

Mark schemes

Q1.

[AO2 = 2]

2 marks for a clear and coherent explanation as to why it might have been better to use open questions with either explicit comparison or explicit application.

1 mark for a muddled/limited reason.

Possible content:

- open questions might give the researcher more detailed insight into what events they remember from the video clips as participants answer in their own words
- open questions allow students to provide all the information they do remember rather than being forced to pick an answer that is only the 'best fit' with their actual memories
- open questions are more likely to be valid as students have to recall the information rather than simply recognising an answer from a selection which means that the researcher can see if they did accurately recall information from the video clip
- open questions are more likely to lead to ideas for further investigation into other factors that may influence the accuracy of memory such as post-event discussion.

Credit other relevant material.

[2]

Q2.

[AO2 = 2]

Award **1 mark** for **each** bullet point:

- structured interview
- the psychologist had written the six questions beforehand/each teacher was asked the same six questions in the same order.

[2]

Q3.

[AO2 = 1]

1 mark for a suitable open question the psychologist could use in their interview about how children respond to instructions in class, eg 'how do the children in your class respond when you give them an instruction?'

0 marks for open question which is not about how children respond to instructions or for a closed question.

[1]

Q4.**(a) [AO3 = 3]**

3 marks for a clear and coherent explanation of why the interview might have improved upon the data collected from the diaries.

2 marks for an explanation that lacks the clarity of the 3-mark answer.

1 mark for a limited or muddled explanation.

Possible content:

- the interviewer could have asked follow-up questions to gain greater insight into some of the comments in the diary
- the interviewer may have gained rapport with the participant so they felt comfortable revealing more personal/sensitive information face-to-face.

Accept other valid points.

Full credit can be awarded for a single, elaborated point or a number of points in less detail.

3

(b) [AO2 = 2]

2 marks for an appropriate question which produces qualitative data about play.

1 mark for a muddled and/or limited question that produces qualitative data.

Note: can accept relevant items that are not phrased as questions, eg 'describe your child's play.'

2

[5]**Q5.****[AO3 = 2]**

2 marks for a clearly outlined and appropriate way of recording the extent of agreement. For credit, the response options must be consistent with items that are statements seeking agreement/disagreement and must have more than 2 response levels.

Examples:

a 5-point scale: Strongly Agree – Agree – Don't Know – Disagree – Strongly Disagree

a 3-point scale: Always – Sometimes – Never

1 mark for a partly appropriate or less detailed way, for example, just offering a midpoint option of 'don't know' or 'use a scale instead of just two options'

Answers suggesting use of an additional open question are not creditworthy.

[2]

Q6.**[AO3 = 2]**

2 marks for a clearly outlined and appropriate way of recording agreement. For credit, the response options must be consistent with items that are statements seeking agreement/disagreement and must have more than 2 response levels.

Examples:

a 5-point scale: Strongly Agree – Agree – Don't Know – Disagree – Strongly Disagree

a 3-point scale: Always – Sometimes – Never.

1 mark for a partly appropriate or less detailed way, for example, just offering a midpoint option of 'don't know' or 'use a scale instead of just two options'

Answers suggesting use of an additional open question are not creditworthy.

[2]**Q7.****[AO3 = 2]**

2 marks for a clearly outlined and appropriate way of recording agreement. For credit, the response options must be consistent with items that are statements seeking agreement/disagreement and must have more than 2 response levels.

Examples:

a 5-point scale: Strongly Agree – Agree – Don't Know – Disagree – Strongly Disagree

a 3-point scale: Always – Sometimes – Never.

1 mark for a partly appropriate or less detailed way, for example, just offering a midpoint option of 'don't know' or 'use a scale with more than two options'

Answers suggesting use of an additional open question are not creditworthy.

[2]

Q8.**[AO3 = 4]**

For **each** modification award marks as follows:

2 marks for a clear and coherent explanation of an appropriate modification that might minimise investigator effects in this study.

1 mark for a muddled/limited explanation.

Relevant points:

- have an interviewer who did not know the aims of the study so that they would not let their own expectations influence how they ask the interview questions (double blind technique)
- have an interviewer who was not the students' teacher so that the students would not be influenced by wanting to impress their teacher
- use open-ended questions/avoid leading questions so that the students are less likely to be led and are able to give a more detailed and accurate explanation of their views in their own words
- use a structured interview so that the investigator cannot alter the questions
- video the interviews and have another investigator watch and analyse them, improving the objectivity of the results
- use a questionnaire (or other means) to collect data without face-to-face interaction, so the students cannot be led/ are not affected by the presence of another person.

Credit other relevant suggestions that would reduce investigator effects in this study eg closed questions, trained interviewers.

[4]**Q9.****[AO2 = 6 AO3 = 6]**

Level	Marks	Description
4	10-12	Suggestions are generally well detailed and practical, showing sound understanding of experimental design. All three elements are present. Justifications are appropriate. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or explanation sometimes lacking.
3	7-9	Suggestions are mostly sensible and practical, showing some understanding of designing the experiment. At least two elements are present. There is some appropriate justification. The answer is mostly clear and well organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.
2	4-6	Some suggestions are appropriate for designing the experiment, but others are impractical or inadequately explained. At least one element is addressed. Justifications are partial, muddled, or absent. The

		answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation on occasions.
1	1-3	Knowledge of designing the experiment is limited. The whole answer lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised.
	0	No relevant content.

Three elements of design to be credited:

- type of experimental design with justification – eg independent groups design (half the children watched the new TV programme, the other half watched the existing TV programme), repeated measures design (all the children watch both programmes) or matched pairs design and why
- method of data collection – type of self-report technique (questionnaires or interviews, structured/unstructured) and why this would be appropriate, quantitative/qualitative data with justification, description of critical question/key data obtained, avoidance of leading questions, logistical details of data collection, eg postal questionnaire, mobile phone questionnaire etc, with justification, eg high response rate, confidentiality, reducing social desirability bias etc
- controlling **one** extraneous variable with justification why this needs to be controlled, eg minimising distractions whilst the TV show was on, number of siblings in household (if independent groups design), time of day TV programme was watched, order effects (if repeated measures design), minimising demand characteristics by having similar style TV programmes/not informing children of the purpose of the study/avoiding leading questions etc. Justification related to the impact on validity if the identified extraneous variable was not controlled.

[12]**Q10.****[AO2 = 2]**

2 marks for a clear and coherent explanation of one limitation linked to the survey.

1 mark for a limited/muddled explanation of one limitation.

Possible limitations:

- social desirability, patients may feel obliged to say the drug is effective at reducing their pain
- pain is subjective, a participant who has a higher pain threshold may report Zapurpain to be more effective for example.

Accept other plausible limitations affecting validity.

[2]