OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCE

Psychology

Advanced GCE A2 **H568**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS **H168**

OCR Report to Centres June 2016

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Psychology (H568)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Psychology (H168)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

G541 Psychological Investigations

General Comments:

In general, candidates demonstrated a good understanding of knowledge of research methods and evaluation issues in their responses to questions on this paper. The highest scoring candidates provided lots of detail and used specific examples in response to the higher tariff questions (Q3b, Q6 and Q12). Higher marks could have been obtained by other candidates if this strategy had been adopted. Responses of the highest scoring candidates also included a sophisticated and detailed inclusion of context in their answers in response to questions that required a link to the research outlined in the scenario presented. This fulfilled the requirements of the mark scheme for a 'detailed' response, rather than the mere 'token (superficial) use' of key words from the research outlined in the scenario as constituting 'context'. Again, higher marks could have been obtained by other candidates if this strategy had been adopted. Responses that were not 'detailed and clear' were capped at the lower band, whether they were in context or not.

More generally, for a small handful of students their use of English is quite poor at times and prevents them from expressing themselves clearly.

There was a very good understanding shown of descriptive statistics as candidates were able to clearly explain what is meant by the mean and how this could be calculated in the scenario given in the question.

The understanding of reliability and validity is good and candidates have a high level of ability to discuss these two issues with reference to a rating scale question.

Many students are going for quantity rather than quality of evaluation so the lack of explanation (elaboration) in their answers is letting them down.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1

This question had two demands – the requirement to outline what is meant by both open and closed questions used in this study. Many candidates did achieve full marks for this question by explaining what is meant by an open and a closed question as well as giving an example of each in their response that was clearly contextualised with reference to 'thinking', 'shapes' and/or 'zizi and soso'. However, a number of candidates had a tendency to say that closed questions did not allow for participants' thoughts and feelings, which is incorrect. A number described what is meant by a closed question but then gave an example of a question that was not closed.

Question No. 2

This question also had two demands – the requirement to outline both a strength and a weakness of closed questions in the context of how symbols influence the way we think. The highest scoring candidates adopted a strategy of making a point, then using an example to illustrate the point from the scenario in the question. They did this separately (two distinct paragraphs) for both the strength and the weakness advanced. Other candidates could have achieved higher marks if they had adopted this structure in their answer. Most candidates cited the ability to analyse data as a strength and were able to refer to an example relating to how symbols influence the way we think. Many referred to the lack of detail for the weakness. Many candidates incorrectly stated that closed questions cannot tell you how a person is thinking or

feeling. These type of responses were not awarded any marks as it is possible to know how someone thinks and/or feels from a closed question it is just that the answer given would lack depth and detail.

Question No. 3(a)

Many candidates did achieve full marks for this question. They were able to clearly explain how qualitative data could be gathered for this study (e.g. via an open question) and give a clear example of what this question would be in the context of how symbols influence the way we think.

Question No. 3(b)

This question had two demands – the requirement to outline both a strength and a weakness of qualitative data in the context of this study. Candidates often achieved very good marks on their answers by describing each point separately. Most were also able to describe both the strength and the weakness in the context of this research study. The most common strength was that qualitative data provides in-depth data that gives a clear understanding of why the person chose to name the shapes in the way that they did. A common weakness was that it was therefore very difficult to analyse the data as it is qualitative and the responses would be quite different from each other, so difficult to put into tables and graphs. Many candidates incorrectly referred to strengths and weaknesses that apply to self-reports rather than to qualitative data in particular.

Question No. 4

This question was really well answered by candidates with many achieving full marks. The vast majority of responses correctly identified that a self-selected sample can be obtained via either a poster or an advert and then gave details of where this poster/advert might be placed as well as putting this into the context of the question. Candidates who achieved less than full marks often did so because they either did not describe exactly where the advert/poster might be placed or they did not put their idea into the context of how symbols influence the way we think.

Question No. 5

This question was generally well answered, with many candidates stating that the design was independent measures design. A significant number of candidates achieved no marks by either stating the design was repeated measures or matched pairs. A small minority of candidates identified the research method as a lab experiment which achieved no marks.

Question No. 6

Similar to previous questions in this paper this question had two demands – the requirement to outline both a strength and a weakness of using a laboratory experiment in the context of this study. Candidates often achieved very good marks on their answers by describing each point separately. Most were also able to put both the strength and the weakness in the context of this research study. The most common strength described was the high level of control in a laboratory experiment and how this can lead to higher levels of reliability and/or control of extraneous variables. The most common weakness described was the low levels of ecological validity and how the type of task the participants were asked to do in this study (listening to the nursery rhymes while wearing headphones) is a very unusual task and not one they would expect to do in their everyday lives.

Question No. 7

Most candidates were able to achieve at least one mark for this question and this was usually achieved by correctly identifying the dependent variable in this study as the number of true and false questions answered correctly and/or the selective attention of the participant. Some candidates did correctly identify that it was the gender of the participant that was the independent variable. It was fairly common for this to be incorrectly identified as the nursery rhymes played into each ear.

Question No. 8

This question was often well answered. Many candidates were able to write an appropriate one-tailed alternative hypothesis that either stated that women would have better selective attention than males or males will have better attention for two nursery rhymes played simultaneously in each ear than females. Full marks could be obtained without fully operationalising the dependent variable. Common mistakes included the candidates giving a two tailed hypothesis or a correlational hypothesis. Many also gave both a two-tailed hypothesis followed by a one-tailed hypothesis. These types of answers were awarded no marks.

Question No. 9(a)

Responses to this question revealed that most candidates have a good understanding of what is meant by the descriptive statistic called the mean. Almost all candidates were able to state that it is the average. A few mentioned it was a measure of central tendency which did receive a mark. Many then gave a description of how to calculate the mean which enabled these candidates to achieve full marks for this question.

Question No. 9(b)

Most candidates did achieve some marks for this question by describing how the mean could be calculated for the male participants in this study and then went onto describe how the mean could be calculated for the female participants in this study. Better responses described this calculation in terms of adding up the scores for the true/false questions in relation to the nursery rhymes played in each ear. These candidates did achieve full marks. Some candidates were somewhat confused about the data collected and suggested that the final total should be divided by 15 which was incorrect and achieved no marks.

Question No. 10

A very straight-forward question that most students achieved three or four marks for their responses. There were a variety of responses to this question including giving individual results for the participants, calculating the mean scores for the sadness rating given and the mean score for the enjoyment rating given to the film and identifying the positive correlation shown in the data. Some candidates gave vague responses such as 'participant 7 was an anomaly' without giving any data or explanation and these types of responses achieved 1 mark. A few also incorrectly identified some of the results as being the highest or the lowest for the variable. For example, some stated that participant 7 gave the lowest score for how much they enjoyed the film which is incorrect and was awarded no marks.

Question No. 11

The vast majority of candidates correctly labelled and sketched a scattergraph in response to this question which was creditworthy and did achieve marks. The most common error was for the candidate to leave out what the ends of the scales meant on each axes e.g.. 20= very sad. A few candidates either put on too many points (e.g. 11) or too few (e.g. 9). There were also some errors in plotting the data and a small minority of candidates did not plot any data. There

were also some candidates who were unclear about 'scattergraph' and put the participant numbers along the x axis. These types of responses received no marks.

Question No. 12

This was the only 10 mark question on the paper and in order to obtain top band marks candidates needed to evaluate both reliability and validity in the context of the self-report rating scale of sadness used by the psychologist after the participants watched the film. There were many really good responses where candidates were able to discuss both of these issues in context and had a quite sophisticated understanding of the issues with using rating scales including points relating to social desirability, responses bias, replicability of the rating scale and ecological validity. Some candidates did also discuss population validity as well as points related to the enjoyment of the film rating scale which was not credit worthy. Where candidates did not remain focussed on the sadness of the film, generally lower marks were obtained as parts of the response were not receiving credit.

Question No. 13

Responses here were generally very good and gave a clear definition of what is meant by a positive correlation and did put this into the context of this study which was assessing how people felt after watching a sad film. Weaker responses did not put their answer into the context of the study and achieved one mark. There were very few references to cause and effect and independent and dependent variables compared to previous sessions.

G542 Core Studies

General Comments

There was a good range of marks across both candidates and the paper. The paper seemed fair and accessible.

In both Section A and Section B many candidates provided fully contextualised answers. Marks were lost by some candidates who provided vague answers which could, particularly in 16(e) and 16(f) apply to almost any of the three named studies. Q17(b) and Q18(b) in Section C required candidates to demonstrate their understanding of psychology: in Q17(b) candidates had to explain how the individual differences approach could explain why the pseudopatients in Rosenhan's study were misdiagnosed whereas in Q18(b) they were required to explain how the social approach could explain why the prisoners in Reicher and Haslam's study may have rebelled. Some candidates were able to do this well though many found it very difficult to provide adequate explanations and to support these with appropriate evidence. Q17(c) and Q18(c) required candidates to identify a similarity and a difference between the way data was gathered in any studies that take the chosen approach and then support these appropriately with evidence from two studies that take the selected approach. Few candidates answered this question well with many misreading the question completely, merely describing a similarity and a difference between two appropriate studies. Q17(d) and Q18(d) required candidates to both identify and justify appropriate strengths and weaknesses in relation to the way observation was used to gather data in the core studies linked to their chosen approach. These then needed to be supported by appropriate evidence from any appropriate studies. Many candidates tackled this question well and provided answers of a higher quality than in previous sessions.

The quality of written communication continues to prevent some candidates from attaining higher marks and there were many examples of handwriting which was difficult to decipher. Such candidates may be eligible for access arrangements.

Comments on Individual Question

Section A

1 A generally well-answered question though some candidates showed confusion between pigmy and bonobo chimpanzees whilst other candidates referred to normal or regular chimpanzees instead of common.

2a A generally well-answered question. Some candidates however failed to make it clear that leading questions direct a participant towards a desired/wanted/implied response.

2b Another generally well-answered question however there were a few instances where candidates combined questions from Experiment 2 so failed to gain any marks.

3a Overall, a well-answered question.

3b Many candidates scored well on this question giving an appropriate conclusion that was clearly linked to the given table.

4a & 4b Both parts of the Freud question were better answered than in previous sessions. As the question asked candidates to suggest an alternative explanation for Hans' fear of horses, both part (a) and part (b) could have been Freudian. The main weaknesses were that many candidates failed to link their answers to fear of the father/fear of castration/provide an explanation that was not related to information provided in the study e.g. Hans fell off a horse which caused him to develop a fear of horses.

5 Another question that was generally well-answered. There were however some answers which referred to: there being only one row of counters/participants being asked to count the number of counters/an outline of the procedure without specific reference to the conservation of number. In such instances candidates could not gain full marks.

6a There were some good answers here though some candidates referred to the model playing nicely with the bobo doll. Rarely was the correct toy (tinker toy) correctly identified.

6b Many candidates failed to complete comparisons e.g. children who witnessed the non-aggressive model were less aggressive. There were also a fair number of very vague and/or muddled answers.

7 Overall, this question was not answered well. Few candidates showed an ability to state a hypothesis correctly. Correctly formulated hypotheses were expected to gain full marks. This to ensure consistency across all units.

8 As in previous sessions there were numerous instances where candidates referred to the posterior/anterior hippocampus being larger/smaller. This answer was generally poorly answered.

9a There were many good answers here though there were some instances where candidates offered 'speech' and 'language' as their two functions and as 'speech' is an aspect of 'language' they were only able to gain 1 mark.

9b Most candidates scored well on this question. Many answers referred to patients being able to write/draw (with either hand) the object which was irrelevant as there is no reference in the original study to these skills being tested as part of the tactile tests. Writing and drawing abilities were only tested in the visual tasks.

10 Most candidates scored at least half marks on this question. However, many failed to correctly identify the independent variable they described.

11 Generally, a very well answered question.

12a Most candidates scored at least partial marks here however many referred to the study being advertised in relation to learning and punishment/teaching and learning/teaching and memory which was incorrect.

12b Most candidates were able to outline a weakness of self-selecting sampling but few actually contextualised their answer.

13 There were some good answers here. Common errors were: (i) not saying the self-report was used by the thinking aloud group *whilst they were gambling,* (ii) not saying that the questions in the (semi-structured) interview were *skill-related,* (iii) merely providing an example of the questions asked.

14a This question was, overall, not answered well. Few candidates were able to either outline how the pseudopatients became participants and/or outline how observation was used. Many just referred to 'taking notes'.

14b Many candidates managed to score 1 mark but the additional mark was frequently lost because candidates had merely referred to a covert observation.

15 A generally well-answered question with many candidates giving good descriptions of Eve White referring to both character features and test results.

Section B

The most popular choice was Freud though the quality of responses for all three studies was similar.

16a This question part was generally answered well. Some candidates who chose the Freud study merely stated that the aim was to study a phobia in a 5-year-old boy and failed to refer to 'horses'. Also, some candidates who chose the Reicher and Haslam study suggested the aim was to duplicate the Zimbardo study which was considered incorrect.

16b There were some good answers here though some candidates gave either muddled or very basic answers.

16c Most candidates were able to identify and illustrate an appropriate strength/weakness of the qualitative data gathered in their chosen study but many failed to justify/explain the strength/weakness.

16d Overall responses to this question were much better than in previous sessions. Many candidates scored more than half marks by outlining appropriate findings from their chosen study. There were many instances of extremely accurate and detail responses.

16e As in previous sessions, many candidates made basic suggestions and although they were able to justify these, they failed to consider how they might be implemented. There were also some instances where candidates made inappropriate suggestions e.g. conduct the Griffiths study in a real gambling environment – it was done in a genuine gambling arcade/Freud: use a snapshot study – not appropriate for studying progress through the Oedipus complex.

16f Again, many evaluations, although valid, were extremely basic and showed little real understanding e.g. using Freud to interview Little Hans instead of his father would reduce bias and subjectivity – unlikely as Freud was out to find evidence for his own theories. Many candidates just seemed to be regurgitating standard evaluation points e.g. the findings will be more valid/ ecological validity will be improved.

Section C

The social approach seemed to be marginally more popular than the individual approach though the quality of responses for both approaches was similar.

17/18a This question part was generally well answered.

17/18b As in previous sessions, this question part proved to be extremely challenging. Answers relating to Reicher and Haslam were overall marginally better than those relating to Rosenhan. Many answers relating to Reicher and Haslam were generic with no real link to the social approach and no real evidence from the named study. Candidates describing the misdiagnosis of pseudopatients were generally unable to explain that this occurred because doctors did not see them as individuals, instead merely diagnosing them in accordance with generic criteria set down in the DSM.

17/18c Few candidates scored well on this question as they did not make it clear that their identified similarity/difference related to *the way data was gathered,* as required by the question. This meant many responses seemed to be 'this is one I learnt earlier'. The question was not the same as ones asked in previous sessions when candidates were asked to describe one similarity and one difference between any studies/core studies that take the _____ approach. Many candidates therefore did not read the question carefully enough.

17/18d There were some good answers here with many candidates being able to identify and justify both strengths and weaknesses of using observation/an observational method to gather data. Unfortunately, supporting evidence was often either very weak or inappropriate. The evidence had to relate to the use of observation i.e. not be a strength/weakness of the named study per se.

G543 Options in Applied Psychology

General Comments:

As in recent years, the paper appeared fair and reliable, with a vast majority of candidates fully addressing all questions. There were very few candidates appearing to know very little or relying on anecdote. There were no obvious inconsistencies between questions nor did I see any rubric errors. A good range of marks was accessed. I am not aware of any examples where candidates answered questions from the wrong sections. Candidates generally produced a consistent level of response across the four questions although the final one tailed off for some. A vast majority of candidates take Forensic and Clinical options, with a smattering of Sport and very few Education scripts.

The general quality of candidate responses was very varied, the best showing sound evaluative skills or developing lines of argument while fewer displaying poor construction and a less specific response to the question posed. However, knowledge was generally good; it was the skill in using this knowledge which produced most of the variation, as well as level of detail. Candidates were generally well prepared. Marking is mindful of the expectations of standard of a typical 17/18 year old with the wide specification coverage and demand of the exam.

Generally, studies were well learned, the differences in mark allocation was largely dependent on how the knowledge was applied by the candidate. In part (a) questions, some candidates were able to access top band marks with impressively detailed accounts; others compromised this but were equally impressive in how they astutely applied their knowledge to respond precisely to the demands of the question. In part (b), scripts were marked out from others by referring their evaluative points to relevant research studies. For candidates who achieved this the better ones explained their issue beyond merely identifying it. Of these, the top band was accessed by those who discussed/assessed/compared/evaluated or followed a line of argument. However, consistently good 2nd band answers would approximate the A/B grade boundary, hence the advice that consistency was the hallmark of an A grade script.

As teachers we have a dual task of educating and nurturing fascination and curiosity as well as how to pass exams and the two are not necessarily mutually exclusive. There is a clear improvement in student engagement with the material when there is genuine interest rather than formulaic learning. As stated, better candidates answered the question asked, whereas others did not (e.g. Q1a saw weaker students regurgitate a study or outline cognition and thinking, whereas better candidates explained criminal behaviour specifically, with direct links to criminal thinking patterns. Some candidates merely outlined research, where better responses used the research to support an explanation which was precise to the question i.e. to explain criminal behaviour. Many candidates talked of criminal thinking patterns, for example, and even referred to Yochelson and Samenow without any reference to criminal behaviour.

Part (b) responses showed great variation. The skill required is “application of knowledge and understanding” rather than to simply “evaluate”. The very best candidates would develop the answer a stage further, such as with a challenge, an extension or a legitimate comparison. Effectively addressing the injunction was a key differentiating aspect and was broadly interpreted by examiners. As ever, an extended demonstration within an answer would be sufficient to award a higher band mark even where the whole answer may not have maintained this level. It is further acknowledged that a consistently strong band 2 response would access the top band.

Weaker candidates made general points without the necessary application/contextualisation which was needed to take answers to higher bands. This was typified in pre-learned evaluative comments that lacked anything beyond a superficial understanding of the material. For example 4b and 5b required commentary of methodology, which was specifically and systematically

addressed by stronger candidates; weaker candidates however seemed to churn out pre-learned limitations (e.g. reductionism) without necessarily linking to methodology. Part (b) responses improved when candidates went beyond being overly descriptive and points were well expressed in the context of the question. I was particularly delighted to see certain previously elusive evaluation issues have now been clarified and mastered, as suggested in previous reports, most notably when asked to discuss reliability or validity.

Candidates from some centres have clearly been taught to add a 'however' (on the other hand) between paragraphs even though the information does not follow on or connect to the paragraph above it. Legitimate links however, are readily credited.

Comments on Individual Questions:

1a Many candidates referred to a relevant study, usually Yochelson and Samenow, and linked the study and its findings to criminal behaviour. Some of these answers, however, merely reported the study without specifying how thinking patterns explain criminal behaviour. Some good references beyond that suggested on the specification, Palmer and Hollin being an example of this.

1b Nearly all candidates described both strengths and limitations, as required. All attempted to comment. Some got confused, did not relate to studies or used contrived pre-set evaluative points which did not lend themselves to cognitive explanations of criminal behaviour. Better candidates did not fall foul of such errors.

2a Most candidates referred to weapon focus with varying degrees of detail and understanding. Loftus' work was generally well used in support of this, though her gender seemed variable.

2b Most candidates had a good idea of what constitutes 'scientific' referring variously to methodology, control, lab-based research, equipment and technology, use of quantitative data, replicability, reliability and validity etc. How they considered research in light of these features and the extent it applies determined the level of award the candidate received.

3a Most answers described Ross et al.`s study. Most candidates described the study fairly well with the effect of the videotape, shield, or no shield, on the jury and/or on the children giving evidence. Better candidates referred directly to there being no significant effect and qualified their statements, such as when there was no other evidence, immediacy or gender. Weaker candidates drifted into the anecdotal.

3b This was not particularly well responded to. Answers appeared to be pre-set ethical comments so mixed up actors and participants, for example. Better answers located ethical comment appropriately in the context of the studies and developed legitimate arguments.

4(a) Better responses described the study in detail including the process of anger management, methods used to collect the data or the effectiveness of anger management as offender treatment. Many candidates produced a 'this is what I know about anger management' response and then briefly referred to the results/conclusion of Ireland`s study. A number of candidates failed to refer it to offender treatment.

4(b) This question was generally answered well as candidates considered various methodological difficulties encountered by researchers investigating offender treatment programmes (e.g. validity, ethics, use of self-report). Higher marks were attained through elaborating and discussing difficulties encountered. Weaker candidates evaluated only treatment which limited these responses as they were not focused on the questions (similar to 1b).

5a Most candidates were able to outline a physiological measure and demonstrate its use in a piece of research, most notably Lustman. The better responses emphasised the physiological measure rather than this being incidental to the recounting of a study in all its splendour, whether it all addressed the question or not.

5b This question was answered fairly well as candidates considered various methodological difficulties encountered by researchers investigating adherence. Reliability and validity were often referred to with varying amounts of success. Bulpitt was referenced regularly, again some candidates making excellent comment about review studies while others made rather more spurious points. A few candidates referred to strengths and weaknesses (maybe in pre-planned essays) whereas only difficulties were requested.

6a This question was fairly well addressed as candidates were able to describe research using a combined approach to measure stress (e.g. Johansson, 1978). Candidates who scored higher marks described both measures and the study in detail (e.g. rating scale from 0 onwards). Lower marks were scored where detail was compromised and for anecdotal answers.

6b Better responses were clear about what reliability is (as distinguished from validity), raised it in reference to measures of stress, often located in research (Holmes and Rahe; Kanner), assessing reliable and less reliable material (physiological measures v self-report). A developed assessment rather than bland comments typified the better responses.

7a Candidates tended to make a good attempt at this question, referring to the listing of symptoms and the use of axes in ICD and DSM, although a few candidates fell foul of mentioning the manuals without saying how dysfunctional behaviour could be categorised. Alternatively, reference to Rosenhan's definitions of abnormality was generally well employed.

7b This question differentiated candidates well. Most candidates had an understanding of ways in which it is appropriate and inappropriate to diagnose dysfunctional behaviour, using research well to identify shortcomings while appreciating its value to recommend treatment. Recognising that the question concerns the validity of a list of behaviours or reliability between practitioners typified stronger responses but was also an area of confusion for some.

8a Those covering a neurotransmitter explanation such as dopamine hypothesis (schizophrenia) or serotonin (depression) tended to give the more thorough explanation of the links between biology and a dysfunctional disorder. Many candidates failed to explain how biology affects behaviour beyond a basic statement and then cite a study to show this. Phobias were most commonly referenced, with biological preparedness being well explained and research specifically linking to this explanation. This was the most poorly explained by some, with weak explanation and poorly described study not linked well.

8b Candidates that scored higher marks considered reductionism in detail and within the context of the disorder using research evidence effectively. Generally, candidates were aware of reductionism and made some assessment about the explanations of the disorder named in 8(a) being reductionist. A common error was evaluating studies rather than explanations. In a minority of answers the same disorder from 8(a) was not outlined such as giving a cognitive explanation for GAD rather than a cognitive explanation for a phobia. However, lower scoring answers were more generic or showed little understanding of reductionism.

There were fewer sport and education candidates, similar issues were found.

G544 Approaches and Research Methods in Psychology

General Comments

The overall standard of performance of the candidates was good and candidates appear to have knowledge of the appropriate material and to be well prepared for the style of questions. In section A candidates described a feasible investigation in detail which was both practical and ethical. Many candidates gave concise, replicable descriptions of a practical project based on the research question. Popular option choices were physical attraction and intelligence and physical attraction and sense of humour. It was pleasing to see that more candidates are answering the short questions in the context of their practical investigation. In section B, most candidates showed understanding of the questions under discussion but sometimes their points were not fully elaborated or their examples described in much detail. Some of the examples used were inappropriate. There were few rubric errors and most candidates were able to complete the paper in the allocated time although a few appeared to be short of time as the parts d and e on section B could be very brief. Although there is not a requirement to include research from the A2 options unit many candidates were over-reliant on AS studies which limited the scope of their answers. The AS studies were used to good effect in the candidates' responses.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A

1 Most candidates wrote a clear, operationalised hypothesis which followed logically from the option choice. The majority of candidates scored full marks.

2 This question was marked out of 13 +6. 13 marks were given for the description of the practical project and its replicability and appropriateness. 6 marks were given for the design and its feasibility. The full range of marks (13) and (6) was awarded.

3 The method was clearly described although it was not always fully replicable. Most candidates knew how to select a sample and carry out a simple correlational study. Some participants did not explain their design fully enough or give enough procedural details such as the setting and location, whether the data was collected from participants individually or in groups etc. Some candidates ignored the instruction to collect data from 10 participants. This should have steered candidates into collecting 10 pairs of scores to use in a correlational design. It is important that candidates describe research that falls within BPS ethical guidelines.

Although some research was describes using 10-15 year olds, most candidates are aware of the need to use participants over 16 years of age.

4 Candidates could gain full marks for describing the advantage of correlation and could relate it to their own practical. Very few made the error of giving cause and effect as an advantage.

5 Part a and b. This question gave candidates the opportunity to describe a different way to measure their variable and evaluate that suggestion. This was done clearly and imaginatively.

6 Most candidates were able to sketch and fully label a scattergram with data shown.

7 Candidates have a good knowledge of ethical issues that arise in correlations and can suggest appropriate ways of dealing with these but not always in the context of their own practical project. Confidentiality was commonly used.

8 Most candidates could suggest an appropriate alternative sampling method in the context of their own practical.

Section B

8a) Candidates had a clear understanding of longitudinal research which they showed by describing aspects of the research such as looking for behaviour change, often in developmental psychology over an extended period of time.

8b) Most of the studies were correctly identified as longitudinal research and were often from AS, such as Thigpen and Cleckley and Freud. Many candidates described the research in detail and made links to the concept of longitudinal research.

8c) There was some clear evidence of structure to these responses with a balance of strengths and weaknesses. Better responses evaluated longitudinal research and used evidence effectively to support the points made. Candidates should be advised to direct their evaluative points towards the longitudinal nature of the research rather than the studies per se. Marks in all bands were awarded although the majority of marks fell between 5 -8.

8d) This produced a good spread of marks and there were some good responses with candidates finding one similarity and one difference. Some candidates tended to give responses that were study led. Candidates could gain full marks with two well described comparisons if they were supported by appropriate evidence from the method. Weaker responses attempted to describe the methods.

8e) Candidates needed to discuss the validity of observational research rather than simply give examples of the research. Good responses discussed points such as the lack of ecological validity of participants observed in laboratory settings.

9a) Good responses outlined the experimental method which involves the manipulation of variables in order to find a cause effect relationship between the IV and DV as well as emphasising the different nature of field experiments which are experiments which take place in a natural environment.

9b) A wide range of research was cited but Piliavin and Rosenhan from the AS course were popular choices. Many candidates were good at describing these studies in detail but some failed to make an explicit link to the method.

9c) Candidates need to discuss the strengths/limitations of the field experimental method rather than simply evaluating research. It is important that candidates support their arguments with appropriate evidence. Responses should not be repetitive as there are many more points to be made than simply focusing on high ecological validity.

9d) Good responses discussed several points of comparison arising from the method when comparing the case study in the individual differences approach to the case study in the developmental e.g. the nature of the sample and length of study. Many responses failed to make a comparison of the methods but focused on describing research. Credit was given when a comparison had been made.

9e) Stronger responses made points about the generalisability of the case study method. e.g. the lack of large enough sample size to reflect nature of target population. Candidates should avoid describing research without a discussion of the points made.

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

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