



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme January 2003

---

## GCE

### Psychology A

### Unit PYA3

---

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334  
Registered address: Addleshaw Booth & Co., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ  
Kathleen Tattersall: *Director General*

### Unit 3: Social Psychology and Research Methods

#### Quality of Written Communication (QoWC)

<b>2 marks</b>	The work is characterised by the <b>accurate</b> and <b>clear</b> expression of ideas, a <b>broad range</b> of specialist terms and only <b>minor errors</b> in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>1 mark</b>	The work is characterised by a <b>reasonable</b> expression of ideas, the use of a <b>reasonable range</b> of specialist terms and <b>few errors</b> of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>0 marks</b>	The work is characterised by a <b>poor</b> expression of ideas, <b>limited use</b> of specialist terms and <b>poor</b> grammar, punctuation and spelling.

#### Assessment Objectives One and Two

<b>AO1</b>	Assessment objective one = knowledge and <b>understanding</b> of psychological theories, terminology, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner.
<b>AO2</b>	Assessment objective two = analysis and <b>evaluation</b> of psychological theories, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner.
<b>AO3</b>	Assessment objective three = <b>design, conduct</b> and <b>report</b> psychological investigation (s) choosing from a range of methods, and taking into account the issues of reliability, validity and ethics, and collect and draw conclusions from the data.

1

Total marks for this question: 30 marks

(a) Outline one explanation of why people yield to majority influence and one explanation of why people yield to minority influence. (3 marks + 3 marks)

**Marking criteria**

People might yield to majority influence because they are unsure and want to be correct (informational influence). They might also conform so that they are liked and belong to the group (normative influence). Candidates only need present one of these, but in enough detail to attract 3 marks. Candidates who offer more than one explanation for majority influence should have only the best one credited.

People might yield to minority influence as described by the dissociation model (where the message becomes disassociated from its source and in so doing loses some of the negative connotation associated with the deviant minority position). Another explanation is Moscovici's dual-process theory. The majority first try to understand the minority's view, which in turn causes them to question their own views and may ultimately cause them to change or 'convert' to the minority view.

**Marking allocation**

For each explanation:

<b>3 marks</b>	Outline explanation of the social influence is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate may offer a detailed and accurate reason of why people yield possibly using psychological terminology, or with reference to explicit theory or research.
<b>2 marks</b>	Outline explanation of the social influence is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate may offer a less detailed and generally accurate account of why people yield.
<b>1 mark</b>	Outline explanation of the social influence is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> .
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline explanation is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may offer an explanation of why people yield to obedience) or the outline explanation is <b>incorrect</b> .

<b>(b) Describe the findings and conclusions of one study of obedience to authority. (6 marks)</b>
--

### Marking criteria

There are several studies that candidates may select, but it is most likely that they will choose one of those mentioned on the specification (i.e. Milgram, Hofling, Meeus and Raaijmakers). It is also possible to use Zimbardo's prison study as an example of how prisoners obeyed the guards. But candidates must provide findings that are related to obedience rather than conformity. However, candidates must be able to describe the findings from their chosen study and also the conclusions. For example, Milgram found that 65% of his participants continued to the full 450 volts, he concluded that it is the power of the situation that causes people to obey.

Candidates who describe more than one study should have the best one credited. Candidates who describe aims and/or procedures should not receive credit for this material.

### Marking allocation

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Description of the findings and conclusions of a study of obedience is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has covered findings and conclusions but not necessarily in the same amount of detail.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Description of the findings and conclusions of a study of obedience is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> . Alternatively, description of either the findings or conclusions of the study is accurate and detailed, i.e. partial performance.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Description of the findings and conclusions of a study of obedience is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . Alternatively, description of either the findings or conclusions of the study is generally accurate but less detailed.
<b>0 marks</b>	The description of the findings or conclusions is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate has described a study which was not concerned with obedience) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

**(c) Outline and evaluate some of the ways in which psychologists have dealt with ethical issues raised by social influence research. (18 marks)**

### Marking criteria

**AO1** credit is satisfied by an outline description of some of the ways psychologists have dealt with ethical issues raised by social influence research.

**AO2** credit is likely to consist of the effective use of this material to evaluate these ways. Commentary and analysis are also relevant to AO2

This question asks candidates to consider some of the ways ethical issues have been dealt with in social influence research. The broader application of social influence research can also receive credit. They could do this by considering the advantages or limitations of ethical guidelines such as those developed by the British Psychological Society (e.g. who exactly is governed by the guidelines, difficulties of enforcing the guidelines). Candidates could also evaluate more specific issues and show how psychologists have dealt with them, (e.g. deception, invasion of privacy, right to withdraw etc.) One way of evaluating the ways in which such issues have been dealt with is to consider the value of the research itself. As Aronson points out, sometimes it is even more unethical not to conduct research rather than to be constrained by the ethical guidelines.

Candidates may introduce further ways of dealing with ethical issues as a form of commentary/evaluation. The degree to which candidates use this material as part of a critical commentary, rather than simply describing alternatives, will constitute the effectiveness of the evaluation and hence the number of marks awarded for AO2. Candidates who offer no commentary may still be judged to have selected appropriate material and thus commentary can be described as ‘just discernible’.

### Marking allocation

#### AO1

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of some of the ways in which psychologists have dealt with ethical issues is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has outlined a number of ways in detail
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Outline of some of the ways in which psychologists have dealt with ethical issues is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has only described a few ways, or merely listed a set of guidelines.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of some of the ways in which psychologists have dealt with ethical issues is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> .
<b>0 marks</b>	The outline is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example not related to the ways in which psychologists deal with ethical issues) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

## AO2

<b>12-11 marks</b>	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on the ways in which psychologists have dealt with ethical issues and <b>reasonably thorough analysis</b> of the relevant points, which have been used in an <b>effective</b> manner, within the time constraints of answering this part of the question.
<b>10-9 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on the ways in which psychologists have dealt with ethical issues and <b>slightly limited analysis</b> of the relevant points, which have been used in an <b>effective</b> manner.
<b>8-7 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on the ways in which psychologists have dealt with ethical issues and but <b>limited analysis</b> of the relevant points, which have been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.
<b>6-5 marks</b>	There is a <b>basic commentary</b> on the ways in which psychologists have dealt with ethical issues with <b>limited analysis</b> of the relevant points, which have been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	There is <b>superficial commentary</b> on the ways in which psychologists have dealt with ethical issues and <b>rudimentary analysis</b> of the relevant points. There is <b>minimal interpretation</b> of the material used.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Commentary on the ways in which psychologists have dealt with ethical issues is <b>just discernible</b> (for example, through appropriate selection of material). Analysis is <b>weak</b> and <b>muddled</b> . The answer may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.
<b>0 marks</b>	Commentary is <b>absent</b> or <b>wholly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.

2

Total marks for this question: 30 marks

(a) What is meant by:

(i) obedience?

(ii) majority influence?

(iii) minority influence?

*(2 marks + 2 marks +2 marks)***Marking criteria****Answers might include the following:**

- The term ‘obedience’ refers to a type of social influence where the individual acts in response to a direct order from someone else who is an authority figure.
- ‘Majority influence’ or conformity refers to the way in which an individual’s attitudes, opinions and behaviour are affected by the attitudes, opinions and behaviour of the group (or the majority). This term is often used to describe an individual’s behaviour when they “go along with” the group because they do not want to appear different.
- ‘Minority influence’ is the term given to the type of social influence when a small group of people are able to persuade an individual (or group) to change their attitudes, beliefs or behaviour.

**Marking allocation**

For each term:

<b>2 marks</b>	Explanation of each term is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate may offer a detailed and accurate account of the term, such as given in the marking criteria.
<b>1 mark</b>	Explanation of each term is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . For example, the candidate may offer only a brief and/or lay interpretation of the term.
<b>0 marks</b>	Explanation of each term is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate may describe a research study of obedience rather than defining the term; or the candidate might merely state that obedience means to obey) or the explanation is <b>incorrect</b> .

**(b) Outline findings of research into conformity (majority influence).**

**(6 marks)**

### Marking criteria

The term research includes both theory and/or studies; candidates may receive credit for either approach. Although there are several studies candidates may offer, it is most likely that they will choose those on the specification (i.e. Sherif, Asch, Zimbardo). However it is important that candidates focus on the *findings* of such research; they will not receive credit for describing the procedures or the conclusions. The actual findings will depend on the studies offered. For example Asch found that on 32 % of the critical trials naïve participants conformed. It is also acceptable for candidates to outline the findings Asch obtained from the variations to his original research (e.g. the results of manipulating group size, the presence of a supportive colleague etc).

Candidates may report several findings from one study or may refer to a number of studies either approaches are acceptable.

### Marking allocation

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of the findings of research into conformity is <b>both accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has described a range of findings in detail.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Outline of the findings of research into conformity is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has only described a few findings.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of the findings of research into conformity is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> .
<b>0 marks</b>	The outline of the findings is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate has described the findings of research into obedience) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .



(c) “Some studies of obedience are criticised for lacking experimental validity, others for lacking ecological validity and others for lacking both.”

To what extent have studies of obedience been shown to lack validity?

(18 marks)

### Marking criteria

**AO1** credit is given for the description of issues of validity that are found in obedience research.

**AO2** credit is likely to consist of the effective use of this material in considering the problems raised by validity. Commentary and analysis are also relevant to AO2.

This question asks candidates to make some judgement as to the extent to which obedience research is valid. The quote points them in the direction of both experimental and ecological validity, although they do not need to mention these terms explicitly. Orne and Holland (1968) argued that Milgram’s research lacked experimental validity (the participants were not in fact deceived). They also argued that his experiments lacked ecological validity, since they were carried out in a laboratory. However, other studies suggest that the situation was very real to participants and that the experiment did not lack experimental validity.

Hofling’s study showed that in the real world nurses would obey a fictional doctor, suggesting that Milgram’s work was ecologically valid. (Although Rank and Jacobsen criticised Hofling for being unrealistic!) Other obedience studies can also be offered as long as they are used to consider issues of validity.

Candidates may introduce further studies as a form of commentary/evaluation. The degree to which candidates use these studies as part of a critical commentary, rather than simply describing alternatives, will constitute the *effectiveness* of the evaluation and hence the number of marks awarded for AO2. Candidates who offer no commentary may still be judged to have selected appropriate material and thus commentary can be described as ‘just discernible’.

### Marking allocation

#### AO1

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Description of issues of validity is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, candidates may offer detailed and accurate account of experimental and ecological validity in terms of obedience research.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Description of issues of validity is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> and/or <b>less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate may mention both experimental and ecological validity but not in much detail; or they offer a detailed account of either experimental or ecological validity.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Description of issues of validity is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> .
<b>0 marks</b>	The description is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example not related to obedience) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

## AO2

<b>12-11 marks</b>	There is an <b>informed commentary</b> on issues of validity and <b>reasonably thorough analysis</b> of the relevant psychological studies/methods, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner, within the time constraints of answering this part of the question.
<b>10-9 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on issues of validity and <b>slightly limited analysis</b> of the relevant psychological studies/methods, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner.
<b>8-7 marks</b>	There is a <b>reasonable commentary</b> on issues of validity but <b>limited analysis</b> of the relevant psychological studies/methods, which has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner.
<b>6-5 marks</b>	There is a <b>basic commentary</b> on issues of validity with <b>limited analysis</b> of the relevant psychological studies/methods, which has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	There is <b>superficial commentary</b> on issues of validity and <b>rudimentary analysis</b> of the relevant studies into obedience to authority. There is <b>minimal interpretation</b> of the material used.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Commentary on issues of validity is <b>just discernible</b> (for example, through appropriate selection of material). Analysis is <b>weak</b> and <b>muddled</b> . The answer may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.
<b>0 marks</b>	Commentary is <b>absent</b> or <b>wholly irrelevant</b> to the problem it addresses.

3

Total marks for this question: 30 marks

A Local Authority was concerned about the amount of under-age drinking in the area. As part of a long-term strategy to try and eliminate this activity they asked a group of Psychology students to help design a questionnaire to be used in a survey of local school children in the area.

The following is an extract from the questionnaire.

-2-	
4. Do you drink alcoholic drinks?	Yes/No
5. How many units of alcohol do you consume, on average, each week?	<input type="text"/>
6. What age can you legally buy alcohol in a pub?	<input type="text"/>
7. Why did you start consuming alcoholic drinks?	
.....	
.....	
.....	
8. For what reasons do you consume alcoholic drinks?	
.....	
.....	
.....	

(a) Outline one advantage and one disadvantage of using a questionnaire. (2 marks + 2 marks)

**AO2**

**Advantages of questionnaires:**

- A great deal of information can be collected from a large sample in a relatively short period of time.
- Large amounts of data can be generated relatively cheaply.
- Questionnaires can be administered by people who do not require much training, as many such questionnaires are self-explanatory.
- Both qualitative and quantitative data may be generated.

**Disadvantages of questionnaires:**

- People might not answer the questions truthfully.
- Social desirability can create a bias; i.e. people may give answers that show them in the best light, rather than answering honestly.
- Researcher effects can influence the respondent.
- If the questions are not clear, respondents may interpret them differently.

In this question there is no requirement to set the advantage/disadvantage within the context of the question; but if the candidates does do so it is *one* way of elaboration and hence obtaining an extra mark. However, it is not the only way and an answer that is not set within the context of the study but is elaborated may still receive 2 marks.

**For the advantage/disadvantage**

<b>2 marks</b>	<b>Accurate and detailed identification</b> of the advantage/disadvantage.
<b>1 mark</b>	<b>Brief or muddled identification</b> of the advantage/disadvantage.
<b>0 marks</b>	<b>No identification</b> of the advantage/disadvantage or <b>incorrect</b> identification.

**(b) Explain one reason why a pilot study should have been carried out in the context of this survey.**  
*(3 marks)*

**AO1 + AO3**

A pilot study allows the researcher to discover any potential problems in the design before the main study is carried out. For example, in this case, it would enable the researchers to check the clarity of the questions, the layout of the questionnaire etc.

If more than one reason is offered, only the first one should receive credit.

The answer must be located within the context of the study to attract full marks.

**Marking allocation**

<b>3 marks</b>	<b>Accurate and detailed</b> explanation of one reason for a pilot study in the context of this survey.
<b>2 marks</b>	<b>Accurate and detailed</b> explanation of one reason for a pilot study but not in the context of this survey. Or, the explanation is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>less detailed</b> .
<b>1 mark</b>	<b>Brief or muddled</b> explanation of one reason for a pilot study.
<b>0 marks</b>	No explanation or <b>incorrect</b> explanation.

- (c) (i) Identify one question in the extract above that would provide qualitative data. (1 mark)
- (ii) With reference to the question chosen in part (i), explain why this question would produce qualitative data. (3 marks)

AO1 + AO3

(i) Qualitative data is any information that is not in numerical form. Thus it can include data in the form of written words, speech, and pictures. Questions 7 and 8 give such data.

**Marking allocation**

<b>1 mark</b>	<b>Accurate</b> choice of question.
<b>0 marks</b>	No answer given or <b>incorrect</b> answer.

**(ii) For the explanation:**

In the extract above, Questions 7, and 8 produce qualitative data. In the case of Questions 7 and 8 the respondents are required to write their answers using their own words.

**Marking allocation**

<b>3 marks</b>	Explanation of why the chosen question produces qualitative data is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> and the answer is linked to the question.
<b>2 marks</b>	Explanation of why the chosen question produces qualitative data is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>less detailed</b> .
<b>1 mark</b>	Explanation of why the chosen question produces qualitative data is <b>basic, muddled and lacking detail</b> .
<b>0 marks</b>	Explanation is <b>inappropriate</b> or the explanation is <b>incorrect</b> .

(d) (i) Identify one sampling method that could have been used in this survey. <span style="float: right;">(1 mark)</span>
(ii) In the context of this survey, explain one reason for using the sampling method you have identified in (i). <span style="float: right;">(2 marks)</span>

**AO1 + AO3**

(i) Candidates should be able to state a method of selection e.g. random sampling, opportunity or convenience sampling, etc.

**Marking allocation**

<b>1 mark</b>	Appropriate selection of respondents identified
<b>0 marks</b>	No appropriate selection of respondents identified

(ii) For the second part of this question candidates should explain why the chosen method is appropriate and explain this within the context of this study. For example, an opportunity sample would be appropriate because the researchers could use those students in the target group (i.e. school children) that they have access to in the local area. Or the same group of school children could be the target group and using the schools registers a random sample could be selected; an unbiased sample is more desirable.

If the explanation for the sampling method is identified in part (i) this may be exported to part (ii) and receive credit as part (ii).

**Marking allocation**

<b>2 marks</b>	Explanation of selection is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> and in the context of this study
<b>1 mark</b>	Explanation of selection is <b>brief</b> or <b>muddled</b> ; or <b>accurate</b> but not in the context of this study.
<b>0 marks</b>	No appropriate explanation is given or <b>incorrect</b> explanation.

- (e) (i) The questions in the extract on page 3 can be criticised. Select one question and give a criticism of it. (2 marks)
- (ii) Re-write the question you selected so that it overcomes the criticism you identified in (i). (2 marks)

**AO2 + AO3**

(i) Each of the questions can be criticised in one way or another. For example, Question 4 is a closed question and does not allow the respondent to explain or expand their answer (they might drink wine at home with their parents on special occasions, but never drink in pubs!). Question 5 is difficult to answer if the respondent does not know how much one unit of alcohol represents and thus they may not be able to give an accurate answer. Both Questions 7 and 8 are fairly open-ended and might be difficult for respondents to answer. Such questions also generate a large amount of qualitative data that is more difficult to analyse.

**For the criticism:**

<b>2 marks</b>	The criticism of the Question is <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> .
<b>1 mark</b>	The criticism of the question is <b>brief</b> or <b>muddled</b> .
<b>0 marks</b>	No criticism is given or the criticism is <b>incorrect</b> .

(ii) The actual criticism chosen in (i) will determine the way in which the question is re-written, however if it does not overcome the criticism then it will receive zero marks.

If the candidate had stated that Question 5 was difficult to answer because school children might not know how much one unit of alcohol represents, one way of re-writing the question would be to provide a list of drinks and their alcoholic units to help respondents to calculate their intake.

**For the re-write:**

<b>2 marks</b>	The re-written question is <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> and overcomes the criticism identified in (i).
<b>1 mark</b>	The re-written question is <b>brief</b> or <b>muddled</b> or attempts to address the criticism identified in (i).
<b>0 marks</b>	There is no re-write of the question or it is <b>incorrect</b> (e.g. the candidate has written a completely different question).

(f) Describe two ways of making sure that this survey would be carried out in an ethically acceptable way. (3 marks + 3 marks)

**AO3**

Candidates should be able to show how the study could be conducted to ensure it is ethical. If a candidate offers more than two ways, examiners should mark and credit the first.

These could include ensuring that the respondents remain anonymous (especially since they may be admitting to illegal activities). Making sure that there is no invasion of privacy; informing all respondents of their rights to withdraw from the study. Since some of the respondents might be under 16, parental consent should be obtained. Given the sensitive nature of the study, respondents should also be allowed to withdraw from the study and to take their data with them.

If a candidate identifies a problem, but the solution is not appropriate to the problem offered, credit should be given to the part that attracts the most marks (e.g. ethical issue is right to withdraw, but way of dealing with it is to obtain parental consent).

**For each way:**

<b>3 marks</b>	Description of the way of making sure this study was ethically acceptable is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . (For example, confidentiality: making sure all participants' anonymity was respected and there was no way of knowing who had filled out the questionnaires by not writing names on.)
<b>2 marks</b>	Description of the way of making sure this study was ethically acceptable is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>less detailed</b> . (For example, confidentiality: make sure the children did not write their names on the questionnaires.)
<b>1 mark</b>	Description of the way of making sure this study was ethically acceptable is <b>basic</b> , <b>lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> .
<b>0 marks</b>	No description is given or <b>incorrect</b> description.



(g) Following the survey it was decided to conduct an observational study into under-age drinking.  
Outline procedures for carrying out such an observation. (6 marks)

AO3

**Candidates could consider several aspects of observational research:**

- How to record the data; for example are behavioural categories going to be used, or checklists/tally charts.
- How will the behaviour be sampled? For example will time interval sampling be used, or event sampling.
- Where will the observation take place?
- Will it involve participant observation or non-participant observation?
- Ethical considerations will also have to be considered (privacy of participants etc).
- Analysis of data is also an acceptable part of the procedures.

Credit will not be given for a description of the aims or anything else that is not part of the conduct of the investigation.

Examiners should be aware of a depth/breadth trade off in the question. Some candidates may offer many procedures but not in such detail, while others may only offer a few but in more detail.

**Marking allocation**

<b>6-5 marks</b>	Outline of the procedures is both <b>accurate</b> and <b>detailed</b> . For example, the candidate will have covered several of the procedures in detail.
<b>4-3 marks</b>	Outline of the procedures is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>less detailed</b> . For example, the candidate has offered a few procedures in less detail.
<b>2-1 marks</b>	Outline of the procedures is <b>basic, lacking detail</b> , and may be <b>muddled</b> and/or <b>flawed</b> . For example, the candidate has only offered very few procedures in little detail.
<b>0 marks</b>	Outline of the procedures is <b>inappropriate</b> (for example, the candidate has not described an observational study) or the description is <b>incorrect</b> .

## Assessment grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
1 (a)	6			6
(b)	6			6
(c)	6	12		18
<b>Total for Q1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>30</b>
2 (a)	6			6
(b)	6			6
(c)	6	12		18
<b>Total for Q2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>30</b>
3 (a)		4		4
(b)	1		2	3
(c)	1		3	4
(d)	1		2	3
(e)		2	2	4
(f)			6	6
(g)			6	6
<b>Total for Q3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>30</b>
QoWC	2			2
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>92</b>