

Psychology

Advanced GCE **G544**

Approaches and Research Methods in Psychology

Mark Scheme for June 2010

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

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

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

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

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

PREPARATION FOR MARKING

- 1 Make sure that you have accessed and completed the two training packages for on–screen marking:
 - a On–screen marking training
 - b OCR essential guide to marking.
- 2 Make sure that you have accessed and are familiar with the mark scheme for this unit on the RM Support Portal.
- 3 Mark the 10 practice scripts and the 10 standardisation scripts.

YOU MUST MARK TEN PRACTICE AND TEN STANDARDISATION SCRIPTS BEFORE YOU CAN BE APPROVED TO MARK.

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 50% and 100% marking 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 messaging system, or by email.
- 5 Work crossed out should NOT be marked.
- 6 There is a NR (No Response) option. Award NR (No Response) if there is nothing written at all in the answer space OR – if there is a comment which does not in anyway relate to the question (eg ‘can’t do’, ‘don’t know’) OR – if there is a mark (eg a dash, a question mark) which isn’t an attempt at the question. Note: Award 0 marks – for an attempt that earns no credit (including copying out the question).
- 7 The **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice scripts. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice scripts. **Please do not use the comments box for any other reason.**

For any questions or comments you have for your team leader use phone, the messaging system or e–mail.
- 8 If you have any **technical difficulties** please refer to the Instructions for On–Screen Marking from Home.

9 Abbreviations, annotations and conventions used in the detailed Mark Scheme

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct response
	Incorrect response
	Benefit of doubt given
	Unclear
	Not answered question
	Effective evaluation
	Attempts evaluation
	Context
	Omission
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	Good response (each plus =1 mark)
	Negative
	Use in conjunction with other annotations to highlight text
	Use in conjunction with other annotations to highlight text

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

10 For answers marked by levels of response:

- a **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
- b **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

Section A			
Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
1	<p>State an alternate hypothesis for your practical project. 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>0 marks – no hypothesis or a null is given 1 mark – an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed but it is not operationalised, OR an operationalised statement is framed but it does not follow logically from the research question eg <i>Stress is correlated with health.</i> 2 marks – an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed but it is not clearly operationalised eg <i>There is a positive correlation between stress (measured on a 10 point scale) and ill health.</i> 3 marks – an appropriate statement of the research question has been framed and it is fully operationalised eg <i>There is a positive correlation between stress (measured on a 10 point scale) and ill health measured by the number of days off work.</i></p>	[3]	<p>Do not reward a null hypothesis or hypothesis that predicts a difference or is not correlational.</p> <p>Full credit can be given for a one or two tailed hypothesis.</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>

2		<p>Describe the method you would use to conduct your practical project. There should be a clear description of the method. Details should include, where appropriate, the type of sample and the way it was selected, the allocation to groups, a description of the test or questionnaire with examples, or the observation schedule and criteria, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings.</p>		
2		<p>For replicability: 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 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. 9-13 marks – At the top end the investigation is fully replicable. The type of sample and the way it was selected, the allocation to groups, a description of the test or questionnaire with examples, or the observation schedule and criteria, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings are all fully and clearly described.</p> <p>For the quality of the design and its feasibility: 0 marks -the design is not appropriate to the research question and/or is not a correlation 1-2 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question and would not result in the collection of at least ordinal data OR it fulfils the criteria for a correlation and ordinal level data but does not logically follow from the research question. The description lacks clarity and it</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>It is not necessary for candidates to describe materials in full for a top band answer or explicitly refer to ethical considerations.</p> <p>Candidates who have put their data in categories can access the top band for replicability.</p> <p>The bottom band may be used for answers where the design is unclear</p> <p>3-4 marks may be given if it is not obvious</p>

		<p>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 and is a correlational design with the appropriate level of measurement but may not be practical [pragmatic] or ethical. The description of the procedure lacks clarity but it would be possible to conduct the investigation</p> <p>5-6 marks – the design should be appropriate to the research question and is pragmatic and ethical. The description is clear, coherent and detailed.</p>		<p>that data is ordinal level./or there is a significant breach of BPS ethical guidelines eg causing physical or psychological harm</p>
3		<p>Which inferential (non-parametric) test would you use to analyse the data? Give reasons for your choice.</p> <p>An appropriate test is identified with reasons to include ordinal level data and correlational analysis</p> <p>0 marks – incorrect answer</p> <p>1 mark - Correct identification of test</p> <p>2 marks – Correct identification of test with partial justification.</p> <p>3 marks – Correct identification of test with full justification.</p>	[3]	<p>Either Spearman's Rho or Pearson's product moment will be given credit.</p> <p>For full marks answer must include reference to ordinal level data and correlational analysis</p>

4	(a)	<p>Sketch a graph to present the data that could be collected. Scattergram drawn with 2 axes fully labelled 0 mark Diagram does not present data using a scattergram 1 mark –a scattergram with data shown but no labelling OR with labelling but no data OR labelling is unrelated to the research question 2 marks – correct diagram with partial labelling eg one axis only /fully labelled but no data 3 marks – fully labelled scattergram (title not needed and where both axes are labelled)</p>	[3]	No credit for bar chart or other inappropriate diagram. Drawing can be positive/negative correlation or no correlation.
	(b)	<p>What could this graph tell you about the relationship between the two variables? 0 marks – no relevant answer 1 mark – incomplete answer for example does not refer to either of the variables 2 marks – correct answer but some details are absent eg only one variable mentioned 3 marks – fully described answer in context</p>	[3]	0 marks for answers relating to difference data or data unrelated to the research 1 mark for general answer with no reference to variables 3 marks for general answer but in the context of the research question

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
5	<p>Explain <u>one</u> weakness of conducting this practical project as a correlation.</p> <p>Weaknesses identified may include a lack of ability to infer a causal relationship between the two variables due to lack of control of extraneous variables</p> <p>0 marks – incorrect answer</p> <p>1 mark – weakness identified with no explanation</p> <p>2 marks – weakness identified with limited explanation</p> <p>3 marks – weakness clearly identified and explained in context.</p>	[3]	<p>For 2 marks the weakness may be clearly explained but no context/ there may be limited explanation but in context</p> <p>For 3 marks the weakness must be described in the context of the practical project</p>
6	<p>How would you address any <u>one</u> ethical issue in the conduct of this project?</p> <p>Ethical issues can where appropriate include; informed consent, age of participants [over 16], confidentiality of the data, withdrawal. These can be addressed with debriefing, avoiding stress, distress, harm or embarrassment to participants, or by not revealing identity for example by using participant number rather than the name.</p> <p>1 mark – an appropriate ethical issue is identified</p> <p>2 marks – an appropriate ethical issue is identified and addressed but it lacks clarity or the issue is not discussed in relation to the investigation.</p> <p>3 marks – an ethical issue is clearly understood and addressed in relation to the investigation.</p>	[3]	<p>Candidates who give a way of addressing the ethical problem eg by debriefing without saying what the ethical problem is will get a maximum of 2 marks.</p> <p>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.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
7	<p>Outline <u>one</u> other way your research question could be investigated.</p> <p>Answers are mostly likely to refer to using a different method which may be an experiment, case study or self report method. However, an alternative correlation using different variables may also be appropriate.</p> <p>0 marks – inappropriate suggestion 1 mark – a further way is suggested but does not suit the research question or it lacks clarity. 2 marks – a further way is suggested which would appropriately investigate the research question, but it lacks clarity. 3 marks – a further way is clearly described which would appropriately investigate the research question.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total marks for question [40]</p>	[3]	<p>0 marks for suggestions unrelated to the research question.</p> <p>1 mark max can be awarded for answers which only suggest a change to the original sample, eg age or gender</p> <p>2 marks max where appropriate alternative is cited for just 1 of the 2 variables and the second variable is not mentioned</p>

Section B				
Question Number		Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(a)	<p>Using your knowledge of psychology, briefly outline the social approach to psychology.</p> <p>Candidates should outline the social approach. This is likely to be done by explaining the influence of other people on behaviour. Social situations rather than individual factors change behaviour and social groups (eg peer groups; family etc) affect behaviour</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 social 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 social 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 social 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 social 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.</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
8	<p data-bbox="255 272 309 304">(b)</p> <p data-bbox="409 272 1305 336">Describe <u>two</u> pieces of research that use the social approach to psychology.</p> <p data-bbox="409 357 1305 453">Candidates can use any piece of social research to answer this question. It is expected that they will draw from the list below but any relevant research must be given credit.</p> <p data-bbox="409 474 1279 537">From AS: Milgram (obedience), Reicher and Haslam (prison study) and Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin (subway samaritan)</p> <p data-bbox="409 542 712 571">Social studies from A2:</p> <p data-bbox="409 576 1290 671">From Forensic : Disrupted families eg Farrington, learning from others –Sutherland (1939), SCoPic studies looking at pathways into crime.</p> <p data-bbox="409 676 1256 740">From Health: social support eg Waxler-Morrison, hassles and life events eg Kanner 1981, self-efficacy eg Bandura</p> <p data-bbox="409 745 1267 873">From Sport: Aggression theories eg Berkowitz (cue theory), social loafing Latane 1979, audience effects including Schwartz and Barsky 1977, apprehension (Cottrell 1968). Also in motivation – techniques – intrinsic/extrinsic – Ryan and Deci 2000.</p> <p data-bbox="409 877 1279 1043">From Education: play eg Weikart 1993 and ability grouping Sukhmandan and Lee 1998, social roles Riley 1995, and all studies relating to student – student and student-teacher interactions. Eg Flander’s interaction analysis and Brophy and Good 1974 for teacher expectation.</p> <p data-bbox="409 1048 869 1077">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="409 1082 1272 1315">1-2 marks – Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor.</p>		<p data-bbox="1480 272 1957 368">Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 405 1921 469">Do not reward evidence that does not use the social approach.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 505 1957 569">Any research that investigates social processes may be credited.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 606 1957 772">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 data-bbox="1480 809 1957 904">Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 941 1912 1037">For one piece of research, a maximum of 4 marks only can be awarded.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>3-4 marks – Definition of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p>5-6 marks – Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p> <p>7-8 marks – Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	[8]	The answer must be competently structured and organised with explicit links to the social approach for a top band answer

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8	<p data-bbox="264 308 309 339">(c)</p> <p data-bbox="409 308 1294 403">Discuss the strengths and limitations of using the social approach to explain behaviour. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</p> <p data-bbox="409 443 1294 571">Examples as part b. Strengths may include the use of ecologically valid research, the usefulness of the research and its applications to social problems/ Limitations may include reductionism and the ethical problems of some research.</p> <p data-bbox="409 579 869 611">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="409 619 1305 914">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.</p> <p data-bbox="409 922 1294 1217">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.</p> <p data-bbox="409 1225 1294 1422">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 data-bbox="1485 308 2069 371">Do not reward psychological evidence that is not from the social approach.</p> <p data-bbox="1485 411 2045 539">Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the social approach without referring to the strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p data-bbox="1485 579 2045 643">Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.</p> <p data-bbox="1485 683 2069 874">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 data-bbox="1485 954 2069 1050">At 4-5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak.</p> <p data-bbox="1485 1225 2069 1321">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, detailed supporting evidence.</p>
8	<p>(d)</p> <p>Compare the social approach with the physiological approach. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</p> <p>Candidates may draw comparisons between the types of methods used and the types of data collected, 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 or evaluate evidence from the social 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 social approach and the physiological approach.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8	<p data-bbox="264 308 309 339">(e)</p> <p data-bbox="409 308 1189 371">Discuss how the social approach provides a situational explanation of behaviour.</p> <p data-bbox="409 376 1301 507">Candidates may use any areas of the social approach to answer this question but must focus on the situational explanation of behaviour, eg. the prestige of Yale university in influencing the degree of obedience in Milgram's study.</p> <p data-bbox="409 512 869 544">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="409 549 1301 743">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 data-bbox="409 748 1290 943">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 data-bbox="409 948 1245 1142">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 data-bbox="409 1147 1256 1342">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 data-bbox="1480 308 2011 438">Do not reward responses that describe features of the social approach without reference to its relevance to a situational explanation of behaviour.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 478 2047 609">Do not reward responses that describe evidence that refers to a situational explanation of behaviour but is not from the social approach.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 649 2069 780">For 1-2 marks the answer may be very brief or be very basic showing little psychological knowledge and understanding, or may be list like.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 820 2029 916">For 3-4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 956 2069 1086">For 5-6 marks there may only be 2 or 3 points discussed without the use of examples or 1 very well developed argument with supporting evidence.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 1190 2069 1385">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 social approach.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9	<p data-bbox="264 308 309 339">(a)</p> <p data-bbox="409 308 1305 371">Using your knowledge of psychology, briefly outline <u>one</u> ethical issue when conducting observational research.</p> <p data-bbox="409 395 1227 523">Ethical issues when conducting observational research include deception, consent, confidentiality, harm, debriefing, right to withdraw etc. Candidate may refer to covert and/or overt observations.</p> <p data-bbox="409 563 869 595">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="409 595 1283 730">1 mark – Identification of the issue which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a list). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Ethical issues approach may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression poor.</p> <p data-bbox="409 730 1272 898">2 marks – The main components of the issue are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to ethical issues. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p data-bbox="409 898 1238 1034">3 marks – The main components of the issue are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to ethical issues. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.</p> <p data-bbox="409 1034 1294 1201">4 marks – The main components of the issue are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The debate is clearly related to ethical issues. The candidate clearly understands the issue in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.</p>	[4]	<p data-bbox="1480 308 2045 371">No examples of psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 411 2045 507">A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant. E.g. ethical issue not relevant to observational research</p> <p data-bbox="1480 547 2045 643">A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding or be brief and simplistic.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 683 2067 850">For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer. For example it may describe consent fully but not be explicit about the context of an observational study</p> <p data-bbox="1480 890 1989 986">Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9	<p data-bbox="264 308 309 339">(b)</p> <p data-bbox="409 308 1126 371">Describe ethical issues raised by any <u>two</u> pieces of experimental research.</p> <p data-bbox="409 376 1301 472">Candidates may use any research that they have studied throughout the AS or A2 course where ethics is an issue. For example, from the AS course students may use.</p> <p data-bbox="409 477 1272 541">Milgram (obedience) and should discuss issues such as deception and psychological harm by giving examples from the study.</p> <p data-bbox="409 545 864 577">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="409 582 1301 710">1-2 marks – Description is very basic (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Ethics may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression limited.</p> <p data-bbox="409 715 1301 906">3-4 marks – Use of psychological terminology is basic. The range of theories/studies described is limited. Description is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration/ uses of example/quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate.</p> <p data-bbox="409 911 1279 1102">5-6 marks – Use of psychological terminology is mainly competent and the range of theories/studies is related to the question. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration/ use of example/ quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is competent.</p> <p data-bbox="409 1107 1279 1315">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 data-bbox="1480 308 1989 403">Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 408 1962 504">Do not reward evidence which is not experimental, for example Thigpen & Cleckley, Freud</p> <p data-bbox="1480 541 2013 643">Do not reward evidence where no ethical issues are raised or where incorrect or inappropriate issues are raised.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 679 2069 775">For 1-2 marks one or two examples are given but are very basic/ issues may be described without referring to research.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 812 2069 882">For 3-4 marks the examples will lack detail or only one example which is fully detailed.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 951 2051 1110">For 5-6 marks the evidence may be very accurate and detailed but the ethical issues may not be strongly emphasised/ the ethical issues may be strongly emphasised but the evidence may not be detailed.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 1155 2047 1251">For 7-8 marks accurate description of examples should explicitly highlight the way in which the ethical issues are raised</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9 (c)	<p>Discuss the strengths and limitations of conducting psychological research which raises ethical issues. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</p> <p>Strengths may include the usefulness of findings and insight gained by participants. Limitations may include harm to participants and to the reputation of psychological research.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p>1-3 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is basic. Range of points is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Points are not organised into issues. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and demonstrates poor psychological knowledge. Sparse or no use of supporting examples from unit content. There is very limited or no argument arising from points. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is sparse and understanding may not be evident.</p> <p>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. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates limited psychological knowledge. Poor use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is sparse. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sparse. Evaluation is lacking in detail and understanding is sparse.</p> <p>6-7 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Range of points limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised into issues. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited.</p>		<p>Do not reward psychological evidence that does not raise ethical issues.</p> <p>Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence that has ethical issues 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.</p> <p>At 4-5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak. Points may not relate to ethics but to the specific research.</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. 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. 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>
9	(d)	<p>Compare the experimental and observational methods. Use examples of psychological research to support your answer.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the manipulation of variables in the experimental method and lack of control in the observational method. Reference may be made to drawing causative inferences for experimental and establishing correlations for observational.</p> <p>0 marks – No or irrelevant answer. 1-2 marks – Explanation of terms and use of psychological</p>		<p>Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe or evaluate evidence from the experimental and observational methods without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks.</p>

Question Number	Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>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>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 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	<p data-bbox="264 308 309 339">(e)</p> <p data-bbox="394 308 1308 371">Discuss whether it is possible to conduct psychological research that is completely ethical.</p> <p data-bbox="394 376 1245 440">Candidates can argue either way for this question as long as they support their argument with relevant research.</p> <p data-bbox="394 445 851 477">0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.</p> <p data-bbox="394 481 1308 673">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 data-bbox="394 678 1317 869">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 data-bbox="394 874 1323 1066">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 data-bbox="394 1070 1308 1278">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 data-bbox="1480 308 2051 539">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 ethics. Candidates who simply write a list of ethical issues unsupported by argument should not be above bottom band.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 715 2051 810">For 3-4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 914 2063 1050">For 5-6 marks there may only be 2 or 3 points discussed without the use of examples or 1 very well developed argument with supporting evidence.</p> <p data-bbox="1480 1121 2063 1321">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

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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



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