

OCR Report to Centres

June 2013

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.

© OCR 2013

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Psychology (J611)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
Overview	1
B541 Studies and Applications in Psychology 1	2
B542 Studies and Applications in Psychology 2	6
B543 Research in Psychology	10

Overview

The distribution of results was similar for this series as with others, although a larger proportion of the entry had followed the terminal route this year. Of course, next year, all candidates will be following this route.

The number of candidates being awarded an aggregated grade increased from last summer, and most of these had sat B542 as their terminal unit. The entries were smaller for B541 than previous years as this was historically done as the first module on the unitised course. A number of B543 candidates were re-sitting the unit and many showed an improvement demonstrating that the skills assessed in this unit are well developed across the duration of the course.

Centres are clearly acting on the outcomes and feedback from previous series, and candidates were, by and large, well prepared for the examinations. Performance across all three units showed a good level of consistency, and there was minimal evidence of candidates confusing topics either within or between units.

As with the last series, many candidates demonstrated impressive knowledge of the core studies. When given a choice of studies or theories (as occurred on both B541 and B542), candidates often fair better when they choose the one they have been taught as core. Extended responses continue to be of a high standard but, in the case of studies, candidates should aim for top band scores by contextualising evaluative points. Some candidates still need to be clearer on what is expected of them when they are specifically asked to evaluate. This was particularly problematic when a question required evaluation and nothing else.

Candidates recalled and selected key concepts effectively across all three units, and the vast majority of candidates now understand the distinction between studies and theories. Through different styles of questioning, candidates demonstrated a more secure knowledge of applications than previous years. Candidates showed impressive knowledge of research skills across all three units suggesting Centres are effectively integrating this part of the specification into their delivery of the GCSE.

B541 Studies and Applications in Psychology 1

General Comments:

Candidates performed well on this paper particularly in terms of knowledge and understanding. There was little confusion between studies and theories, and questions pertaining to applications were generally well identified. Candidates can improve their performance by recognising when a question requires them to evaluate and also need to be clear on what this skill demands. This series saw a change in the makeup of the entry as it was the first time that mid-course candidates could not sit the module. This meant that most of the entry was either candidates re-sitting the module or candidates who were sitting this module, alongside the two others, after doing the GCSE for a year.

Comments on Individual Questions:

- Q1** Most candidates did well on this question with the majority correctly matching three of the four stages. The stage that was most likely to be incorrectly matched was 'Storage' which was frequently linked to the example of encoding.
- Q2** Most candidates correctly identified the long term memory on 2(b) but fewer identified sensory store for 2(a). A common error was to offer stages of information processing (despite being questioned on this in Q1) rather than actual stores.
- Q3** Many candidates managed to score something on this question but a significant minority of candidates confused decay with displacement. Most candidates made reference to time and to lack of rehearsal (or similar) and therefore were able to score two marks. The third mark was more elusive for the majority of candidates but better responses found other ways of describing the process of decay and/or recognised that data becomes available when this type of forgetting occurs.
- Q4** The majority of candidates showed some knowledge of the procedure used in Terry's experiment and many were able to earn themselves two marks. Reference to the independent variable (immediate and delayed recall) was a prerequisite for full marks and this proved to be a good discriminator - especially as many candidates only acknowledged one of the conditions in their description. A number of candidates offered findings instead of or as well as procedure but there was no credit available for this.
- Q5** Most candidates were able to identify a memory aid which made sense given the source. Many could give some description of how it would be used or why it would work but only a few candidates effectively described and explained its application with enough clarity to earn all marks.
- Q6** Most candidates earned both marks here although a common mistake was to offer agoraphobia in place of social phobia.
- Q7** Virtually all candidates got this question correct. The few who didn't tended to offer 'The setting lacked ecological validity' (correct) and 'The participant behaved differently because he was being observed' (incorrect).
- Q8** Few candidates scored full marks here, with most unable to correctly identify the unconditioned stimulus. Many candidates recognised it was something to do with the seagull but only offered this as the answer or linked the fear response to the stealing of the ice cream rather than the actual swooping. A common error in responses to other parts was to offer more than was being asked for, mainly a stimulus and a response e.g.

offering 'phobia of feathers' for 8(d). There were a significant minority of candidates who demonstrated a poor understanding of these terms - for example, offering 'beach' as conditioned stimulus or 'stealing ice cream' as an unconditioned response.

- Q9** This question was generally well answered and elicited a good range of marks. Most candidates chose flooding as the behaviour therapy. However, candidates struggled to gain all four marks for varying reasons – chiefly for not expressing adequately that flooding means clients facing their 'worst' fear, for referring to cognitive outcomes (e.g. realising fear is irrational) rather than behavioural outcomes (forming a new association), and/or for failing to apply the therapy to Adam's specific situation. A significant minority of candidates identified one type of behaviour therapy and then went on to describe another.
- Q10** Some candidates clearly misunderstood this question with common errors being either to offer criticisms of a study or to list different types of phobias. Candidates that did interpret the question correctly often scored well, although some should have planned their responses more carefully to avoid overlapping points.
- Q11** In part (a) many candidates referred to androgyny involving people having both masculine and feminine characteristics but very few recognised that there should be a balance. Weaker responses tended to use sex terms rather than gender terms. The second part saw more creditworthy answers, but a common error was to assume that a particular sex automatically possessed the gender associated with that sex - answers such as 'a girl who likes playing rugby'. Very weak responses offered atypical syndromes, examples of sexuality or even named people.
- Q12** Examiners were looking for any two relevant features to award both marks here, and on this basis most candidates earned both marks. Indeed, many candidates showed impressive knowledge of the Electra complex offering much more than was needed for the two marks on offer. Common errors were to make reference to lust for father rather than his penis and to make reference to fear of mother rather than fear of loss of her love. Some candidates should have used the term identification rather than 'imitating' or 'associating' to secure a mark. Very few candidates made the mistake of confusing the Electra complex with the Oedipus complex.
- Q13** There were a high number of correct responses earning all four marks. The most common error was to offer the response 'gonads' in place of 'chromosomes'.
- Q14** The best responses focused on a feature of the theory and explained, often through use of evidence, why its assumption was wrong. Other good responses recognised that there is a role for learning in gender development and then gave examples to support this (e.g. cultural variations in gender roles, changes in gender over time). Common errors included a belief that the theory does not explain androgyny, or that it does not explain atypical gender development. A surprising number of candidates misunderstood the nature of a criticism, simply explaining the biological approach instead.
- Q15** Most candidates gained at least some marks on this question but knowledge of the details of the study varied greatly. Full marks were not awarded to many candidates as most struggled after identifying the loss of Bruce's penis and his being raised as a girl. The best responses made explicit reference to Brenda's changing gender role/identity as part of the findings and then drew a conclusion that made clear reference to the role of biology over the environment. Although it didn't usually lead to a loss of marks, a number of candidates seemed to be of the belief that Diamond & Sigmundson were directly involved in the case - for example that they decided to remove Bruce's penis in the first place, or that they advised the parents to raise Bruce as a girl or even that they raised Brenda themselves.

- Q16** Most candidates could identify the secure attachment but there was some confusion of the two insecure attachments.
- Q17** There was evidence of many candidates attempting to expand on their chosen limitation but many could not elaborate enough for a third mark - sometimes because they chose a limitation where this was not an easy task. Good responses identified a limitation, explained it, and then considered its impact on the study itself. A significant number of candidates chose to offer a second criticism to expand their answer even though the question clearly asked for just one. A common error was to evaluate Ainsworth's study where the limitations had no relevance to the Hazen & Shaver study.
- Q18** Most candidates chose the hospital setting for the chosen method of application - with the practices of skin-to-skin contact at birth and flexible visiting hours/carers staying over in wards being frequently offered. The best way to earn the second mark was to explain the reasoning behind the practice.
- Q19** Most candidates got the right answer here although attachment types were frequently offered too.
- Q20** A number of candidates did not know how to approach this question - either omitting it, describing a study or offering their own very common sense theories. The majority of candidates opted for Bowlby's theory. Most candidates could give a good account of monotropy and the critical period (although the terms in themselves did not receive credit) but the best answers also made reference to the instinctive nature of attachment and its role in survival. Where Bowlby was chosen, a common mistake was to describe deprivation and privation rather than the theoretical part of these processes i.e. the proposed effects of being deprived and privated. It was pleasing to see that most candidates followed the command of the question - just describing the theory rather than evaluating it as well.
- Q21** The vast majority of candidates score both marks by recognising that both statements were true.
- Q22** Most candidates score well here, especially on part (c). Part (b) caused the most problems with many candidates offering 'avoiding conflict' which negated the correct part of their response i.e. 'agreeing with others'. Candidates need to be careful to focus on the specific part of the sentence that is being asked for.
- Q23** A reasonably well answered question with many candidates being credited for the use of uniforms (most notably in schools or prisons). There were also some good responses focusing on the use of punishment and reward, and the manipulation of consensus. Too many candidates offered more than one way of keeping order so often did not say enough about any one way to earn full marks.
- Q24** A high proportion of candidates referred either to a personality who likes to give out orders, or to one who obeys orders willingly, but few were able to offer the distinction between obedience to those in power and exercising authority over those perceived as inferior - which was needed for one mark. However, there were a number of references to strict upbringing (or similar) which were worthy of one of the marks.
- Q25** Bickman was the most commonly offered study here, although there were some decent attempts to describe studies such as Milgram's, Hofling et al's and Zimbardo's - however evaluation tended to be weaker where these alternative studies were offered. Candidates showed detailed knowledge of the Bickman study although a common error was to assume each confederate wore a different uniform. There was also a lack of clarity when describing the tasks in a number of responses, and candidates should guard against

using the idea of passers-by listening to confederates, as in 'they listened to the guard more than the civilian' because, strictly speaking, this is not the dependent variable. Evaluation of Bickman was often impressive demonstrating both breadth and depth - however, some evaluation points read like a list of standard criticisms with little reference to the study itself. A common error was to relate gender bias to the fact that all participants were male when in fact it was the confederates that were all male. Too many candidates also wrongly stated that Bickman's study lacked ecological validity. Overall, the standard of written communication was good and tended to match the quality of the content of the essay.

B542 Studies and Applications in Psychology 2

General Comments:

Candidates performed well on this paper and in line with previous series. Candidates' knowledge and understanding was generally good but some were unable to provide specific details of studies or key terminology. There were only occasional examples of candidates confusing studies and theories, and questions relating to applications were generally well answered. Candidates do need to get better at recognising when a question requires them to evaluate and also need to be clear on what this skill demands of them. Examiners noted that common errors are beginning to occur across series but many of these could be easily addressed and improve candidates' chances of doing well on future papers.

Comments on Individual Questions:

- Q1** Most candidates scored full marks here by choosing the correct answer in each case. The nationality of the participants and the set of parents having the most effect on criminal behaviour were the answers most likely to be wrong.
- Q2** Few candidates had problems identifying an appropriate role model although a number of candidates suggested “criminals” which was not enough unless they were more specific about why they would be role models. Fewer candidates got the mark for the example of vicarious reinforcement. The main problem was that candidates were not specific about what the reward would be, or did not specify the crime when the reward was more obscure e.g. sweets.
- Q3** Part (a) caused very few problems with most candidates earning a mark. Some candidates made the mistake of focusing on hair which strictly speaking is not a feature, and others simply stated features e.g. ears, nose, etc. Most candidates earned both marks in part (b) - usually by making a reference to genes or similar, and then explaining that this is passed on from parent to child. However, there were also some very sophisticated responses that considered dominant and recessive genes and the likelihood of inheritance. Part (c) was the most challenging for candidates. Although many candidates accurately recalled many areas of the brain associated with criminality and their respective functions, most were not specific about the type of crime the dysfunction might relate to e.g. an overactive limbic system may explain crimes like rape.
- Q4** There were examples of excellent responses which covered a range of well explained limitations of the biological theory, including the issue of one criminal gene explaining all crimes and even the idea of crime being a social construct and therefore not biological. Other responses were more basic, identifying that the biological theory ignored the effect of the environment or that not all criminals showed brain dysfunction - but even these two points would have been worth two marks overall. The main issue was the large number of candidates who did not evaluate despite the use of the command word. Instead, many of these candidates offered description of the biological theory - quite often repeating what they had said in different parts of Q3.
- Q5** Nearly all candidates could identify the two other constancies although a reasonably common error was to offer depth cues. Very few candidates could outline the kind of illustrations that would get credit - either the illustrations were simply definitions of the chosen constancies or had elements missing. This was despite the fact that an example had been given to help candidates to frame their own illustrations.

- Q6** Most candidates could identify two relevant depth cues - although some offered cues not apparent in the picture. In most cases, the depth cues were named but others relied on descriptions to earn the first of each pair of marks. Although a significant number of candidates were well prepared for this kind of question, too many were unable to apply their cue adequately to the picture. A common problem was to talk about an object - often the elephant - being further away or higher or smaller but there was no comparison with another object at this point. Some candidates also referred to objects being in front or behind rather than talking about the distance of an object. As with previous series - candidates frequently identified 'height in plane' as the cue but then went on to describe relative size when applying the cue to the picture limiting themselves to one of the two marks.
- Q7** Most candidates appeared to understand what this question was asking for and a number of candidates showed good knowledge of these difficult processes compared to previous series. The majority of candidates knew that top down processing relied on expectations from past experience, and many candidates could draw an explicit comparison with bottom up processing, or at least identify two implicit comparisons. Common errors were to describe features of bottom up processing that actually apply to both processes (e.g. data comes from the environment, eyes send information to the brain), or to confuse or not name the two processes in the answer. Some candidates simply stated which theory each process was associated with but this was not credited as a feature.
- Q8** This question elicited the full range of marks, with subliminal advertising being the most popular response. However, the best responses often outlined the use of perceptual set in the manipulation of audience perception. Some responses covered a number of techniques but were often limited to two marks because they lacked any real explanation - candidates that focused on one technique and covered it well tended to score better. A common error was to focus on how advertising can impact on memory or on attention rather than perception.
- Q9** The second and third part of this question saw many correct responses. However, the first part had fewer correct responses, often because candidates were quoting more than the phrase that was required. Candidates need to ensure that they read and respond to the question set.
- Q10** In general, candidates were not precise enough about what makes stages invariant - with many just offering another word for invariant, usually 'fixed'. However what they needed to get across was the idea that order or timing of stages is fixed. Candidates fared better on the second part of this question although some thought it was enough to simply say that stages apply to all rather than making it explicit that this would be all people in the world.
- Q11** Most candidates opted for Piaget's conservation of number experiment, using counters, and there were some clear and accurate descriptions of the study. Common errors were to offer Piaget's 'three mountains' experiment (not on conservation as such) or to offer studies done by others (e.g. McGarrigle & Donaldson's version with the naughty teddy).
- Q12** Virtually all candidates scored both marks here.
- Q13** The marks on this question were distributed fairly evenly. Those that scored zero often made the mistake of offering limitations of Piaget's research (despite Q12). One mark responses sometimes had the problem that one criticism overlapped too much with the other.

- Q14** This was a challenging question for many candidates. The question required a definition of a key term taken from the specification and indeed a number of candidates were well prepared for this - giving a clear and precise response to the question. A number of candidates demonstrated an underlying understanding of the term and sometimes this was enough to earn them one of the marks. However, too many candidates were simply guessing at what it meant and indeed a significant minority simply missed out the question altogether.
- Q15** Nearly all candidates got credit for giving a feasible reason for going to a counsellor, although some were more sophisticated than others with 'depression' being the most commonly offered reason. Fewer candidates earned the second mark, usually because their chosen feature was too generic and applied to many other forms of therapy. A common error was to assume counsellors would give advice when that clearly goes against the philosophy of the approach.
- Q16** Candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of the Van Houtte & Jarvis study with the vast majority correctly identifying all four statements as either true or false.
- Q17** Many candidates did try to expand on their chosen limitation but not many could elaborate enough for a third mark - sometimes because they chose a limitation where this was not an easy thing to do. Good responses identified a limitation, explained it, and then considered its impact on the study itself. A significant number of candidates chose to offer a second criticism to expand their answer even though the question clearly only asked for one.
- Q18** Although a number of candidates failed to score on this question (normally because no answer was offered) where candidates did score, the full range of marks were credited. Most candidates chose to focus on humanistic theory and this tended to lead to higher marks as there is so much detail that can be offered. However, this caused problems for some candidates who tended to list lots of features with no coherency or explanation in their response thus limiting them to a middle band mark. Most candidates did evaluate their chosen theory, usually with some success.
- Q19** Nearly all candidates scored two marks here. A common mistake was to offer two types of facial expression for one answer and two types of body language for another. This meant there were contradictory answers for each part of the question and therefore no credit could be given. A significant number of candidates gave their own examples of non-verbal communication rather than using the source as directed.
- Q20** Most candidates found this question straightforward, correctly matching the four terms with the correct examples.
- Q21** As with Q4, a large proportion of candidates just described the theory when they had only been asked to evaluate it. Indeed, it was even more of an issue on this question than Q4 showing an inconsistency in some candidates' approach. Where candidates did understand what the question required, there were some high quality responses. Some candidates' criticisms were quite generic and it would have been better if they had been considered more in the context of explaining non-verbal communication.
- Q22** Most candidates made a good effort to answer this question with nearly every candidate using the core study carried out by Yuki et al. Weaker responses described a theory rather than a study. Descriptions of Yuki et al's study were generally clear and detailed but many candidates missed the opportunity to outline the nature of the emoticons and some were vague on what was being rated in the study. There was more difference in the quality of evaluation. Most evaluation points were valid, but better answers explored them in the context of the study e.g. explaining why Yuki et

al's laboratory experiment lacked ecological validity rather than simply stating that it did. Too many candidates are still making the mistake of claiming the study was culturally biased and a number also wrongly suggested it was gender biased. The quality of written communication was of a decent standard and was often matched by the substance of the essay.

B543 Research in Psychology

General Comments:

A significant number of candidates showed a good level of knowledge and understanding of conducting research in psychology.

A very high proportion of candidates attempted all the questions on the paper demonstrating the paper was accessible to almost all candidates. It was pleasing to see a high number of candidates using a good level of psychological terminology in their responses. Candidates are encouraged to pay particular attention to the method requested in section B as candidates are still seen to be designing alternative methods to that requested (for example, interviews or observations when the questionnaire method has been asked for).

In section A, candidates are encouraged to utilise the source material more effectively. Key features of the source can be used to illustrate responses and to demonstrate a good level of understanding throughout. Application is a key feature of this paper and as such candidates are encouraged to pay particular attention to those questions which demand contextualisation.

In section B, candidates are encouraged to focus on continuity between the questions to avoid muddled or contradictory designs. Candidates are also encouraged to avoid repetition in their responses across questions as credit for one aspect of a design can only be achieved once. Indeed, there is a general need for candidates to plan their responses more carefully. This paper is one hour long to allow for additional planning and it is evident that some candidates are making good use of this time. Higher scoring responses were often preceded by a plan using the space given on the paper. A common characteristic of low scoring responses on this section was the absence of any kind of planning in the box.

Candidates need to be able to distinguish between concepts clearly. For example in this paper, the concepts of reliability and validity were often confused as were ethical issues and ethnicity and ecological validity. Candidates also need to be able to apply the concepts to novel situations as described by the source material and go beyond just learning a definition of them. For example, in this paper, those candidates who were able to demonstrate they knew what concepts such as reliability meant often failed to explain them fully when asked to apply them to the source material.

Candidates are also encouraged to pay particular attention to the command words in questions and go beyond the mere identification of a concept or evaluative point, when a description, level of interpretation or explanation is required. Likewise, the use of circular and tautological definitions should be avoided.

Comments on Individual Questions:

- Q1** Few incorrect responses were observed for this question with the majority of candidates identifying that the null hypothesis predicts that there will be no significant difference.
- Q2** Generally a well answered question with many candidates correctly identifying the independent and dependent variables from the study in the source. Where errors were made, the independent variable was confused with the dependent variable and vice versa. Candidates are encouraged not to draw more than the number of lines stated in the question.

- Q3** A range of responses was identified for this question. Whilst many candidates could identify the sample in the source, some candidates confused the sample with sampling methods and tried to identify which sampling method had been used by the psychologist in the source.
- Q4** The majority of candidates were able to demonstrate an understanding of the purpose of a control such as to make it a fair test or to reduce the effects of extraneous variables.
- Q5** A very well answered question with very few incorrect responses being observed.
- Q6 (a)** Overall this was a well answered question with many candidates correctly naming repeated measures as the design used in the source. Candidates who failed to achieve the mark commonly gave the research method (for example identifying a laboratory experiment) as opposed to the experimental design.
- Q6 (b)** Whilst many candidates were able to correctly identify a reduction in participant variables / individual differences or less participants needing to be found as a strength of using a repeated measures experimental design, fewer candidates were able to go beyond this simple identification and explain fully how using the same participants acted as a strength for the study in the source. Candidates are encouraged to use the information in the source material to contextualise / evidence their responses where required. A common error seen was repetition in responses between Q4 and Q6(b) whereby candidates were seen to repeat their responses in both questions.
- Q7** Although this was a well answered question, some candidates either identified an appropriate ethical issue but failed to contextualise to the source or described appropriate evidence without identifying the ethical issue. Candidates are encouraged to utilise the source material where applicable. Some candidates continue to confuse ethical issues with ethnicity or ecological validity.
- Q8** Responses varied on this question. Whilst some candidates showed a good understanding of the concept of demand characteristics and could outline how they may affect a study, these were in the minority. Some candidates did not demonstrate an understanding of the term and fewer were able to explain the concept in its entirety.
- Q9(a)** Generally this was a well answered question although some candidates were unable to distinguish between low ecological validity and ecological validity with many candidates stating what is meant by low ecological validity and thus not achieving the mark.
- Q9(b)** Generally this was a well answered question with many candidates giving an appropriate reason why the study in the source may have lacked ecological validity. Identifying the research being conducted in a laboratory was the most common answer seen.
- Q10** There were a surprisingly large number of candidates who failed to read and interpret the bar chart correctly. The most common errors seen were where candidates attempted to conduct some form of calculation on the ratings given; dividing the correct median rating by two to give an incorrect response for example, and some candidates rounded up the rating to give an answer of 7 or rounded it down to give an answer of 6. Candidates are encouraged to become more familiar with interpreting data presented in charts and graphs.

- Q11** Many candidates only gave a partial answer here by identifying a weakness of the interview method but failing to outline the weakness in light of using the interview method. Many candidates relied on weaknesses such as participants may lie but they did not go beyond this. Those candidates who did achieve full marks gave fully outlined responses that went beyond mere identification.
- Q12(a)** This was one of the lowest scoring questions in section A. Many candidates failed to demonstrate knowledge of the concept of reliability; incorrectly stating that reliability meant trustworthiness or accuracy or offered definitions of validity instead.
- Q12(b)** This was one of the lowest scoring questions in section A. Many candidates gave reasons for measuring brain activity that were unrelated to achieving reliability with the results or they repeated their responses from Q12(a).
- Q13(a)** This was a very well answered question with the majority of candidates identifying a type of observation that could have been used to study the participants.
- Q13(b)** This was a well answered question with many candidates giving an appropriate explanation for their choice of observation in Q13(a). A minority of candidates confused observation types and provided a justification for a different type of observation than they had stated in Q13(a) or confused types of observations, for example overt and covert were seen to be used interchangeably as was participant and non-participant. On occasion, covert was mistaken for non-participant and vice versa.

Section B

- Q14(a)** The majority of candidates could demonstrate their understanding of the nature of a hypothesis by predicting either a difference or no difference. The most common error was to not include a full independent variable or omit the dependent variable. Where other errors were made, candidates were seen giving aims or research questions instead of hypotheses.
- Q14(b)(i)** This was a very well answered question and the majority of candidates identified an appropriate sampling method for use in their investigation. A minority of candidates confused samples with sampling methods and incorrectly offered a choice of participant for their investigation.
- Q14(b)(ii)** Responses to this question varied. Some candidates gave accurate descriptions of how they would use the sampling method they stated in Q14(b) (i) but some candidates failed to demonstrate an understanding of the sampling method they had chosen by offering descriptions for alternative methods or by giving circular definitions.
- Q14(b)(iii)** Those candidates who gave sampling methods which are named in the specification in Q14 (b) (i) for example random and opportunity tended to achieve the mark here for offering a valid strength in this part of the question. Where candidates offered alternative sampling methods such as volunteer, stratified or quota, generic or incorrect strengths were often seen.
- Q14(c)** This was a very well answered question with the majority of candidates being able to offer two appropriate questions. A minority of candidates gave two questions that asked for the same or similar information or gave questions that failed to target the participant.

- Q14(d)** Responses to this question varied greatly. Few candidates achieved full marks by including at least three relevant features of how the questionnaire could be carried out. However, despite there being some very good responses, many candidates failed to show an understanding of the questionnaire method. Responses referring to using interviews or to conducting observations were commonly seen. Candidates need to be careful not to give details of the procedures that have been assessed in previous parts of the questions (ie the sampling method (14(b)), repetitions of the questions stated in 14 (c) or ethical considerations (14(f)). Candidates were often seen giving justifications for their procedure also. Candidates are encouraged to be mindful of contradictory procedures in light of information provided in other question parts.
- Q14(e)(i)** A well answered question with many candidates identifying an appropriate ethical issue applicable to their investigation. Those candidates not achieving the mark tended to confuse ethical issues with ethnicity and offered responses that referred to the use of participants from different countries.
- Q14(e)(ii)** Candidates were often seen to describe the ethical issue they had identified in Q14 (e) (i) or to repeat their previous answer without outlining *how* they would deal with the issue as requested by the question. Many candidates identified a solution to their ethical issue without giving any further information, thus achieving a partially correct response. Candidates are encouraged to pay attention to the command words in questions and to elaborate on responses where, outline, explain or describe are the featured in the question.
- Q14(f)** Responses to this question varied. A key feature of section B is continuity and as such candidates are encouraged to contextualise their responses in light of their investigation's design. Many candidates were seen to offer strengths that contradicted their design; offering a strength of using open questions when they have stated using closed questions in Q14(c) and Q14 (d) for example, and thus could only achieve a partially correct response. Some candidates failed to show knowledge of the strengths associated with using the questionnaire method and a minority focussed on strengths of alternative features of their designs such as the sample or sampling method instead.

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

© OCR 2013

