GCE

Psychology

Advanced GCE

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

Mark Scheme for June 2013

Abbreviations, annotations and conventions used in the detailed Mark Scheme

Annotation	Meaning
✔	Correct response
✘	Incorrect response
BOD	Benefit of doubt given
?	Unclear
NAQ	Not answered question
EE	Effective evaluation
AE	Attempts evaluation
CONT	Context
λ	Omission
IRRL	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

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
SECTION A					
1			The aim should be appropriate to the option chosen and be clearly worded. **0 marks** – no aim is given/ an aim is given that does not fit with any of the options **1 mark** – an appropriate aim has been framed but it is not a close fit with the option. **2 marks** – an appropriate aim question has been framed and is clearly stated	**[2]**	An example for 1 mark is a statement related to discipline but not parental discipline or simply restating the option as an aim. For 2 marks the answer can be worded as a hypothesis.
2			**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, a description of the questionnaire (including types of questions) with examples, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings. **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 organisation 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, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings are all fully and clearly described.	**[13]**	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. Start at the top band and move down to find the right band to fit the candidate's response. For a top band answer the description should include more than one example of the questions from the questionnaire. They must give details of the sample and sampling method. It is not necessary for candidates to explicitly refer to ethical considerations.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
2 cont.			**For the quality of the design and its feasibility**: **1–2 marks** – the design should be appropriate to the research question and it fulfils the criteria for a questionnaire but does not logically follow from the research question. The description lacks clarity and it would be difficult to conduct the investigation from the description of the procedure. **3–4 marks** – the design should be appropriate to the research question ie is a questionnaire but it is not practical [pragmatic] or ethical. The description of the procedure lacks clarity but it would be possible to conduct the investigation. **5–6 marks** – the design should be appropriate to the research question and is pragmatic and ethical. The description is clear, coherent and detailed, and accurate replication of the investigation would be possible.	**[6]**	No marks for extremely unethical procedure/questions or a design which describes a study that does not use a questionnaire ie a set of questions (not just one) **and** does not use a self-selected sample. The bottom band may be used for answers where the design is unclear or does not use the self-selected sampling method or does not use a questionnaire. 3–4 marks may be given if it is not explicit that a questionnaire is being used (ie sufficient details given) or not explicit that the sample is self-selected.
3			Disadvantage can include: that responses can lack validity due to social desirability bias, the responses may be difficult to analyse and interpret particularly from open ended questions, the questionnaire may lack internal reliability if there is no consistency between responses, or any other appropriate response. **0 marks** – no or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – an appropriate disadvantage identified. **2 marks** – an appropriate disadvantage is identified and discussed but it lacks clarity or is not discussed in relation to the practical project. **3 marks** – a disadvantage is clearly understood and discussed in relation to the practical project.	**[3]**	

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
4			Answers could include: comments on the consistency of measurement, on the standardised procedure and questions to produce quantitative data giving replicability and hence, reliability. Any appropriate answer which must be in context to be in the top band. **0 marks** – no or irrelevant answer. **1–2 mark** – reliability identified and discussed briefly but not clearly. **3–4 marks** – at least one point individually related to reliability/ two points individually related but described more briefly. **5–6 marks –** at least two points individually related to reliability and described fully/ three points individually related but described more briefly.	**[6]**	For 3–4 marks at least one point should be in context For 5–6 marks 2 points need to be in context
5			Candidates should put their data into categories eg how many people agree/disagree with the death penalty. **0 marks** – no or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – appropriate but limited suggestion. **2 marks** – appropriate suggestion but not in the context of the practical project/ not clearly stated. **3 marks** – clear suggestion given and discussed in relation to the practical project.	**[3]**	

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
6			Participants are not asked for personal information about themselves or their behaviour but are asked for their attitudes. Give right to withdraw/not answer particular questions. Obtain <u>informed</u> consent to participate. **0 marks** – no or irrelevant answer. **1–2 marks** – incomplete answer with identification of method unclear/ not related to their own practical. **3 marks** – clearly stated how they could make the practical ethical with reference to their specific practical project.	**[3]**	
7			Candidates may describe any alternative research. **0 marks** – no or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – future research is identified but not described. **2 marks** – future research is identified which would be appropriate to this investigation, but it lacks clarity or is not closely linked to this investigation. **3 marks** – appropriate future research is clearly identified and closely linked to this investigation. **4 marks** – appropriate future research is clearly described and closely linked to this investigation.	**[4]**	Suggestions should be more than a different sample or location for full marks. Maximum of 2 marks if the candidate suggests the same research either in the future or in different locations or with different participants.
			Total	**[40]**	

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
SECTION B					
8	**(a)**		The nature side of the debate suggests that all behavior is determined by hereditary factors that are passed down in our genes. However, the nurture side of the debate suggests that human behavior is the result of interactions with the environment. More specifically that behavior is learnt.	**[4]**	No examples of psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks.
			0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.		
			1 mark – Identification of the debate which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The nature nurture debate may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent, expression poor.		A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant.
			2 marks – The main components of the debate are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to the nature nurture debate. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent.		A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding.
			3 marks – The main components of the debate are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the nature nurture debate. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good.		For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer.
			4 marks – The main components of the debate are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The description is clearly related to the nature nurture debate. The candidate clearly understands the nature nurture debate. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.		Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
	(b)		Candidates can use any piece of research that focuses on behaviour being learned to answer this question. Examples of Behaviourist research include Watson and Rayner's study on Little Albert, Bandura's research into imitation of aggression, McGrath's research on treatment of a phobia and the work of BF Skinner and Ivan Pavlov.	**[8]**	Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2.
			0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.		Do not reward evidence that does not support the nurture side of the debate.
			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.		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.
			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.		Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response. For one piece of research, a maximum of 4 marks only can be awarded.
			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.		
			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.		The answer must be competently structured and organised with explicit links to nurture for a top band answer.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(c)		Examples as part b. Strengths may include the perspective is based on rigorous scientific technique and has a wide range of practical applications including behavior therapies. Weaknesses may include may include reductionism and the ethical problems of some research. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **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 the approach. 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. **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 the approach. 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. **6–7 marks** – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Range of points limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised into the approach. 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. **8–9 marks** – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into the approach. 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.	[12]	Do not reward psychological evidence that is not from the behavioural perspective approach. Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the behavioural perspective without referring to the strengths and weaknesses. Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response. 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. At 4–5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak. At 6–7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with more limited supporting evidence. At 8–9 marks there may be only 3 strengths/ weaknesses, but these will be supported by very detailed examples.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
			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 the approach. 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.		At 10–12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with well described impressive supporting evidence.
8	(d)		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	**[8]**	Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from the behavioural perspective and physiological approach without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks, if studies are not in the context of the approaches.
			0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.		
			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 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.		For 1–2 marks the answer will either be very brief or have a limited discussion.
			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.		For 3–4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples.
			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.		For 5–6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the approaches with well supported examples.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
			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.		For 7–8 marks there should be at least two points of comparison linked with evidence from both the behavioural perspective and physiological approach.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(e)		Candidates may use any areas of the behaviourist perspective to answer this question but must focus on the nurture side of the nature-nurture debate, i.e. the role of learning to support the nurture side of the debate. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **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 they are 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. **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. **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. **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.	**[8]**	Do not reward responses that describe features of the behaviourist perspective without reference to its relevance to the nature-nurture debate. Do not reward responses that describe evidence that refer to the nature-nurture debate but are not from the behaviourist perspective. For 1–2 marks the answer may be very brief or be very basic showing little psychological knowledge and understanding. For 3–4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples. 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. 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.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9	(a)		The case study method is characterised by a detailed description of a particular individual or group under study. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – Identification of the method which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a list). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. The issue may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent Expression poor. **2 marks** – The main components of the method are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to the issues. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent. **3 marks** – The main components of the method are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to the issues. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good. **4 marks** – The main components of the method are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The debate is clearly related to the issues. The candidate clearly understands the issue in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.	[4]	No examples of case studies are needed in this answer to access full marks. A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer. Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.
	(b)		Candidates may use any research that they have studied throughout the AS or A2 course where a case study is used. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **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. **3–4 marks** – Use of psychological terminology is basic. The range of theories/studies described is limited. Description is often accurate, generally	[8]	Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2. Do not reward evidence which is not a case study. For 1–2 marks one or two examples are given but are very basic. For 3–4 marks the examples will lack detail or only one example which is fully detailed.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
			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. **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. **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.		For 5–6 marks the evidence may be very accurate and detailed but the case study method may not be strongly emphasised. For 7–8 marks accurate description of case studies should explicitly highlight the methodology. 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.
9	(c)		Strengths may include the data gathered may be qualitative – rich and detailed, developmental changes may be recorded and rare or unique behaviours can be studied in detail. Weaknesses include limitations of sample if one or a very few participants are studied, there may be bias because of emotional attachment by the researcher. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **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 the 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.	**[12]**	Do not reward psychological evidence that is not a case study. Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe case studies without referring to the strengths and weaknesses. Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response. 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 case study method but to the specific research.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
			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 the 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.		At 4–5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak.
			6–7 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Range of points limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised into the 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.		At 6–7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with more limited supporting evidence.
			8–9 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into the 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.		At 8–9 marks there may be only 3 strengths/ weaknesses, but these will be supported by very detailed examples.
			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 the 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.		At 10–12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with well described impressive supporting evidence.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9	**(d)**		Candidates can compare on the basis of reliability, validity, reductionism, ethics, usefulness and more.	**[8]**	Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from experimental and case study methods without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks.
			0 marks – No or irrelevant answer.		
			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 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.		For 1–2 marks the answer will either be very brief or have a limited discussion.
			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.		For 3–4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples.
			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.		For 5–6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the experimental and case study methods with well supported examples.
			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.		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.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Additional Guidance
9	(e)		The discussion should go beyond a definition of terms. For example, the case study method can be considered holistic to some extent as it takes into account all aspects of the person's behaviour but it is also partly reductionist because of the methods employed eg psychometric tests. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1–2 marks** – Few discussion points. Range of arguments is sparse or not present. There is little or no organisation. Selection of arguments is poor and are peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is limited and lacking detail. **3–4 marks** – Limited discussion. Limited range of arguments with some organisation. Arguments are vaguely related to the question and demonstrate a sound psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is limited. Discussion has limited detail and some understanding is evident. **5–6 marks** – Some discussion points. Range of limited 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 has some detail. **7–8 marks** – Many discussion points. 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 thorough.	**[8]**	A max of 4 marks where answers only address one side of the debate. 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 holism in relation to the case study method. For 3–4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples. 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. 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.
			Total	**[40]**	

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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