



General Certificate of Education

Psychology 5181

Specification A

Unit 3 (PYA3R) Social Psychology and Research Methods

Mark Scheme

June examination - 2008 series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

**UNIT 3 (PYA3)
QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION (QoWC)**

| | |
|----------------|---|
| 2 marks | <p>The work is characterised by some or all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear expression of ideas • good range of specialist terms • few errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling • errors do not detract from the clarity of the material. |
| 1 mark | <p>The work is characterised by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reasonable expression of ideas • use of some specialist terms • errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling • errors detract from the clarity of the material. |
| 0 marks | <p>The work is characterised by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • poor expression of ideas • limited use of specialist terms • errors and poor grammar, punctuation and spelling • errors obscure the clarity of the material. |

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES ONE, TWO AND THREE

| | |
|------------|--|
| AO1 | Assessment objective one = knowledge and understanding of psychological theories, terminology, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner. |
| AO2 | Assessment objective two = analysis and evaluation of psychological theories, concepts, studies and methods and communication of knowledge and understanding of psychology in a clear and effective manner. |
| AO3 | Assessment objective three = design, conduct and report 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. |

Question 1

1 (a) Describe the procedures and findings of **one** study of minority influence.

(6 marks)

| Marking criteria | Marks | Performance descriptions |
|--|-------------------|--|
| <p>The two studies suggested on the specification are Moscovici et al and Nemeth et al. The former is the most likely one to be offered. <u>Moscovici's procedures:</u> the participants were all female and were divided into groups of six. Each group had four naïve participants and two confederates. They were asked to state the colour of slides, which were in fact all blue, but the shades of each slide varied. In the consistent condition, the confederates said that the slides were green all the time; in the inconsistent condition they said that the slides were green 24 times and that they were blue 12 times. <u>Findings:</u> In the consistent group, the participants agreed with the minority and said that the slides were green on 8.4% of the trials. In the inconsistent group, they agreed with the minority on 1.3% of the trials. In the consistent condition, 32% of the participants agreed with the minority at least once by saying that the slide was green.</p> | <p>6</p> | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation/outline description of the procedures and findings of one study of minority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of both procedures and findings (though not necessarily balanced).</p> |
| | <p>5-4</p> | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate description of the procedures and findings of one study of minority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate provides a detailed account of procedures, with only a brief mention of findings, or a balanced account of both in less detail. <i>Note: If only procedures or findings are given, maximum mark is 4</i></p> |
| | <p>3-2</p> | <p>Basic The candidate provides a basic description of the procedures and findings of one study of minority influence that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, only a brief account of either procedures or findings is given, or a very brief account of both</p> |
| | <p>1-0</p> | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate For 1 mark, the candidate provides a description of the procedures and findings of one study of minority influence, which is very brief/flawed and demonstrates very little knowledge. For 0 marks, the candidate provides an inappropriate description which fails to demonstrate any knowledge of the procedures and findings of one study of minority influence.</p> |

- 1 (b) Outline **two** explanations of how people might resist obedience.

(3 marks + 3 marks)

| Marking criteria | Performance Descriptions for each explanation |
|---|--|
| <p>Candidates are likely to choose from the following explanations, although other reasons for disobedience may also be relevant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feeling responsible: individuals can be reminded that it is they who are responsible for their actions, not the authority figure. Under these conditions, agentic shift tends to be reversed. • Disobedient models: i.e. seeing others refusing to obey may reduce obedience. • Reactance: attempts to restrict an individual's freedom can sometimes cause the process of reactance. The person fights even harder to be allowed to do what they want. • Knowledge: it has been shown that knowledge about the process of obedience may enhance people's ability to resist obedience. | <p>3</p> <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of how people might resist obedience that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, how the presence of disobedient peers helps the person to overcome all the binding factors that usually produce obedient behaviour.</p> <p>2</p> <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate explanation of how people might resist obedience that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, seeing someone else disobeying the authority figure helps the person to disobey.</p> <p>1</p> <p>Basic The candidate provides a basic explanation of how people might resist obedience that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, simply stating disobedient role models.</p> <p>0</p> <p>Flawed or inappropriate The candidate provides an explanation that is flawed or an inappropriate explanation that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of how people might resist obedience. For example, an explanation of why people resist majority influence.</p> |

1 (c) Discuss **at least two** criticisms that have been made of research into majority influence. (18 marks)

Marking criteria

AO1 credit should be given for outline descriptions of at least two criticisms

AO2 credit should be given for a commentary on these criticisms.

There are several criticisms of majority influence research that a candidate might outline.

- Ethics/deception: For example, Asch’s work was criticised for its use of deception. Participants were not told that it was a study of conformity.
- External validity: Asch’s work was carried out in a laboratory and therefore can be considered to be artificial.
- Historical bias: Perrin & Spencer’s work throws doubt on the validity of Asch’s original findings, they claimed that it demonstrated a historical bias; it was “a child of its time”.
- Population bias: Asch used only males and American males at that, making generalisations to other populations difficult.

For the AO2, discussion is a broad concept, so points of interest as well as other comments are acceptable. For example, it could be argued that without deception it would not have been possible to conduct such research. Also, the participants were debriefed and did not come to any harm.

Work by Doms & Avermaet found evidence to support Asch, thus disputing the historical bias.

Candidates could also consider cross-cultural research, for example by Smith and Bond in their evaluation.

Candidates need only offer two criticisms and if these are described in detail and used effectively, then full marks can be awarded. Examiners need to be aware of the breadth/depth trade off. If only one criticism is offered, partial performance will apply.

Some description of the studies is creditworthy as long as they illustrate the criticism.

| Marks | Performance descriptions | Marks | Performance descriptions |
|------------|---|--------------|--|
| | AO1: Outline of at least two criticisms of research into majority influence | | AO2: Commentary of criticisms |
| 6 | Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of at least two criticisms of research into majority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, there is a range or criticisms (breadth) or two but in detail (depth). | 12-10 | Informed commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent. |
| 5-4 | Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of at least two criticisms of research into majority influence description of research that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, a few criticisms are outlined briefly. <i>If only one criticism is outlined, this is accurate and reasonably detailed (max 4 marks).</i> | 9-7 | Reasonable commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. |
| 3-2 | Basic The candidate provides a basic outline of at least two criticisms of research into majority influence that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, one or more criticisms are identifiable, but with little detail. If only one criticism is outlined, this is less detailed but generally accurate. | 6-4 | Basic commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. |
| 1-0 | Very brief/flawed or inappropriate For 1 mark, the candidate provides an outline, which is very brief/flawed. For 0 marks, the candidate provides an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of criticisms of majority influence. | 3-0 | Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent. |

2 (a) Outline **two** explanations of obedience to authority.

(3 marks +3 marks)

| Marking criteria | Performance Descriptions |
|--|---|
| <p>There are several explanations why people obey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agentic shift (agency theory) where people move from an autonomous state to an agentic state. • Binding factors or gradual commitment, the order starts out small but gradually increases until it is too difficult to refuse (foot-in-the-door technique). • Situational factors such as in Milgram's studies "proximity of victim" or "presence of experimenter". <p>Other relevant explanations may also be offered.</p> | <p>3</p> <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation of why people obey that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, buffers make it easier to obey because they protect the person from having to see the consequences of their action and so they are more likely to follow the order.</p> |
| | <p>2</p> <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate explanation of why people obey that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, when the person is in the agentic state they are more likely to do what the authority tells them because they are not thinking for themselves.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> <p>Basic The candidate provides a basic explanation of why people obey that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, if the authority figure is legitimate.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> <p>Flawed or inappropriate The candidate provides an explanation, which is flawed, or an inappropriate explanation that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of why people obey. For example, explaining why people resist obedience.</p> |

- 2 (b) Explain **two** ethical issues that have arisen in social influence research. (3 marks + 3 marks)

| Marking criteria | | Performance Descriptions for each explanation |
|--|----------|--|
| <p>There are several ethical issues that may be offered, but the most likely ones are those identified on the specification; e.g. deception, informed consent and the protection of participants from psychological harm. However, other ethical issues (such as confidentiality, the need for privacy etc) are also relevant.</p> <p>There is no requirement to make the link to social influence research explicit (it is hard to imagine any ethical issue that would not be relevant in some way to SI research!)</p> <p>Debriefing itself is not an ethical issue; it is a way of dealing with issues such as deception and lack of informed consent. However, examiners should look carefully at such answers, candidates may have made a case for the need to debrief as a result of having done something unethical. Thus there may be some relevant material.</p> | 3 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed explanation for each ethical issue that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. For example, the candidate has given an explanation of deception that shows <i>why</i> this is an issue (e.g. it prevents fully informed consent being given, makes participants distrustful of future research participation).</p> |
| | 2 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate explanation for each ethical issue that demonstrates relevant knowledge and/or understanding. For example, the candidate gives an outline of deception, which shows weak or no understanding of <i>why</i> this is an ethical issue.</p> |
| | 1 | <p>Basic The candidate provides a basic explanation for each ethical issue that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and/or understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, simply identifying the issue, e.g. deception or informed consent.</p> |
| | 0 | <p>Flawed or inappropriate The candidate provides an explanation that is flawed or an inappropriate explanation that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of an ethical issue. For example, the candidate has described the procedures of a study that has been considered unethical.</p> |

- 2 (c) "We are influenced by other people all the time. Sometimes it is the smaller group, the minority, that influences us."

Outline and evaluate research into minority influence.

(18 marks)

Marking criteria

AO1 criteria are satisfied by a description of research into minority influence. Research may be studies and/or theories.

AO2 credit should be given for the evaluation of such research.

There are several studies that candidates might outline, but the most likely ones are those mentioned on the specification (Moscovici et al & Nemeth et al.) However, other studies are also acceptable. For example, Clark used the classic film "Twelve Angry Men" to investigate minority influence. Other research considered factors such as the importance of group size.

Theories are also creditworthy as AO1:

- Dual process model; compliance or conversion
- Social Impact model (Latane & Wolf)
- Theory of Social Cryptoaesthesia.

It is also possible to make a case for Asch's experiments to be relevant here. The naive participant in fact belongs to a rather large majority (i.e. people outside the experiment who if asked would answer correctly – the rest of society). Thus the confederates are a very small minority (people who give the wrong answer). If a candidate makes such a case then Asch's work can be credited. However, the case must be made **explicitly**.

The commentary can consider the methodology used in the studies. For example, most are laboratory based (lack ecological validity, demand characteristics, gender bias in Moscovici's experiment etc.) Ethical issues such as deception can also be considered as can the practical application of such research e.g. innovation versus status quo.

Since a lot of research compares majority and minority influence, any answers that include the former should not be ruled out. Candidates might make a case for the inclusion of such material as AO2.

2 (c)

| Marks | Performance descriptions | Marks | Performance descriptions |
|-------|--|-------|---|
| 6 | <p>AO1: Outline of research into minority influence</p> <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The candidate provides an accurate and reasonably detailed outline of research into minority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate has outlined Moscovici's research including details of the procedures, findings and conclusions.</p> | 12-10 | <p>AO2: Evaluation of research into minority influence</p> <p>Informed commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the time constraints for this part of the question, there is effective use of material to address the question and provide an informed commentary. • Effective analysis and evaluation of material. • Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. • The structure is generally clear and coherent. |
| 5-4 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The candidate provides a less detailed but generally accurate outline of research into minority influence that demonstrates relevant knowledge. For example, the candidate has outlined Moscovici's research, but with out the detail or the conclusions that were drawn.</p> | 9-7 | <p>Reasonable commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is appropriate selection of material to address the question, but this is not always used effectively to produce a reasonable commentary. • Reasonable analysis and evaluation of material. • A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. |
| 3-2 | <p>Basic The candidate provides a basic outline of research into minority influence that demonstrates some relevant knowledge but lacks detail and may be muddled. For example, the candidate has outlined one study of minority influence, with a brief outline of some of the procedures.</p> | 6-4 | <p>Basic commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a basic commentary. • Basic analysis and evaluation of material. • Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. |
| 1-0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate The candidate provides an outline, which is very brief/flawed, or an inappropriate outline that fails to demonstrate any knowledge or understanding of the topic. E.g., the candidate may identify the relevant study, "calling a blue slide green".</p> | 3-0 | <p>Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection and use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary, or commentary is absent or wholly irrelevant. • Analysis and evaluation just discernible or absent. |

Question 3

A group of psychology students decided to investigate possible reasons for unhealthy behaviours: they chose to focus on smoking. The students designed a questionnaire and gave it to other students at their university. The following is an extract from the questionnaire.

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Please circle the most appropriate answer. | | | |
| 1. Age: | Under 18 | 18-25 | 26 and above |
| 2. Sex: | Male | Female | |
| If you smoke, please answer the following questions. If you do not smoke, please go to question 6. | | | |
| 3. Do you smoke: | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
| 4. Why did you start smoking? | | | |
| 5. Have you ever tried to stop smoking and, if so, why did you fail? | | | |
| 6. Explain why smoking is dangerous to health. | | | |

3 (a) Outline **one** strength and **one** limitation of using a questionnaire.

(2 marks + 2 marks)

| Marking criteria | Marks | Marking Allocations for the strength/limitation |
|---|-----------------|--|
| <p>AO2 Note that the answers do not need to be in context for full marks. Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a great deal of information can be collected from a large sample in a relatively short period of time. • Questionnaires can be administered by people who do not need much training, as many questionnaires are self-explanatory. <p>Limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • If the questions are not clear, people may interpret them differently. | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and detailed Explanation of the strength/limitation is both accurate and detailed. For example, a strength is that questionnaires do not need to be given by specially trained people because the instructions are usually clear, so anyone can administer them.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic Explanation of the strength/limitation is basic, lacking detail and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, stating that people might lie.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect Explanation of the strength/limitation is inappropriate for example; the candidate may give a strength/limitation that is incorrect.</p> |

3 (b) (i) Explain what is meant by a *pilot study*.

(2 marks)

| Marking criteria | Marks | Marking Allocations |
|--|-----------------|--|
| <p>AO1 A pilot study is a small-scale study that is carried out before the main study, to check that the design is suitable and to discover and rectify any potential problems.</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and detailed A small study done before the main study. It is to overcome any possible problems in the method.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic A small study done before the main one. Or, it is a study to overcome problems</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect A small study to test your hypothesis, or a small scale study.</p> |

- 3 (b) (ii) Explain why a pilot study should have been carried out in the context of this investigation. (2 marks)

| Marking criteria | Marks | Marking Allocations |
|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>AO3</p> <p>The pilot study should have been used to check that the questionnaire was suitable. For example that the questions were clear and unambiguous. That the target population (university students) could understand the questions, that the language was appropriate, none of the questions were ambiguous etc. The researchers could also check the layout of the questionnaire, make sure that they leave sufficient space for the participants to answer the questions.</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and detailed</p> <p>The explanation of why a pilot study should have been carried out is accurate and detailed. For example, to make sure that the questions made sense to the university students and that they understood what each question meant, to see if any of the words were too difficult and to change them if they were.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic</p> <p>The explanation of why a pilot study should have been used is basic but lacks detail and is muddled. For example, simply stating to see if there is enough space to write.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate</p> <p>The explanation of why a pilot study should have been used is incorrect.</p> |

- 3** (c) (i) Identify **one** question in the extract above that would give **quantitative** data. (1 mark)
- (ii) Identify **one** question in the extract above that would give **qualitative** data. (1 mark)
- (iii) With reference to the question you have selected in your answer to (c) (ii), explain why it would produce qualitative data. (2 marks)

| Marking criteria | | Marks | Performance descriptions for identification of question. |
|-------------------------|---|--------------|--|
| AO3 | (i) Questions 1, 2 and 3 would produce quantitative data. | 1 | Appropriate Choice of question is correct |
| | (ii) Questions 4, 5 and 6 would all produce qualitative data. | 0 | Inappropriate/incorrect Choice of question is incorrect |
| AO3 | (iii) Qualitative data is any information that is not in numerical form. In the case of Questions 4, 5 and 6 the respondents are required to write their answers using their own words. | | |
| | | | Performance descriptions for explanation of why it generates qualitative data. |
| | | 2 | Accurate and Detailed The explanation is accurate and detailed. For example, Question 4 because the respondent would have to describe their reasons why they started smoking and it would be in their own words, their own feelings about why they began this behaviour. |
| | | 1 | Basic The explanation is basic, lacking detail, and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, Question 5 because their answer would be in words. |
| | | 0 | Inappropriate/incorrect The explanation is inappropriate or is incorrect. |

- 3 (d) (i) Identify **one** sampling method that could have been used and explain **one** limitation of this method. (3 marks)

| Marking criteria | Marks | Performance descriptions for sampling method. |
|---|-------|--|
| <p>AO1 The sampling methods identified on the specification are: random, opportunity and volunteer. However, other sampling methods are also creditworthy, e.g. stratified sampling, snowball sampling.</p> | 1 | <p>Appropriate Sampling method is correct.</p> |
| <p>AO2 Limitations will depend on the sampling method given; they can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not generate a representative sample • Can be time consuming • Might not get sufficient people • Only a certain sort of person volunteers and they might not be typical of the target population. • Researcher bias | 0 | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect Sampling method is inappropriate or incorrect.</p> |
| | | |
| | | <p>Performance descriptions for limitation</p> |
| | 2 | <p>Accurate and Detailed The limitation is accurate and detailed. For example, it is difficult to select a random sample because all the names of the target population are needed before hand.</p> |
| | 1 | <p>Basic The limitation is basic, lacking detail, and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, it might be biased.</p> |
| | 0 | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect The limitation is inappropriate or is incorrect.</p> |

- 3 (d) (ii) In the context of this investigation, explain **one** reason for using the sampling method you have identified in your answer to (d) (i). (2 marks)

| Marking criteria | Marks | Performance descriptions. |
|---|-----------------|---|
| <p>AO3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity sample – because it is fairly quick and easy to do, you just stand outside a lecture hall and ask the students as they leave. • Random sampling – because you could use the enrolment lists, so everyone would have an equal chance of being selected, get a computer to select the numbers and this would make it fair. • Volunteer/self selected – because then you would only get those people who really wanted to take part and they would be better participants than those who were made to fill in the questionnaire. | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and detailed The reason is accurate and detailed, for example, as given in the marking criteria.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic The reason is basic, lacking detail, and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, random, because then you could use the enrolment lists.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect The reason is inappropriate, for example, the candidate may give a limitation of the method.</p> |

- 3 (e) (i) The questions in the questionnaire can be criticised. Select **one** question and give **one** criticism of it. (2 marks)

| Marking criteria | Marks | Performance descriptions |
|---|-----------------|---|
| <p>AO3 Question 3 is difficult to know what the terms “rarely” or “sometimes” mean. They are not precise terms and may have different meanings for different people.</p> <p>Question 4 is open-ended and might be difficult for respondents to answer.</p> <p>Such questions also generate a large amount of qualitative data that is more difficult to analyse.</p> <p>Question 5 is a badly worded question (in fact is two questions in one) and difficult to answer.</p> <p>Question 6 might be considered a leading question, it presumes that the respondent will agree with the suggestion that smoking is indeed dangerous to health.</p> <p>Any other valid criticism would be credited.</p> <p>There are no marks for identifying the question, only for the criticism of it.</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and detailed The criticism is both accurate and detailed.</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic The criticism is basic, lacking detail and may be muddled and/or flawed. For example, (question 4) because it is hard to put it in words.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Inappropriate/incorrect The criticism is inappropriate for example; (question 1) because it gives qualitative data.</p> |

3 (e) (ii) Rewrite the question you selected so that it overcomes the criticism you identified in (i). (2 marks)

| Marking criteria | Marks | Performance descriptions |
|--|-----------------|--|
| <p>AO3</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For example, if they had criticised question 5 for being too complicated and not easy to answer because it was two questions. The re-written question could be: <p>Question 5 (i) Have you ever tried to give up smoking: yes/no (ii) if yes why do you think you failed?</p> <p>.....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A criticism of Question 1 could be that it is not specific enough. The re-written question could be: How old are you? | <p>2</p> | <p>Accurate and detailed Re-written question is both accurate and detailed. For example, as given in the marking criteria.</p> <p>1 Basic Re-written question is basic, lacking relevant detail and may be muddled and/or flawed.</p> <p>0 Inappropriate/incorrect Re-written question is inappropriate for example; the candidate has written a completely different question, or does not successfully overcome the criticism.</p> |

- 3 (f) Describe **two** ways of making sure that this investigation would be carried out in an ethically acceptable manner. (3 marks + 3 marks)

| Marking criteria | Marks | Performance descriptions for each way. |
|--|-------|--|
| <p>AO3 The ways could include ensuring that the respondents remain anonymous, especially as they are admitting to activities which may be regarded as socially unacceptable. Making sure that there is no invasion of privacy; informing all respondents of their right to withdraw from the study; data protection issues. Given the sensitive nature of the study, respondents should be allowed to withdraw from the study and to take their data with them.</p> | 3 | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The description is accurate and reasonably detailed. For example, confidentiality – making sure all the university students’ anonymity was respected by not including names and there was no way of knowing who had filled out the questionnaires and what they thought about smoking. (For 3 marks it must be contextualised.)</p> |
| | 2 | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The description is less detailed but generally accurate. For example, ensuring confidentiality – make sure the university students didn’t write their names on the questionnaires.</p> |
| | 1 | <p>Basic The description is basic but lacks detail and is muddled. For example, make it confidential.</p> |
| | 0 | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate The description incorrect.</p> |

- 3 (g) The questionnaire showed that 63% of the sample had tried to stop smoking. The students decided to conduct follow-up interviews to explore this issue. In the context of this investigation explain **one** advantage of conducting these interviews. (3 marks)

| Marking criteria | Marks | Performance descriptions |
|---|-----------------|---|
| <p>AO3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The students would be able to make sure that their respondents understood the questions and could clarify points if necessary. • There is scope for follow-up questions to enable the students to explore a range of reasons why people failed to stop smoking. • It is often easier to give in-depth answers verbally rather than in writing. • They might discover things about this topic that they hadn't expected and that might not have been discovered using questionnaires. <p>Any other valid advantage would be credited.</p> | <p>3</p> | <p>Accurate and reasonably detailed The advantage is accurate and reasonably detailed. For example, failing to stop smoking is a sensitive issue and the respondent might feel more able to discuss this in a personal interview, rather than an impersonal questionnaire. They would be able to explain their reasons more fully.</p> |
| | <p>2</p> | <p>Less detailed but generally accurate The advantage is less detailed but generally accurate. For example, if an interviewee doesn't understand something they can ask the interviewer to explain it. (No context is given).</p> |
| | <p>1</p> | <p>Basic The advantage is basic but lacks detail and is muddled.</p> |
| | <p>0</p> | <p>Very brief/flawed or inappropriate The advantage is incorrect.</p> |

ASSESSMENT GRID

| Question | AO1 | AO2 | AO3 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 (a) | 6 | | |
| (b) | 6 | | |
| (c) | 6 | 12 | |
| Total for Question 1 | 18 | 12 | |
| 2 (a) | 6 | | |
| (b) | 6 | | |
| (c) | 6 | 12 | |
| Total for Question 2 | 18 | 12 | |
| 3 (a) | | 4 | |
| (b) | 2 | | 2 |
| (c) | | | 4 |
| (d) | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| (e) | | | 4 |
| (f) | | | 6 |
| (g) | | | 3 |
| Total for Question 3 | 3 | 6 | 21 |
| QoWC | 2 | | |
| Total for unit | 39 | 30 | 21 |