

**GCE**

**Psychology**

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

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2016**

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 2016

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 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 hypothesis has been framed and it is clearly operationalised            e.g. <i>There will be a correlation between ratings of liking of a photo on a 10 point scale and ratings of their physical attractiveness on a 10 point scale.</i></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> - an appropriate statement of the hypothesis has been framed but it is not clearly operationalised</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> - an appropriate statement of the hypothesis has been framed but it is not operationalised, OR an operationalised statement is framed but it does not follow logically from the research question</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>- no hypothesis or a null hypothesis is given.</p>	[3]	<p>Do not reward a null hypothesis or hypothesis that predicts a difference.</p> <p>The hypothesis can be one or two tailed.</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, where appropriate, the type of sample and the way it was selected, a description of the test or questionnaire with examples, the conditions and timing, methods of testing, scorings or ratings.</p>		

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p><b>For replicability:</b>  <b>9-13 marks</b> – At the top end the investigation is fully replicable. The type of sample and the way it was selected, a description of the procedure, with examples of the materials, conditions and timing, methods of testing, scorings or ratings are all fully and clearly described.  <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.  <b>0-4 marks</b> – The description of the sample, the way it was selected and the way participants 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 as</b> are details of the scoring, timing and conditions of the test</p> <p><b>For the quality of the design and its feasibility:</b>  <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.  <b>3-4 marks</b> – the design should be appropriate to the research question ie .is a correlational design with the appropriate level of measurement but it is not practical [pragmatic] or ethical. The description of the procedure lacks clarity but it would be possible to conduct the investigation  <b>1-2 marks</b> – the design should be appropriate to the research question but would not result in the collection of at least ordinal data, <b>or</b> it fulfils the criteria for a correlation but does not logically follow from the research question.</p>	<p>[13]</p> <p>[6]</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>Start at the top band and move down to find the right band to fit the candidate's response.</p> <p>At the top of the top band, details of the procedure should include the setting and location, where the data is collected from participants individually or in groups and where data is collected from verbal or written responses.</p> <p>It is not necessary for candidates to refer to ethical considerations.</p> <p>For a top band mark data collected from the 10 participants must fulfil the criteria for a correlation.</p> <p>3-4 marks may be given if it is not explicit that 10 participants were used or if the number of participants was other than 10.</p> <p>The bottom band may be used for answers where it is not clear how 10 scores are collected.</p> <p>No marks for an unethical procedure or a design which describes a difference rather than a correlation.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
3	<p>Possible answers include: correlational research can be useful for studying variables that cannot be manipulated. It can show general trends and patterns in data so that further research can be conducted. Any other appropriate answer.</p> <p><b>3 marks-</b> an advantage in outline clearly in the context of this practical.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – an advantage is outlined clearly but not in the context of this practical project/ an advantage is outlined in the context of this practical project but not clearly.</p> <p><b>1 mark-</b> an advantage is outlined but not clearly or in context.</p> <p><b>0 marks-</b> no or irrelevant answer</p>	[3]	Do not credit answers that suggest an advantage is that one variable may influence/effect/cause another or that correlations reveal cause and effect.
4 a)	<p>Any appropriate different way to measure a variable can be described.</p> <p><b>3 marks-</b> clear description of alternative way to measure a variable given in context.</p> <p><b>2 marks-</b> alternative measurement described fully but not in context.</p> <p><b>1 mark-</b> alternative measurement described briefly</p> <p><b>0 marks-</b> no or irrelevant answer</p>	[3]	0 marks for answers unrelated to measurement of one of the variables in the practical project.
b)	<p>The evaluation could include eg the conditions under which it was conducted, demand characteristics, reliability and validity.</p> <p><b>3 marks-</b> at least one relevant evaluation point made in context</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – alternative measurement evaluated but not in context.</p> <p><b>1 mark-</b> very limited evaluation given.</p> <p><b>0 marks-</b> no or irrelevant answer</p>	[3]	1 mark max if answers in part a is irrelevant or inappropriate

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
5	<p>A sketch of a scattergram is expected. The scattergram should show 2 labelled axes and could be presented as a positive, negative or no correlation.</p> <p><b>3 marks-</b> Fully labelled scattergram (title not needed) where both axes are labelled and data is shown</p> <p><b>2 marks-</b> a scattergram with partial labelling and with data or fully labelled but no data</p> <p><b>1 mark-</b> a scattergram with data but no labelling or labelling is unrelated to the research question.</p> <p><b>0 marks-</b> diagram does not present data using a scattergram</p>	<b>[3]</b>	To be fully labelled either the label should include the rating scale or the axis should be scaled with numbers
6	<p>Personal questions could be avoided, debriefing, avoiding stress, distress, harm or embarrassment to participants. Also confidentiality and right to withdraw may be raised.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – a suggestion is made and clearly explained in relation to the investigation.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> - an appropriate suggestion is made but it lacks clarity or is not explained in relation to the investigation or several suggestions are made but not explained clearly/in context.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> - an appropriate suggestion identified</p> <p><b>0 marks-</b> no or irrelevant answer</p>	<b>[3]</b>	A 2 mark answer may be clearly explained but if it makes no reference to the candidate's proposed practical it cannot get 3 marks.

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
7	<p>An alternative sampling method could be random, self-selected, opportunity or any other appropriate method. This should be described in the context of the practical project.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> - an alternative sampling method is suggested and clearly described in the context of the practical project.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> - an alternative sampling method is suggested but lacks clarity or is not in context.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – an alternative sampling method is suggested but lacks clarity.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>- no or irrelevant answer or alternative sampling method has only been named.</p>	<b>[3]</b>	Do not reward a response that uses the same sampling method



Section B				
Question Number		Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(a)	<p>Candidates should outline longitudinal research methods. This is likely to be done by describing where participants are studied over an extended period of time to investigate change or development of behaviour.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> – The main components of the method are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The answer is clearly related to longitudinal research. The candidate clearly understands the method in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – The main components of the method are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to longitudinal research. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – The main components of the method are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to longitudinal research. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Identification of the method which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Longitudinal research 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</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 longitudinal research to answer this question. Any relevant research must be given credit. For example the case of Little Hans or Farrington's study of juvenile crime, Kanner-Daily Hassles, Cowpe -chip pan fires, McGrath 'Lucy'</p> <p><b>7-8 marks</b> – Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The range of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from 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 of theories/studies described is taken from 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 theories/studies 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 evidence that is not longitudinal eg Dement and Kleitman, Zimbardo Prison Study, Watson and Rayner Little Albert, Johansson Swedish Sawmill</p> <p>Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2.</p> <p>Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p>For a top band mark the answer must be competently structured and organised with explicit links to longitudinal research.</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>For one piece of research, a maximum of 4 marks only can be awarded.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8 (c)	<p>Strengths may include that participant variables are controlled as the same participants are observed, changes over time can be observed, large amounts of quantitative data and qualitative data, high ecological validity. Limitations may include waiting a long time for results and lack of generalisability.</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.</p>	<b>[12]</b>	<p>Do not reward psychological evidence that is not longitudinal research.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from longitudinal 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 10-12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with clearly 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>Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p> <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>		

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8 (d)	<p>Candidates should draw comparisons between the observational method used in the two approaches which may refer to the types of data collected, or may use evaluation issues such as reductionism, determinism, ethics, usefulness, etc. For example in the Social approach observational methods may be used to collect data on how situational factors influence behaviour. However, in the Developmental approach observations may be used to collect data on how dispositional characteristics such as changes in age influence behaviour.</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</p>	<b>[8]</b>	<p>Do not give credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the methods without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks, if studies are in the context of the observational methods.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks there should be at least two points of comparison linked with evidence from both the observational method related to the approaches.</p> <p>For 5-6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the observational method used in the Social approach and the observational method used in the Developmental approach 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 be very brief and may be inaccurate</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>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 are 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><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8 (e)	<p>Candidates may use any areas of observational research to answer this question but must focus on the validity of the research, eg. the ecological validity of participants observed in laboratory settings.</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>	<b>[8]</b>	<p>Do not reward responses that describe features of the observational method without reference to its relevance to problems of validity.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks the candidate may have a well developed argument with 3 or 4 points without the use of examples. Alternatively they may take 2 or 3 arguments which are supported by psychological evidence from the observational method.</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>The experimental method involves the manipulation of variables in order to find a cause effect relationship between the IV and DV. Field experiments are experiments that take place in a natural environment.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> – The main components of the method are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The debate is clearly related to the field experiment. 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 the method are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the field experiment. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – The main components of the method are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to the field experiment. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – Identification of the method which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a list). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The field experiment 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>	<b>[4]</b>	<p>Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.</p> <p>No examples of experimental research are needed in this answer to access full marks.</p> <p>For 4 marks the answer must mention manipulation of the IV.</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
9 (b)	<p>Candidates may describe any field experiments that they have studied during the AS or A2 course. For example Piliavin-Subway Samaritans, Rosehnan-Insane Places, Chaney-Funhaler, Fisher-Cognitive Interview, Meichenbaum-SIT, Mann &amp; Vrij-Liars</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> <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 evidence that is not a field experiment Cowpe-Chip Pan fires, Giffiths-gambling, Savage-Rumbaugh</p> <p>Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2.</p> <p>Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p>For a top band mark the answer must be competently structured and organised with explicit links to field experimental methods.</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>For one piece of research, a maximum of 4 marks only can be awarded.</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 may include high ecological validity, manipulation on IV hence cause and effect can be established. Limitations may include some lack of control of extraneous variables and issues with ethics.</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>	<b>[12]</b>	<p>Do not reward psychological evidence that is not a field experiment.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe experimental evidence without referring to the strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p>At 10-12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with clearly 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.</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>		
9	(d)	<p>Candidates may refer to the nature of the sample and length of study for example when comparing the case study in the individual differences approach to the case study in the developmental approach. Candidates may focus on the different reasons for carrying out a case study of individual differences, compared to a case study in the developmental approach.</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</p>	[8]	<p>Do not give credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the case study methods without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks if not compared in the context of the approaches.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks there should be at least 2 points of comparison linked with evidence from the case study method, related to the approaches.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>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 unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No or irrelevant answer.</p>		<p>For 5-6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the case study method used in the individual differences approach and the developmental approach supported by 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 be very brief</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (e)	<p>Candidates may use any areas of psychology to answer this question but must focus on the generalisability of the case study method. eg the lack of large enough sample size to reflect nature of target population. Generalisability can also refer to the behaviour being studied, so a case study may be seen as generalisable if the behaviour is applicable to a range of people and/or because the methods may be more holistic.</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>	<b>[8]</b>	<p>Do not reward responses that describe features of the case study method without reference to its relevance to problems of generalisability.</p> <p>For 7-8 marks the candidate may have a well developed argument with 3 or 4 points without the use of examples. Alternatively they may take 2 or 3 arguments which are supported by psychological evidence from the case study method.</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>

**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 2016

