.0 and 5.02 (e.g. 5.0, 5.01278772, 5.012, 5.02) and to any number of decimal places	<b>Max 5</b>	<p>Rationale for allocation of marks ... As the expected frequencies are already provided, there are essentially four steps left to perform to reach the correct calculation. As there are 5 marks in total to be awarded, the breakdown is one mark for each step correctly performed, with the extra mark for showing all relevant workings.</p> <p>*Please note where candidates have calculated <math>X^2</math> cell-by-cell this is also creditworthy</p> <p>-Alternative ways of using the formula, providing it arrives at the correct cell value (expressed as a decimal or even fraction) and overall answer is creditworthy (e.g. some students who learn about <math>X^2</math> in different subjects may do this)</p>																											
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Step-by-step calculations for Chi square test</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Cell</th> <th>O-E</th> <th>(O-E)<sup>2</sup></th> <th>(O-E)<sup>2</sup> \ E</th> <th><math>\Sigma</math> (O-E)<sup>2</sup> \ E</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a</td> <td>5 – 8.5 = –3.5</td> <td>(–3.5)<sup>2</sup> = 12.25</td> <td>12.25 / 8.5 = 1.441</td> <td rowspan="4">1.441 1.065 1.441 <u>1.065</u> <b>5.012</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>b</td> <td>15 – 11.5 = 3.5</td> <td>(3.5)<sup>2</sup> = 12.25</td> <td>12.25 / 11.5 1.065</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c</td> <td>12 – 8.5 = 3.5</td> <td>(3.5)<sup>2</sup> = 12.25</td> <td>12.25 / 8.5 1.441</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d</td> <td>8 – 11.5 = –3.5</td> <td>(–3.5)<sup>2</sup> = 12.25</td> <td>12.25 / 11.5 1.065</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Step-by-step calculations for Chi square test					Cell	O-E	(O-E) <sup>2</sup>	(O-E) <sup>2</sup> \ E	$\Sigma$ (O-E) <sup>2</sup> \ E	a	5 – 8.5 = –3.5	(–3.5) <sup>2</sup> = 12.25	12.25 / 8.5 = 1.441	1.441 1.065 1.441 <u>1.065</u> <b>5.012</b>	b	15 – 11.5 = 3.5	(3.5) <sup>2</sup> = 12.25	12.25 / 11.5 1.065	c	12 – 8.5 = 3.5	(3.5) <sup>2</sup> = 12.25	12.25 / 8.5 1.441	d	8 – 11.5 = –3.5	(–3.5) <sup>2</sup> = 12.25	12.25 / 11.5 1.065
		Step-by-step calculations for Chi square test																													
		Cell			O-E	(O-E) <sup>2</sup>	(O-E) <sup>2</sup> \ E	$\Sigma$ (O-E) <sup>2</sup> \ E																							
		a			5 – 8.5 = –3.5	(–3.5) <sup>2</sup> = 12.25	12.25 / 8.5 = 1.441	1.441 1.065 1.441 <u>1.065</u> <b>5.012</b>																							
		b			15 – 11.5 = 3.5	(3.5) <sup>2</sup> = 12.25	12.25 / 11.5 1.065																								
		c			12 – 8.5 = 3.5	(3.5) <sup>2</sup> = 12.25	12.25 / 8.5 1.441																								
		d			8 – 11.5 = –3.5	(–3.5) <sup>2</sup> = 12.25	12.25 / 11.5 1.065																								
Correct calculation with all workings shown	<b>5</b>																														
Correct calculation of the sum of (O-E) <sup>2</sup> /E but with some or all workings missing	<b>4</b>																														
Correct calculation of each individual (O-E) <sup>2</sup> /E value	<b>3</b>																														
Correct calculation of each individual (O-E) <sup>2</sup> value	<b>2</b>																														
Correct calculation of each individual (O-E) value	<b>1</b>																														
The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	<b>0</b>																														
		*OR 1 mark for each set of calculations done correctly for each cell ((O-E) <sup>2</sup> /E) Plus 1 mark for overall correct answer ( $X^2$ value)																													

Using the extract of the tables of critical values for the chi square test presented below, what is the critical value at the 5% probability level for data collected in this study? [2]				
Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
28	(b)	The critical value is 3.841	<b>Max 2</b>	-If a candidate just circles the correct critical value in the table award 2 marks (as to be able to do this requires knowledge of what df to use)  -Award 1 mark if df = 1 is just circled on the table (so remember to check table)
		Critical value correctly stated	<b>2</b>	
		Degrees of freedom correctly identified as 1 but without stating the critical value from the table (or incorrectly stating the critical value)	<b>1</b>	
		The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	<b>0</b>	

Write the significance statement for the analysis performed on this data using the Chi square test. [2]						
Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance		
28	(c)	$X^2 = 5.01, df=1, p<0.05$	<b>Max 2</b>	Example 2 marks (written version) <i>As the calculated value is higher than the critical it is significant</i>  -Example 1 mark response <i>The null is rejected, and/or the alternative hypothesis is accepted</i>		
		<b>OR</b> In words e.g. this is a significant result (at the 5% probability level) because the calculated value of $X^2$ had to be equal to or exceed the table critical value (3.841) to be significant			<b>OR</b> written in words rather than a formal statement	<b>2</b>
		Correctly written significance statement (calculated value, degrees of freedom and probability level)				
		just stating $p<0.05$			<b>OR</b> weak and/or brief written response	<b>1</b>
		The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	<b>0</b>			

Using the data presented in the pie chart in Figure 1, calculate the ratio of how many people said that personality was the most important thing for love compared to those that said wealth was. Show your workings. [4]				
Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance	
29	Answer = <b>3:1</b>	<b>Max 4</b>	-Zero if ratio presented the wrong way round (1:3)	
	First, the number of people represented by 37.5% (who regarded 'personality' as most important for love) and 12.5% (who regarded 'wealth' as most important for love) needs to be calculated. This requires a knowledge of percentages. 37.5% of 40 = $37.5/100 \times 40 = 15$ 12.5% of 40 = $12.5/100 \times 40 = 5$ So the ratio is 15:5, which can be simplified to 3:1			
	Correctly stated ratio with all workings shown clearly			<b>4</b>
	Correctly stated ratio but with some or all workings missing			<b>OR</b> correctly stated ratio, but not simplified (i.e. left at 15:5) <b>3</b>
	Some correct workings shown			<b>2</b>
	Some correct workings shown but also with some that are incorrect			<b>1</b>
The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	<b>0</b>			

Evaluate the population validity of the data collected in this study. [6]						
Question	Answer		Marks	Guidance		
30	<p>In general, population validity is a form of external validity that refers to the extent to which the findings from research can be applied to other people who did not take part directly in the research.</p> <p>Examples of points that could be made here include: size of the sample (40) and how this affects generalising the findings to others; balance of males and females (20 males, 20 females in the sample); potential bias in the sample due to the use of the self-selected sampling method used (so only those interested in, or currently in, or out of love may have volunteered to take part etc). etc</p>		<b>Max 6</b>	<p>-Context = love (and things 'love related')</p> <p>-Accept positive and/or negative evaluation points as creditworthy</p> <p>-Do not accept as creditworthy any general evaluation points related to the methodology used in general (e.g. use of the self-report method etc)</p>		
	Clear evaluation with two or more points with some context (for 6 marks two of the points must be in context)				<b>5-6</b>	
	Clear evaluation with two or more points made but not in context	<b>OR</b> one clear evaluation point in context			<b>OR</b> two points, one in context one not	<b>3-4</b>
	Attempt to evaluate population validity (whether in context or not)				<b>1-2</b>	
	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information				<b>0</b>	

The discussion section of the write-up of a practical report includes a conclusion made from the analysis of the data collected. Outline one conclusion from the discussion section of any of your own practical activities. [3]				
Question	Answer		Marks	Guidance
31	Responses here will vary depending on the nature of what the candidate investigated in their chosen practical activity.		<b>Max 3</b>	<p>-Note: it is not necessary to know the full aim or hypothesis of the candidates chosen practical activity in order to be able to gain full marks here.</p> <p>-Must be a conclusion (interpretation of a finding) and not simply the presentation of results / findings. Cap at 1 mark max if just a finding(s) / result(s) presented</p> <p>For 3 marks there must be sufficient detail / elaboration. For example ...</p> <p>-The conclusion could be elaborated by suggestion of an application of the outcome of their study</p> <p>-An explanation of why the findings occurred as they did is another way of elaborating on their response</p>
	Conclusion clearly outlined in context		<b>3</b>	
	Conclusion clearly outlined but not in context	<b>OR</b> attempt to outline conclusion in context	<b>2</b>	
	Brief and/or weak attempt to outline conclusion (whether in context or not)		<b>1</b>	
	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		<b>0</b>	