

Psychology

Advanced GCE A2 H568

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H168

Examiners' Reports

January 2011

HX68/R/11J

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils 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 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 2011

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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Psychology (H568)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Psychology (H168)

EXAMINERS' REPORTS

Content	Page
G541 Psychological Investigations	1
G542 Core Studies	4
G543 Options in Applied Psychology	8
G544 Approaches and Research Methods in Psychology	13

G541 Psychological Investigations

General Comments

Most candidates seemed generally well prepared for the examination, with very few candidates unable to attempt all questions on the paper. However, the key difference, as in previous sessions between candidates who performed well and those who performed less well was a failure to contextualise answers to the theme of the research presented in the scenario provided.

Another hallmark of higher scoring candidates was a spontaneous use of examples to clarify AO1 responses (a good strategy where definitions can be hard to articulate).

Sometimes candidates did not focus on the question asked, and provided irrelevant details, such as an evaluation of a procedure that was not asked for or needed

There was some evidence that a number of candidates lack understanding of the concepts of reliability and validity, which is strange given the frequency of questions using these themes.

Comments on Individual Questions

- 1 (a) Although most candidates were able to correctly identify the experimental design as 'repeated measures', some confused design with method in general and cited the 'laboratory experimental method'. Some other candidates confused independent with repeated measures design.
- 1 (b) Providing candidates successfully identified the design as repeated measures in the previous question, most were able to outline a strength and a weakness of it. However, all too often this was not related to the theme of the investigation outlined in the scenario (ie lacked context), and prevented many candidates from achieving top-band marks here.
- 2 Most candidates were able to successfully identify the independent (IV) and dependent variable (DV). Occasionally a lack of clarity about the IV or the DV prevented marks being awarded, however.
- 3 The most frequent response as an alternative suggestion to measure the dependent variable (DV) was to time participant's laughter response in some way. This was appropriate, providing candidates included enough detail about exactly how (when to start and stop, whether to aggregate separate bouts of laughter over the whole 30 seconds etc), which was not always done. Other responses included the use of some kind of self-report rating scale, which was also appropriate, but again did not always include as much detail as it could have. Evaluation of the suggested alternative measurement method often lacked context which prevented candidates from achieving top-band marks. For example, a common response was to simply say *timing someone is accurate*, and *self-report data may lack validity* etc. Higher scoring candidates compared their alternative measurement method with the original one used, for example commenting on how the length of time someone laughs for may be more valid than recording the volume of laughter, as a person may simply have a loud voice and laugh loudly just once or twice etc. Few candidates scored top marks on this question.
- 4 (a) Most candidates were able to successfully identify the number of candidates data was collected from and provide a justification linked to the number of data entry points on the scattergraph.

- 4 (b) Most candidates named the sampling method correctly and provided a brief description of its use in the study from the information provided in the scenario presented. Occasionally candidates got confused and started to discuss other sampling methods, such as systematic sampling, for which there was no justification.
- 4 (c) Most candidates had no problem identifying strengths and weaknesses of the sampling method used, but did not always discuss these in context, which prevented top-band marks being awarded.
- 5 (a) This proved to be quite a straightforward question, with the majority of candidates correctly identifying the mode and providing an appropriate justification of how this was derived from the information provided in the scattergraph.
- 5 (b) Sometimes candidates provided two findings that were in fact the same thing in reverse (*the more friends someone has the more they go out, and the less friends someone has the less they go out*), which was not credited twice. There were plenty of alternative findings available from the information provided in the scattergraph which other candidates detected and were credited for, including reference to data examples from individual participants. Descriptive statistics (such as the mean and range of the two variables plotted) was also acceptable and used by some candidates.
- 6 (a) Most candidates knew quantitative data was something to do with 'words', but some said little more than this. Higher scoring candidates qualified their answer with an example to clarify and provide more detail (eg ... *that provides information about how someone is thinking and feeling* etc).
- 6 (b) Most candidates were able to suggest two examples of qualitative data that could have been collected, with a variety of imaginative and novel responses here, including details about where people go out socialising and why, what they like to wear and what they do when they go out.
- 7 (a) This question proved to be a good discriminator, with few candidates achieving top marks because of a lack of replication detail. Sometimes, what should have been obvious things, such as what was actually to be observed and how were not outlined, and at times where they were, there was a lack of clarity. It seems many candidates assumed details such as where and when the observation was to occur were somehow already known and simply omitted. Sometimes candidates presented irrelevant detail, such as beginning to evaluate the procedure presented that would have been better suited to the following question.
- 7 (b) This question also was a good discriminator. Quite a few candidates confused reliability with validity, and some did not make it clear whether they were discussing reliability or validity at times. The higher scoring candidates wrote two separate paragraphs, one for reliability and one for validity that were presented in context of the theme outlined in the scenario. Given that both reliability and validity are two fundamental evaluation concepts that appear so regularly (so can be anticipated) it is strange that candidates do not do better on such questions and reveals the need for more practice in this area prior to the examination.
- 8 (a) Some candidates confused time sampling with event sampling, or did not provide enough of a distinction in their answer here to tell the two apart. Once again, the higher scoring candidates provided examples to clarify their response.
- 8 (b) A lack of context once again prevented many candidates from achieving full marks here, with few linking their response to the theme of the research presented in the scenario.

- 9** Here again, context was the differentiator as virtually all candidates could identify an appropriate ethical issue, but very few discussed this in relation to the research presented in the scenario provided.

G542 Core Studies

General Comments

Many candidates knew the core studies well though there were too many instances where fine details were omitted and/or answers were not adequately contextualised. Often candidates did not seem to understand the difference between possible practical and ethical problems that researchers might/did have to manage and/or ethical and moral issues that could be raised in relation to certain studies. Furthermore, as in previous sessions, many candidates used psychological terms without showing any real understanding eg ecological validity, reliability, demand characteristics quasi/natural experiment being merely identified but not explained in the context of the question.

There were very few instances of rubric errors where both Q17 and Q18 were attempted though there were some where candidates failed to answer questions in Section A and/or Section B and/or Section C. However the majority of candidates attempted all necessary questions and seemed to understand the requirements, content, time and mark allocation of the paper.

Once again many candidates failed to identify when they used the additional page 21. With marking now being effected on-screen, examiners are notified when additional pages are attached but not when the extra space provided at the end of the script is used. Therefore if candidates do not make it clear they have used this space problems arise for examiners, especially if the candidate has ended a sentence before moving to page 21, as they do not necessarily become aware of the additional information until they have finished marking the script. Candidates should therefore continue to be encouraged to make some annotation to indicate when an answer is continued elsewhere on the script.

Overall examiners felt the majority of candidates had been well-prepared for this paper. Candidates who did not access the higher marks seemed to have failed to do as advised by their teachers ie fully contextualise all responses. The paper received positive comments from examiners who felt it was appropriate for the ability range of the intended candidates. As always some candidates performed extremely well, some very poorly, and there was a good spread of marks overall.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

- Q1 (a):** Although the majority of candidates were able to name Kanzi and Mulika, many were not able to spell the names correctly and/or their writing was so poor, correct spelling could not be identified. Candidates should be reminded that this is an AS Level paper and such words should be spelt correctly.
- Q1 (b):** Generally well answered.
- Q2:** Poorly answered. Few candidates scored more than 2 marks with many making speculating as to HOW participants were selected and many merely describing the three groups of participants. This question became a good differentiator.
- Q3:** Generally well answered though many candidates combined Experiment 1 with Experiment 2/described Experiment 1 instead of Experiment 2.

- Q4:** Most candidates scored at least 2 marks on this question. However many showed a lack of understanding of an ethical issue as opposed to a moral issue eg ethical issue = psychological harm because witnessing an adult act aggressively may have distressed the child; moral issue = psychological harm because the child may have learnt that aggressive behaviour is acceptable and display it in the future (in some cultures this would considered desirable).
- Q5(a) + Q5(b):** Many candidates only scored partial marks here as they failed to fully contextualise their answers – mere reference to Little Hans was not creditworthy as he was mentioned in the strap line.
- Q6(a) + Q6(b):** Again many candidates only scored partial marks as they either did not support their answers with findings or adequately elaborate/explain their answers.
- Q7(a) + Q7(b):** Generally well answered.
- Q8 (a):** As in previous sessions, candidates struggled with the Sperry question. The question therefore, as anticipated, became another good differentiator. Candidates continued to refer to eyes rather than visual fields and many failed to refer appropriately to both visual fields.
- Q8 (b):** Generally quite well answered with most candidates scoring at least partial marks.
- Q9 (a):** Generally well answered though many candidates referred to 'participants had to have been driving taxis/cabs for at least eighteen months' when they should have referred to 'participants had to have been licensed taxi/cab drivers (for at least 18 months)' – see mark scheme.
- Q9 (b):** Generally well answered though some candidates identified the IV as the size of the hippocampus.
- Q10:** Most candidates scored at least 2 marks on this question. However many merely identified a possible practical problem and did not explain why it may have been a problem eg 'some passengers may have travelled on the train more than once' – why was this a practical problem? Some candidates also outlined ethical problems which were not creditworthy.
- Q11:** Generally well answered.
- Q12 (a):** Most candidates gained partial marks here. Few however fully described how permeability was created.
- Q12 (b):** Generally well answered.
- Q13:** As in Q4, most candidates scored at least 2 marks on this question. However, many showed a lack of understanding of ethical issues as opposed to moral issues eg ethical issue = psychological harm because pseudopatients became distressed by the way they were ignored/treated by hospital staff; moral issue = psychological harm because pseudopatients were 'labelled' as schizophrenic.
- Q14 (a):** Generally well answered.
- Q14 (b):** Few candidates actually contextualised their answer, so only scored 1 mark.

- Q15 (a):** Poorly answered. Few candidates showed any real knowledge of any of Griffiths' hypotheses. Another good differentiator.
- Q15 (b):** Although many candidates scored well in relation to Hypotheses 2 and 3, this question was, as anticipated, another good differentiator.

Section B

Loftus & Palmer was by far the most popular study with Samuel & Bryant being the next most popular.

- Q16 (a):** Most candidates were able to correctly identify the research method used but few were able to describe either the IV or the DV.
- Q16 (b):** Many candidates were able to give a basic generic introduction eg a snapshot study is one that does not last a long time, and then support this with vague details from their chosen study, thus gaining 2 marks. Few gave good, accurate descriptions appropriately linked to their chosen study.
- Q16 (c):** Most candidates were able to identify an appropriate strength and weakness of a snapshot study but few were able to accurately link these to their chosen study to show good understanding.
- Q16 (d):** The majority of candidates were able to give a basic description of the procedure of their chosen study. However some candidates failed to refer to both experiments in Loftus & Palmer; and many failed to refer to the tasks, conditions + age in Samuel & Bryant, the visual, tactile + dual tasks in Sperry. There were however some very good responses in relation to Loftus & Palmer in particular.
- Q16 (e):** Although most candidates could make several appropriate suggestions for how their chosen study could be improved, few actually suggested how their improvements could be implemented. Little real understanding was therefore evident and so these candidates failed to score more than 3 or 4 marks. Many candidates made suggestions for improvements and then described the implications of their improvements – such information could not gain credit in this question part as it was the requirement of part (f). There were however some very good answers which showed sound understanding.
- Q16 (f):** Although most candidates were able to make several general statements referring to the implications of their improvements, only some were able to show real understanding and/or make clear links to their chosen study throughout eg 'by having a bigger sample results will be more generalisable' – which study? Some candidates did however give some excellent answers.

Section C

The social approach (Q17) was more popular than the individual differences approach (Q18).

- 17 (a)** Some candidates gave an assumption that was actually more appropriate to the behaviourist approach and many only gave a vague response eg all behaviour occurs in a social context.
- 18 (a)** Few candidates gave more than a vague assumption eg our individual characteristics make us unique and affect our behaviour. Few made reference to behaviour here.

- 17 (b):** Although many candidates were able to give reasonable descriptions of why participants in Milgram's study were obedient, few were able to really explain this from the social approach by linking the evidence to the influence of our surrounding environment/people. Some candidates even failed to refer to Milgram's study as requested in the question.
- 18 (b):** Again, although most candidates were able to suggest that gambler and non-gamblers had different thinking patterns so they behaved differently, few were able to really explain this from the individual differences approach. As in 17(b), some candidates even failed to refer to the named core study.
- 17/18 (c):** Although several candidates cited inappropriate studies in both questions (the question asked them to refer to core studies ie social approach = Milgram, Reicher & Haslam, Piliavin; individual differences = Thigpen & Cleckley, Griffiths, Rosenhan), many scored well here. Weaker answers tended to not do the obvious ie identifying the similarity/weakness eg a similarity between and is that they both broke the ethical guideline of deception; and then demonstrating with evidence from each of the named studies in turn. Many candidates are still bringing in evaluation points rather than supporting evidence.
- 17/18 (d):** This question part was answered well by many candidates and the number of study-specific answers continues to decrease. The main weakness was that candidates did not explain why their strength/weakness was a strength/weakness eg a strength of the social approach is that the studies are often high in ecological validity – so why is that a strength? As in previous sessions, many of the supporting examples did not actually support/illustrate the identified strength/weakness.

G543 Options in Applied Psychology

General Comments

The paper appears to have performed fairly and reliably, with no obvious flaws or inconsistencies. Candidates with a good knowledge of the material and well-practised skills performed best. Most candidates produced consistently good responses, and the sizeable minority who previously performed better on one option seems to have dwindled. There was noticeably more consistency and quality throughout, particularly in the better scripts. The general quality of candidate responses was very varied, ranging from impressive insight and eloquence to quite poor construction and poor response to the specific 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 seemed generally well prepared, significantly more so than in the previous January session. Marking is mindful of the expectations of standard of a typical 17/18 year old with the size of specification and demand of the exam, hence the level of detail required for a good mark is not as exacting as may have been feared by some teachers. More significant in differentiating award of marks is the extent to which candidates responded to the precise demand of the question. This has been referred to above.

Purely formulaic responses are less in evidence. There is a clear improvement in student engagement with the material, and there are more expedient approaches than the aforementioned formulaic answer. A majority of candidates did seem able to make a good attempt at four questions and there were few rubric errors. I am not aware of any examples where candidates answered questions from the wrong sections.

As stated, better candidates answered the question asked, whereas others did not (eg Q5a asks HOW can fear arousal be used whereas weaker candidates merely commented on effectiveness thus not answering the question). Some candidates 'churned out' research (eg 8a weaker responses told the story of 'little Albert' with no reference to psychological theory), where it should only have been used as support or evidence and made relevant.

Part (b) responses showed great variation. The skill required is "application of knowledge and understanding" which has a different emphasis to simply "evaluate". Whereas bottom band was lacking in all/most departments, many candidates made good general points without the application/contextualisation, which was needed to take answers to higher bands. In Q15, biological differences in brain structures were not related to educational potential or in Q10 theories of arousal were not applied to the sporting context. This was typified in pre-learned evaluative comment that lacked anything beyond a superficial understanding of the material. In part (b) responses improved to second band where candidates went beyond being overly descriptive and points were well expressed and contextualised. The top band 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 mark even where the whole answer may not have maintained this level. It was further agreed that a consistently strong band 2 response would access the top band.

Comments on Individual Questions

- Q1 a)** Many different responses seen, with Raine's study most popular as well as much recounting of the unfortunate circumstances surrounding Phineas Gage. The best answers directly addressed the 'how' part of the question in relation to criminal behaviour. They were also characterised by references to brain dysfunction (eg lower level activity in the pre-frontal lobes related to aggressive

behaviour). More detailed descriptions and reference to relevant research scored higher marks. Weaker answers tended to be either anecdotal or simply recounted research without responding to the question.

- b)** Some good responses seen to this question. Most candidates evaluated the three biological bullet points. Issues such as reductionism, usefulness, generalisability, scientific methodology and nature/nurture were commonly used as issues. In general, all candidates were able to offer some form of evaluation of biological explanations of crime. Better answers were able to expand arguments further using appropriate research and evidence. Some candidates were not sure about the “(biological)” bit in the question – this may have put off some candidates.
- Q2 a)** Candidates almost invariably offered Farrington as evidence for the link between disrupted families and criminal behaviour. The best answers clearly identified what is meant by a disrupted family. It was necessary to draw out the issues that are relevant for disrupted families, such as, lone parents, loss of male role models, young mothers etc. Poverty and criminal behaviour are not disruptive per se, though these were most commonly referred to. Too many students tended to think that if they were talking about disruptive or dysfunctional families then this would do. It didn't. An alternative to the study suggested on the specification is the Juby and Farrington study which extracts information about disrupted families and the pre- and post-disruptive variables that affect anti-social and criminal behaviour.
- b)** Answers generally reflected good understanding of longitudinal research. Answers varied in how well they located commentary in “upbringing as an explanation of crime”. Some excellent responses were seen; candidates identified the strengths and weaknesses of longitudinal research and applied this to the context of turning to crime. Many candidates illustrated these points using the study by Farrington such as the detailed qualitative data collected, the opportunity to monitor change and development of criminal behaviour over time. They also went beyond this research, identifying weaknesses such as attrition, bias of researchers becoming familiar with the participants over the years and the obvious costs of time and money.
- Q3 a)** The least popular question in this section. Almost every answer used the Canter/ Duffy case to answer this question. The best answers explicitly related the approach to the case study giving examples of how Canter used the Duffy case. Examples included small space analysis, geographical profiling etc. Weaker answers simply described the case study.
- b)** Most candidates offered some evaluation. Candidates mentioned both approaches although differences were less well identified. The more able candidates were able to compare and contrast and mention evaluative aspects such as the differing methodologies. The better answers drew clear points of comparison between the two approaches such as reliability, reductionism, generalisability and so on. Weaker answers tended to simply describe the two approaches side by side.
- Q4 a)** The majority of candidates used research by Pickle or Breoder as evidence to support their answer. The best responses explained the effect of drawing attention to evidence by ruling it inadmissible and / or offering an explanation for doing so by using the reactance theory. Candidates seemed to be aware of inadmissible evidence drawing Jurors attention to the evidence. However, descriptions of studies varied in terms of accuracy. For instance, a high

proportion of answers erroneously stated that in Pickle's study the use of an explanation when ruling evidence inadmissible from the Judge resulted in more (rather than less) guilty verdicts.

- b)** Well-answered with a range of good answers on both the contribution to psychology and contribution to society side, with a good review of the caution that needs to be applied when using evidence based on mock trials with mock jurors who are mostly undergraduate students. Higher marks were obtained through following evaluative and insightful lines of arguments such as "The advantage of research studies is the control of variables, although this reduces the ecological validity due to it not being a courtroom. However, as it is illegal to study real Juries this is the best way and can give Judges and Lawyers a better understanding of how to conduct a case and influence a Jury." Weaker answers tended to simply evaluate the various pieces of research without really addressing the question of usefulness.
- Q5 a)** Most candidates supported their answer with a piece of research, Janis and Feshbach being the most popular but Lewinson also featured. The better answers addressed the "how can" part of the question; some linked their answer to the health belief model and perceived susceptibility and seriousness while others mentioned motivation provided by fear. Good answers recognised the importance of getting the right level of fear for the audience. For others there was confusion about the level of fear Janis and Feshbach found gave the greatest change in behaviour as measured after a week despite impact reported after the trial.
- b)** Most candidates commented on the effectiveness of fear, legislation and media campaigns. Standard answers commented on how well each method had been successful in changing the behaviour of the participants. Better answers identified the limitations of each method such as over exposure in Cowpe's media campaign and the issue of generalising the findings of Janis and Feshbach's study to other health behaviours and with different ages. The command of the question is "assess"; very good answers offered a judgement on the effectiveness of the various methods.
- Q6 a)** The question asked for a cognitive technique for managing stress, only the very best answers actually described a technique, such as stress inoculation therapy, by outlining the steps and explaining the cognitive aspect to the technique. Many candidates however simply described the study by Meichenbaum which compares the effectiveness of SIT and systematic desensitisation without explaining the cognitive technique. These answers attracted very few marks.
- b)** Some good answers were seen to this question but many candidates simply described various methods of managing stress without addressing the question. The best answers considered the advantages and disadvantages of approaching stress management from an individual or situational perspective. Some very good points were raised by candidates such as giving an individual the skills to manage stress would allow them to apply these in many situations which could be argued to be more effective than managing a situation; changing the situation would not help that individual in all other situations and may have negative effects on others in the situation, eg the work place.
- Q7 a)** The most common answer to this question focused on genetic explanations with the Gottesman and Shield's study of concordance rates of schizophrenia in monozygotic and dizygotic twins and adoption studies. The best answers

offered an interpretation of the evidence in support of the biological explanation but with an appreciation of the environmental influence. Some candidates used criminal behaviour as dysfunctional using explanations from Brunner or Raine to good effect. A few candidates referred to schizophrenia and the dopamine hypothesis but linked it well to the question.

- b) Most candidates made a good attempt at this question. Most had a good understanding of reductionism and were able to comment on the reductionism of the various explanations of dysfunctional behaviour such as biological, behavioural and cognitive. Only the very best candidates focussed on the "extent" to which explanations are reductionist and discussed the positive aspects of reductionism.

Q8 a) Candidates tended to refer to the Little Albert study in providing a Behaviourist explanation of phobias. Although this was relevant too many candidates omitted the psychology from the explanation. Where reference to classical conditioning was specific it was too often superficial or merely referred to in passing. Better responses detailed an explanation of the disorder along with the appropriate psychology. Behaviourist explanations of affective and psychotic disorders tended to be less effective, generally failing to explain how behaviourism can explain the disorder. Occasionally candidates wrote about biological explanations and so received no credit.

- b) Generally, candidates were aware of the explanations from the different approaches and made some comparison. Most candidates managed to use the same disorder as in part (a) that the question required. Occasionally, however, an error made on this question was by candidates who compared explanations but did not focus these on the disorder referred to in part (a). Better candidates compared issues and debates which are in comparison or contrast within the approaches. Examples of effective comparisons included usefulness in terms of treatment, reductionism of explanation, validity and generalisability of the findings of research. Weaker candidates tended to describe the explanations in series, possibly with strengths and weaknesses and assume they equate, without any real evaluation such as a comparison of the validity of two approaches.

There were fewer comments made about the exercise and sports questions, but one examiner reports "Qu 9: Hardly any candidates acknowledged McClelland here, but tended to give peripheral studies on social loafing or motivation and then attempted to link them back. Part (b) candidates struggled here to focus specifically in reliability – lots of general evaluation, with reliability tagged on at the end. Not answered well in general.

Qu 10: Answers were better. Good evidence used with higher band candidates referring directly to factors affecting arousal. Part (b) candidates performed well – perhaps because this question lends itself to more general issues of evaluation.

Too few candidates attempted the Education questions to provide meaningful comment.

Final Comments:

- Additional sheets were abundantly common and it may therefore be advisable, since the students now have 2 hours, to distribute 12-page booklets for this paper rather than 8-page booklets.

Examiners' Reports – January 2011

- Please remind candidates to complete the question grid on the first page, as requested. This may also serve as a useful check that candidates have complied with the rubric of the question paper.

G544 Approaches and Research Methods in Psychology

General Comments

The overall performance of the candidates varied considerably, suggesting that the paper discriminated between the strongest and weakest candidates. Few scripts marked contained rubric errors. Shorter more factual questions showed good knowledge, however longer questions that asked for evaluation/ comparison or discussion acted as discriminators.

Section A:

Weaker responses in this section were characterised by a failure to put the answers in the context of their own practical. Q2 generated a very wide range of responses to the requirement to use 'a questionnaire' both in the quality of detail in the responses as well as in the method selected by candidates, which ranged from surveys, experiments, correlations and even observations. That said, most candidates chose to carry out a survey. The majority of candidates chose options 'exam anxiety' or 'fear of crime'. Weaker responses tended to evaluate the method rather than giving details of the sample and procedure. Candidates should be reminded that it is not ethical to suggest using under 16s in research without parental consent.

Section B: Questions 8 and 9 attracted an approximately equal number of answers. In a few cases candidates missed out on marks because they did not read the question carefully for example in 9b describing research that was not experimental (eg Savage Rumbaugh, Thigpen & Cleckley). Some candidates tend to focus on research rather than the approach or issue particularly in parts c to e.

Section A:

Q1 Most candidates provided a research question, a few put aims and hypothesis or an actual question from the questionnaire although these were a minority.

Q2: Most candidates clearly described their questionnaire, sample and procedure so that replication would be possible and full replication with good detail was found in some answers. Many candidates provided far too much detail of why they had chosen their sample, questions and procedure rather than giving details of who their participants were etc. For example a candidate would say they will use an opportunity sample by using the people there at the time, without saying the number of participants and the location. A few candidates described advertising for participants or selecting every 10th person that walked past which are not appropriate as an opportunity sample. Exam anxiety and crime were the most popular options – with a smattering of horses and sport: few candidates selected social phobia. The full range of marks out of 13 for 'replicability of procedure' were awarded and for the design of the questionnaire marks were awarded in all bands.

Q3: Q4a, Q4b: Most candidates identified an appropriate advantage and gave a basic explanation and were awarded 2 marks. The full range of marks was awarded.

Q5: Some candidates seemed to struggle with this and a very wide range of responses were marked. A minority of candidates gave an explanation of demand characteristics, rather than of leading questions. The full range of marks was awarded.

- Q6:** Some answers focussed on what would be done after the project had been carried out, rather than how to 'avoid' distress. Top band answers were clear and innovative. The full range of marks was awarded.
- Q7:** A wide range of suggestions, random, quota, stratified, self selecting. Weaker responses described how the sample would be selected rather than explaining why the sampling method was appropriate, or wrote answers with no context to their practical project. The full range of marks was awarded.

Section B

- 8 (a)** Most candidates wrote effective answers and the full range of marks was awarded. A minority of candidates were clearly confused about the developmental approach and referred to only the development of children as in the three AS studies. Marks were awarded from all bands.
- 8 (b)** Most candidates described the AS studies Bandura, Samuel & Bryant and Freud though a minority described Farrington from the A2 specification. Weaker candidates appeared to be relying on their memory of the AS studies which, given the sometimes inaccurate descriptions, seemed to be hazy. Stronger candidates described the research accurately and explained why this was developmental research. Marks were awarded from all bands.
- 8 (c)** Weaker answers evaluated the studies they had described in 8b rather than the strengths/limitations of the developmental approach. Stronger candidates organised their answers point by point related to the developmental approach and gave appropriate evidence. There appeared to be a lack of understanding of the issues of reductionism and determinism as they may relate to the developmental approach. Marks in all bands were awarded.
- 8 (d)** Candidates struggled with this question and a significant number of responses compared a developmental study with a psychodynamic study. Stronger candidates focussed on the differences between the assumptions of the two approaches and described apposite evidence to support their arguments. Marks were awarded in all bands.
- 8 (e)** Weaker answers tended to ignore the injunction to 'discuss' and wrote 'list like' answers outlining two or three examples of AS research, usually Bandura, Freud, and Samuel & Bryant. Stronger answers wrote arguments illustrated by examples, focusing on both nature and nurture explanations. The full range of marks was awarded.
- 9 (a)** Most candidates found this a straightforward question and were awarded 3 or 4 marks.
- 9 (b)** A minority of candidates did not read the question carefully and as a result lost marks by describing research that was not experimental. eg Thigpen & Cleckley. Most candidates described Milgram, Piliavin, Loftus & Palmer or Bandura. Marks were awarded from all bands.
- 9 (c)** Some candidates only addressed the strengths and weaknesses of conducting experimental research and thus did not relate their points to the collection of quantitative data. Weaker candidates evaluated the studies they had described in 9b rather than addressing the question as posed. Stronger candidates argued a range of points effectively and related them to the question.

- 9 (d)** Many candidates made only one point of comparison. Stronger candidates argued a range of points arising from the different research methods eg control, validity, demand characteristics, ethics, samples, etc. Marks were awarded across all bands and credit was given to similarities and/or differences.
- 9 (e)** Most candidates were able to discuss the usefulness of qualitative data. Weaker candidates wrote 'personal opinion based' answers and some candidates wrote list like answers, e.g Freud is useful because... Stronger candidates argued the strengths and weaknesses from both a 'theoretical' and a 'practical' viewpoint. Marks were awarded in all bands.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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 2011

