



# GCE

## Psychology

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G541**: Psychological Investigations

# Mark Scheme for January 2012

---

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

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

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

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















© OCR 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Good response/positive (to be used to indicate number of marks awarded for part questions e.g. +++/++= 3+2 marks)
	Negative
	Unclear
	Attempts evaluation
	Benefit of doubt
	Context
	Omission
	Incorrect response
	Evaluation
	Expandable horizontal wavy line
	Irrelevant
	Not answered question
	Expandable vertical wavy line
	Correct response

G541

## Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance												
1	<p>Strengths could include: the ability to use the same cartoon to control for possible effects of some cartoons being funnier than others; no carry-over effects (e.g. insight or fatigue) from having already participated in one condition prior to the other.</p> <p>Weaknesses could include: individual differences in how happy or not people are, regardless of whether 'smiling' or not; need more participants as they can only participate in one condition.</p> <p>3 marks for strength, 3 marks for weakness</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 587 1263 1034"> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 587 439 655"><b>0 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="439 587 1263 655">The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 655 439 759"><b>1 mark</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="439 655 1263 759">Appropriate strength/weakness outlined briefly but lacks clarity/detail (e.g. simply stating 'no order effects') and not in context</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 759 439 967"><b>2 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 759 824 967">Appropriate strength/weakness outlined clearly outlined, but not in the context of the research outlined in the source material</td> <td data-bbox="824 759 1263 967"><b>OR</b> outline of strength/weakness lacks clarity/detail but attempt to discuss in context</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 967 439 1034"><b>3 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="439 967 1263 1034">Appropriate strength/weakness outlined clearly outlined and in the context of the research outlined in the source material</td> </tr> </table>	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		<b>1 mark</b>	Appropriate strength/weakness outlined briefly but lacks clarity/detail (e.g. simply stating 'no order effects') and not in context		<b>2 marks</b>	Appropriate strength/weakness outlined clearly outlined, but not in the context of the research outlined in the source material	<b>OR</b> outline of strength/weakness lacks clarity/detail but attempt to discuss in context	<b>3 marks</b>	Appropriate strength/weakness outlined clearly outlined and in the context of the research outlined in the source material		6	<p>-Context here refers to for example: smiling, happiness, emotion, funny, pencil, teeth, lips or cartoon.</p>
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information														
<b>1 mark</b>	Appropriate strength/weakness outlined briefly but lacks clarity/detail (e.g. simply stating 'no order effects') and not in context														
<b>2 marks</b>	Appropriate strength/weakness outlined clearly outlined, but not in the context of the research outlined in the source material	<b>OR</b> outline of strength/weakness lacks clarity/detail but attempt to discuss in context													
<b>3 marks</b>	Appropriate strength/weakness outlined clearly outlined and in the context of the research outlined in the source material														

G541

Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question		Answer		Marks	Guidance	
2	(a)	The independent variable is 'smiling' operationalised as holding a pencil in the teeth or lips.		2		
		<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information			
		<b>1 mark</b>	Independent variable identified but no explanation of how it has been operationalised			<b>OR</b> description of how the independent variable has been operationalised without saying what it is
		<b>2 marks</b>	Independent variable correctly identified and details of how it was operationalised			
	(b)	The dependent variable is 'happiness' operationalised as a score on a scale (between 1 and 10).		2	<p>-If unclear because reference is made to both IV and DV cap at 1 mark.</p> <p>-Accept 'mood' for DV.</p> <p>-Accept 'rating scale' for how the DV is operationalised.</p>	
		<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information			
		<b>1 mark</b>	Dependent variable identified but no explanation of how it has been operationalised			<b>OR</b> description of how the dependent variable has been operationalised without saying what it is
		<b>2 marks</b>	Dependent variable correctly identified and details of how it was operationalised			

G541

Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance																								
3	<p>For both reliability and validity positive and/or negative evaluation issues are acceptable.</p> <p>Comments about reliability could include use of the same scale (1 to 10) with clearly defined ends so should be easy to use in the same way by each participant; possible differences in the way each number on the scale is interpreted by participants; use of the same cartoon clip.</p> <p>Comments about validity could include: potential dishonesty of participants when selecting a number; demand characteristics (picking a number to please/upset the researcher); the numerical scale allows the extent of participants happiness to be assessed; difficult to express happiness just in a quantitative way.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 655 1263 1374"> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 655 439 722"><b>0 marks</b></td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="439 655 1263 722">The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 722 439 790"><b>1-2 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 722 846 790">General attempt to evaluate reliability only</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="846 722 1263 790"><b>OR</b> General attempt to evaluate validity only</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 790 439 857"><b>3-4 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 790 846 857">General attempt to evaluate both reliability and validity</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="846 790 1263 857"><b>OR</b> attempt to evaluate reliability <b>or</b> validity in context</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 857 439 1099"><b>5-6 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 857 703 1099">Clear evaluation of reliability, <b>or</b> validity in context</td> <td data-bbox="703 857 967 1099"><b>OR</b> clear evaluation of both reliability and validity, but not in context (if only one clear = 5 marks)</td> <td data-bbox="967 857 1263 1099"><b>OR</b> attempt to evaluate both reliability and validity in context (if only one in context = 5 marks)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1099 439 1270"><b>7-8 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 1099 846 1270">Clear evaluation of reliability in context and attempt at evaluation of validity (just 7 marks if attempt not in context)</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="846 1099 1263 1270"><b>OR</b> Clear evaluation of validity in context and attempt at evaluation of reliability (just 7 marks if attempt not in context)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1270 439 1374"><b>9-10 marks</b></td> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="439 1270 1263 1374">Clear evaluation of <b>both</b> reliability and validity in context. <b>Note:</b> For 10 marks all evaluation points discussed must be correctly labelled with no confusion between the two.</td> </tr> </table>	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information			<b>1-2 marks</b>	General attempt to evaluate reliability only	<b>OR</b> General attempt to evaluate validity only		<b>3-4 marks</b>	General attempt to evaluate both reliability and validity	<b>OR</b> attempt to evaluate reliability <b>or</b> validity in context		<b>5-6 marks</b>	Clear evaluation of reliability, <b>or</b> validity in context	<b>OR</b> clear evaluation of both reliability and validity, but not in context (if only one clear = 5 marks)	<b>OR</b> attempt to evaluate both reliability and validity in context (if only one in context = 5 marks)	<b>7-8 marks</b>	Clear evaluation of reliability in context and attempt at evaluation of validity (just 7 marks if attempt not in context)	<b>OR</b> Clear evaluation of validity in context and attempt at evaluation of reliability (just 7 marks if attempt not in context)		<b>9-10 marks</b>	Clear evaluation of <b>both</b> reliability and validity in context. <b>Note:</b> For 10 marks all evaluation points discussed must be correctly labelled with no confusion between the two.			10	<p>-Context here refers to happiness and emotion.</p> <p>-NB reference to anything other than the actual measure of the DV is not creditworthy (such as Ps prior emotion state)</p>
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information																										
<b>1-2 marks</b>	General attempt to evaluate reliability only	<b>OR</b> General attempt to evaluate validity only																									
<b>3-4 marks</b>	General attempt to evaluate both reliability and validity	<b>OR</b> attempt to evaluate reliability <b>or</b> validity in context																									
<b>5-6 marks</b>	Clear evaluation of reliability, <b>or</b> validity in context	<b>OR</b> clear evaluation of both reliability and validity, but not in context (if only one clear = 5 marks)	<b>OR</b> attempt to evaluate both reliability and validity in context (if only one in context = 5 marks)																								
<b>7-8 marks</b>	Clear evaluation of reliability in context and attempt at evaluation of validity (just 7 marks if attempt not in context)	<b>OR</b> Clear evaluation of validity in context and attempt at evaluation of reliability (just 7 marks if attempt not in context)																									
<b>9-10 marks</b>	Clear evaluation of <b>both</b> reliability and validity in context. <b>Note:</b> For 10 marks all evaluation points discussed must be correctly labelled with no confusion between the two.																										

G541

Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance						
4	<p>Findings could include: most number of times thinking about a white bear reported was 21; least number of times was 2; range of scores was 2-21 showing a lot of variation in how many times thoughts of a white bear were reported; most people reported thinking of a white bear 10 or more times during the five minute period, .</p> <p>2 marks for each finding</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="318 512 1263 751"> <tr> <td data-bbox="318 512 443 580"><b>0 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="443 512 1263 580">The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="318 580 443 683"><b>1 mark</b></td> <td data-bbox="443 580 1263 683">The candidate has stated a finding, but this lacks clarity, or is not in the context of the research outlined in the source material.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="318 683 443 751"><b>2 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="443 683 1263 751">The candidate has stated a clear finding and this is in the context of the research outlined in the source material.</td> </tr> </table>	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	<b>1 mark</b>	The candidate has stated a finding, but this lacks clarity, or is not in the context of the research outlined in the source material.	<b>2 marks</b>	The candidate has stated a clear finding and this is in the context of the research outlined in the source material.	4	<p>-Context here refers to a 'white bear' (or just 'bear')</p> <p>-The following descriptive statistics are creditworthy. Mean = 11.6, median = 11.5 (accept 11 or 12), range = 19, total = 116</p> <p>-Accept the scores of 2 and 21 as anomalous or extreme</p>
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information								
<b>1 mark</b>	The candidate has stated a finding, but this lacks clarity, or is not in the context of the research outlined in the source material.								
<b>2 marks</b>	The candidate has stated a clear finding and this is in the context of the research outlined in the source material.								

G541

Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance															
5	<p>Appropriate descriptive statistics include calculating the mean, median or range.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 316 1263 963"> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 316 439 379"><b>0 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="439 316 1263 379">The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 379 439 485"><b>1 mark</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 379 848 485">Appropriate descriptive statistic named</td> <td data-bbox="848 379 1263 485"><b>OR</b> described but not named (or described but named incorrectly)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 485 439 687"><b>2 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 485 848 687">Attempt to describe how an appropriate descriptive statistic could be used but not in context of the information outlined in the source material</td> <td data-bbox="848 485 1263 687"><b>OR</b> described in context (or described in context but named incorrectly)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 687 439 895"><b>3 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 687 848 895">Attempt to describe how an appropriate descriptive statistic could be used in context of the information outlined in the source material</td> <td data-bbox="848 687 1263 895"><b>OR</b> Appropriate descriptive statistic fully explained but not in context</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 895 439 963"><b>4 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="439 895 1263 963">Appropriate descriptive statistic fully explained in context of the research outlined in the source material</td> </tr> </table>	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		<b>1 mark</b>	Appropriate descriptive statistic named	<b>OR</b> described but not named (or described but named incorrectly)	<b>2 marks</b>	Attempt to describe how an appropriate descriptive statistic could be used but not in context of the information outlined in the source material	<b>OR</b> described in context (or described in context but named incorrectly)	<b>3 marks</b>	Attempt to describe how an appropriate descriptive statistic could be used in context of the information outlined in the source material	<b>OR</b> Appropriate descriptive statistic fully explained but not in context	<b>4 marks</b>	Appropriate descriptive statistic fully explained in context of the research outlined in the source material		4	<p>Context here refers to a 'white bear' (or just 'bear')</p> <p>-Mode and bar chart not appropriate - Credit average, dispersion and central tendency.</p>
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information																	
<b>1 mark</b>	Appropriate descriptive statistic named	<b>OR</b> described but not named (or described but named incorrectly)																
<b>2 marks</b>	Attempt to describe how an appropriate descriptive statistic could be used but not in context of the information outlined in the source material	<b>OR</b> described in context (or described in context but named incorrectly)																
<b>3 marks</b>	Attempt to describe how an appropriate descriptive statistic could be used in context of the information outlined in the source material	<b>OR</b> Appropriate descriptive statistic fully explained but not in context																
<b>4 marks</b>	Appropriate descriptive statistic fully explained in context of the research outlined in the source material																	



G541

Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance												
6	<p><b>Strengths</b> could include: allows researchers access to what kind of things related to a white bear participants were thinking of; informative about what else participants were thinking of when not a white bear</p> <p><b>Weaknesses</b> could include: difficult to classify and interpret findings; may be difficult to understand what some participants mean at times; not a natural process – may be different to how participants think when not expressing their thoughts aloud.</p> <p>3 marks for strength, 3 marks for weakness</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 587 1274 967"> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 587 439 655"><b>0 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="439 587 1274 655">The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 655 439 724"><b>1 mark</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="439 655 1274 724">Attempt to outline strength/weakness but in general, not in the context of the research outlined in the source material.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 724 439 895"><b>2 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 724 824 895">Strength/weakness clearly outlined but not in the context of the research outlined in the source material.</td> <td data-bbox="824 724 1274 895"><b>OR</b> Attempt to outline strength/weakness in the context of the research outlined in the source material.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 895 439 967"><b>3 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="439 895 1274 967">Strength/weakness clearly outlined in the context of the research outlined in the source material.</td> </tr> </table>	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to outline strength/weakness but in general, not in the context of the research outlined in the source material.		<b>2 marks</b>	Strength/weakness clearly outlined but not in the context of the research outlined in the source material.	<b>OR</b> Attempt to outline strength/weakness in the context of the research outlined in the source material.	<b>3 marks</b>	Strength/weakness clearly outlined in the context of the research outlined in the source material.		6	<p>-Context here refers to a 'white bear' (or just 'bear').</p> <p>-Do not credit strengths and weaknesses of the method (e.g. self-reports – dishonesty)</p>
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information														
<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to outline strength/weakness but in general, not in the context of the research outlined in the source material.														
<b>2 marks</b>	Strength/weakness clearly outlined but not in the context of the research outlined in the source material.	<b>OR</b> Attempt to outline strength/weakness in the context of the research outlined in the source material.													
<b>3 marks</b>	Strength/weakness clearly outlined in the context of the research outlined in the source material.														

G541

Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance		
7	(a)	An open question is one that does not restrict how respondents reply. For example, describe what it was like when trying not to think of a white bear		2	<p>-Context here refers to a 'white bear' (or just 'bear')</p> <p>- Assume response is an open question if there are no predetermined options. EG Did you think of any bears? = 2 marks.</p>	
		<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information			
		<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to suggest an appropriate open question, but lacks some clarity			<b>OR</b> open question clearly outlined but not in context
		<b>2 marks</b>	Appropriate open question clearly outlined in context			
	(b)	A closed question is one that presents respondents a number of pre-determined response categories to select from when answering the question. For example, How difficult was it not to think of a white bear? - very difficult - somewhat difficult - not very difficult.		2	<p>-Context here refers to a 'white bear' (or just bear')</p> <p>-Must have response options to gain any credit</p>	
		<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information			
		<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to suggest an appropriate closed question, but lacks some clarity			<b>OR</b> closed question clearly outlined but not in context
		<b>2 marks</b>	Appropriate closed question clearly outlined in context			
	(c)	A rating scale question involves the use of a scale for respondents to indicate their answer. For example Indicate on a scale of 1 (not very difficult) to 10 (very difficult) how difficult you found it not to think of a white bear		2	<p>-Context here refers to a 'white bear' (or just 'bear')</p> <p>-A verbal rating scale is Okay, but must include at least three options.</p>	
		<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information			
		<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to suggest an appropriate question involving the use of a rating scale, but lacks some clarity			<b>OR</b> rating scale question clearly outlined but not in context
		<b>2 marks</b>	Appropriate question involving the use of a rating scale, clearly outlined in context			

G541

Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance										
8	<p>Note: null hypotheses are not tailed. Some good examples here would be something like ... There is/will be no correlation between how ugly people rate snakes and how frightened they are of them. Any correlation found is due to chance.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 384 1274 799"> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 384 439 453"><b>0 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 384 1274 453">The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 453 439 555"><b>1 mark</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 453 1274 555">The candidate has written an appropriate null hypothesis but has simply stated 'there will not be/is no correlation'. There is no indication of either of the measured variables</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 555 439 624"><b>2 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 555 1274 624">The candidate has written an appropriate null hypothesis but has only referred to one variable</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 624 439 726"><b>3 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 624 1274 726">The candidate has written an null hypothesis referring to both variables, but there is a lack of clarity about one of the measured variables or both</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 726 439 799"><b>4 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 726 1274 799">The candidate has written a clearly stated appropriate null hypothesis referring to both of the measured variables</td> </tr> </table>	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	<b>1 mark</b>	The candidate has written an appropriate null hypothesis but has simply stated 'there will not be/is no correlation'. There is no indication of either of the measured variables	<b>2 marks</b>	The candidate has written an appropriate null hypothesis but has only referred to one variable	<b>3 marks</b>	The candidate has written an null hypothesis referring to both variables, but there is a lack of clarity about one of the measured variables or both	<b>4 marks</b>	The candidate has written a clearly stated appropriate null hypothesis referring to both of the measured variables	4	<p>- Allow 'relationship' or 'correlation'.</p> <p>-Do not credit any reference to difference/effect/IV/DV regardless of what else is written.</p> <p>-The variables do not have to be fully operationalised for maximum marks.</p> <p>-Do not credit reference to an 'association' or a 'link'.</p> <p>-Do not credit directional statements.</p>
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information												
<b>1 mark</b>	The candidate has written an appropriate null hypothesis but has simply stated 'there will not be/is no correlation'. There is no indication of either of the measured variables												
<b>2 marks</b>	The candidate has written an appropriate null hypothesis but has only referred to one variable												
<b>3 marks</b>	The candidate has written an null hypothesis referring to both variables, but there is a lack of clarity about one of the measured variables or both												
<b>4 marks</b>	The candidate has written a clearly stated appropriate null hypothesis referring to both of the measured variables												

G541

Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance															
9	<p>The use of rating scales are acceptable here but also measurements based on any other alternatives, such as an observation schedule that classifies the number of anxiety responses towards a snake when exposed to one or discussing one. However, the measure must yield a quantifiable result for use in a correlation analysis.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 419 1274 866"> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 419 439 488"><b>0 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="439 419 1274 488">The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 488 439 557"><b>1 mark</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="439 488 1274 557">Attempt to outline how fear could be measured, but lacks detail and/or clarity and not replicable but not in context.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 557 439 695"><b>2 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 557 857 695">Minor omissions that would prevent replication</td> <td data-bbox="857 557 1274 695"><b>OR</b> Attempt to outline how fear could be measured, but lacks detail and/or clarity and not replicable but in context.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 695 439 799"><b>3 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="439 695 857 799">Replicable outline of how fear could be measured but not in context</td> <td data-bbox="857 695 1274 799"><b>OR</b> Minor omissions that would make replication difficult but in context</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 799 439 866"><b>4 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="439 799 1274 866">Replicable outline of how fear could be measured that is in context</td> </tr> </table>	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to outline how fear could be measured, but lacks detail and/or clarity and not replicable but not in context.		<b>2 marks</b>	Minor omissions that would prevent replication	<b>OR</b> Attempt to outline how fear could be measured, but lacks detail and/or clarity and not replicable but in context.	<b>3 marks</b>	Replicable outline of how fear could be measured but not in context	<b>OR</b> Minor omissions that would make replication difficult but in context	<b>4 marks</b>	Replicable outline of how fear could be measured that is in context		4	<p>-The measure of fear must be quantifiable. -Context is 'snakes'.</p> <p>-For 3 marks numerical values for rating scales is needed.</p> <p>-For 4 marks the scale needs to be labelled (ends and/or mid-points).</p> <p>- For 4 marks it must be clear who is doing the rating if a rating scale is used.</p> <p>-If verbal scales given cap at 2 marks.</p>
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information																	
<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to outline how fear could be measured, but lacks detail and/or clarity and not replicable but not in context.																	
<b>2 marks</b>	Minor omissions that would prevent replication	<b>OR</b> Attempt to outline how fear could be measured, but lacks detail and/or clarity and not replicable but in context.																
<b>3 marks</b>	Replicable outline of how fear could be measured but not in context	<b>OR</b> Minor omissions that would make replication difficult but in context																
<b>4 marks</b>	Replicable outline of how fear could be measured that is in context																	

G541

Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance												
10	<p>Possible responses here include strengths of using a rating scale (e.g. produced quantifiable data, easy to compare fear of snakes across different people etc) and weaknesses (e.g. a number does not indicate more detailed reasons about how/why a person fears snakes etc).</p> <p>3 marks for strength, 3 marks for weakness</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="331 451 1290 762"> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 451 450 523"><b>0 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="450 451 1290 523">The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 523 450 595"><b>1 mark</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="450 523 1290 595">Attempt to outline strength /weakness, but lacks detail and/or clarity</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 595 450 699"><b>2 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="450 595 835 699">Clear outline of strength / weakness, but not in context</td> <td data-bbox="835 595 1290 699"><b>OR</b> Attempt to outline strength /weakness, but lacks detail and/or clarity but in context.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 699 450 762"><b>3 marks</b></td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="450 699 1290 762">Clear outline of strength / weakness in context</td> </tr> </table>	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information		<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to outline strength /weakness, but lacks detail and/or clarity		<b>2 marks</b>	Clear outline of strength / weakness, but not in context	<b>OR</b> Attempt to outline strength /weakness, but lacks detail and/or clarity but in context.	<b>3 marks</b>	Clear outline of strength / weakness in context		6	<p>-Context is 'snakes'</p> <p>-Ethical issues are acceptable but must be outlined appropriately and not just stated (e.g. 'reduces harm').</p>
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information														
<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to outline strength /weakness, but lacks detail and/or clarity														
<b>2 marks</b>	Clear outline of strength / weakness, but not in context	<b>OR</b> Attempt to outline strength /weakness, but lacks detail and/or clarity but in context.													
<b>3 marks</b>	Clear outline of strength / weakness in context														

G541

Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance	
11		A positive correlation is where as the values of one variable increase, related values of the second variable also tend to increase (although not necessarily at the same rate).	2	<p>-A sketch of a scattergraph displaying a positive correlation is fine, but must be accompanied by some explanatory text for full marks.</p> <p>-Reference to DV = 0 (as it implies causation).</p> <p>-Clear examples of positive correlations (whether in context or not) can achieve full marks.</p>	
		<b>0 marks</b>			The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information
		<b>1 mark</b>			Attempt to explain what a positive correlation is, but could be clearer
		<b>2 marks</b>			Clear explanation of a positive correlation

G541

Mark Scheme

January 2012

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance						
12	<p><b>Strengths</b> could include: provides information about patterns/trends that can then be investigated more experimentally if desired; can be plotted visually in a scattergraph to see relationship clearly; enables us to make predictions based on the relationship between variables; when unethical or impractical to carry out an experiment; starting point for further research; etc.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses</b> could include: does not inform us about cause-and-effect; the relationship revealed can be misleading; some variables cannot be correlated (only variables generating continuous data can be correlated)</p> <p>2 marks strength, 2 marks for weakness</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="331 655 1285 863"> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 655 450 724"><b>0 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="450 655 1285 724">The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 724 450 793"><b>1 mark</b></td> <td data-bbox="450 724 1285 793">Attempt to identify strength/weakness, but lacks some clarity</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="331 793 450 863"><b>2 marks</b></td> <td data-bbox="450 793 1285 863">Strength/weakness clearly outlined</td> </tr> </table>	<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information	<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to identify strength/weakness, but lacks some clarity	<b>2 marks</b>	Strength/weakness clearly outlined	4	<p>-For full marks the strength and weakness cited must be specific to the correlational method, and not generic. For example, a weakness is that just because we might find a positive correlation between the variables it does not show cause and effect.</p> <p>-Citing quantitative data on its own is not sufficient to credit, but elaborating on it is creditworthy. A weak elaboration would gain one mark.</p> <p>-Reference to a relationship between an IV and a DV should not be credited.</p>
<b>0 marks</b>	The candidate has not provided any creditworthy information								
<b>1 mark</b>	Attempt to identify strength/weakness, but lacks some clarity								
<b>2 marks</b>	Strength/weakness clearly outlined								

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

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

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

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

© OCR 2012

