

**Psychology**

Advanced GCE A2 H568

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H168

**OCR Report to Centres**

---

**June 2012**

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

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

This 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 2012

## CONTENTS

**Advanced GCE Psychology (H568)**

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Psychology (H168)**

### OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
G541 Psychological Investigations	1
G542 Core Studies	3
G543 Options in Applied Psychology	7
G544 Approaches and Research Methods in Psychology	10

# G541 Psychological Investigations

## General Comments

Candidates seemed well prepared for the paper and were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of research methods and centres should be commended for preparing their candidates appropriately. However, as in previous series, many candidates were denied top band marks by not outlining, where relevant, their responses in the context of the theme of the research outlined in the stimulus material presented.

Many candidates gave very strong responses showing a high level of understanding but were capped due to lack of context (although sometimes weaker responses, but with some context, scored just as high). More and more candidates are attempting to answer in context and this is benefiting the overall mark that they achieve.

Understanding shown of key psychology terms in this paper (inter-rater reliability, alternate hypothesis, negative correlation, scattergraph and independent and repeated measure design) was good for differentiating between responses. It may be useful for candidates to compile a glossary of important terms and concepts in preparation for such questions.

It was notable that many higher scoring candidates used examples to illustrate their responses, even on questions that did not require context (eg Q8 - Explain what is meant by a negative correlation) which helped clarify their response and provided greater detail and understanding.

The majority of candidates finished this paper in the time allowed and very few omitted any questions.

## Comments on Individual Questions

1(a). Most candidates were able to identify an appropriate ethical issue, although many only acquired the context mark by reference to (use of the word) 'couples'. More sophisticated responses (to be encouraged) referred to issues related to the setting/location (eg inappropriateness of monitoring people who may be having intimate conversations or interactions whilst out having a drink in a bar).

1(b). Candidates were able to make a suitable suggestion to deal with the ethical issue identified in the previous question, but again, often by casual reference (eg simply stating '*ask the couples for consent*').

2(a). This question was a good differentiator at the top end. Weaker responses confused reliability with validity or thought it was about being able to repeat the study and get the same outcome. It may be useful for centres to work on this concept with their candidates highlighting how reliability in observational research is different to how it applies in laboratory experiments.

2(b). Stronger responses proposed ways that inter-rater reliability could be improved rather than just how it could be checked. Some candidates found this question challenging, especially those who had found it difficult to explain what inter-rater reliability refers to in the previous question. There were many misconceived ideas, such as the notion that simply repeating the study could improve inter-rater reliability.

3. Most candidates were able to successfully outline two findings from the table of data presented (with the vast majority opting to report that the most common behaviour engaged by the couples at the same time was folding of the arms and the least common behaviour touching the nose). Some responses lacked clarity eg saying 'large body movements were more common than small ones'. Weaker responses reported in error the descriptive statistics of the mean and median, which are inappropriate with the nominal data presented in the table.

4. Most candidates were able to outline one strength and one weakness of the use of the observational method. Higher scoring responses were outlined in context, referring to things such as breaking ethical guidelines and invasion of privacy. Weaker responses were not contextualised and referred to sampling more natural behaviour because the research was conducted in a natural environment.

5. Most candidates were able to outline one strength and one weakness of the sample, referring to the appropriateness of the group because of the frequent use of technology, and size of the sample (representativeness and generalisation issues). Weaker responses referred to inappropriate things such as the scale used to assess personality.

6. Some candidates seemed to think 'alternative hypothesis' meant alternative way to conduct the study', and some candidates cited null hypotheses. Candidates who did correctly advance alternative hypotheses were sometimes unclear in their reference to one, or occasionally both variables. Some candidates (more than in recent previous series) used the word 'difference', and made predictions based on a causal effect between variables. Occasionally some candidates also used the term 'dependent variable'.

7. Most candidates outlined one strength and one weakness of the way personality was measured, with many referring to the use of a quantitative scale providing data that is easy to manipulate but lacking in qualitative detail. Again, many candidates did not contextualise their response and simply provided generic comments that could have been applied to the use of a quantitative scale to measure *any* variable. Higher scoring candidates made comments in context referring to 'personality'.

8. To get marks for this question a clear explanation of what a negative correlation is was required. Weaker responses included putting '*as one variable decreases so does the other*'; assuming 'negative' meant 'no effect', or 'no correlation'; using words like 'causes; and 'effects' when talking about correlations.

9. To get marks for this question a clear explanation of how data is presented in a scattergraph - one entry on the graph representing two different measurements obtained from one individual presented at the intersection of the values on each axis. Many responses did not go beyond stating that a scattergraph was a graph. Some responses made reference to a dependent variable being plotted on one axis and an independent variable on the other.

10. The highest scoring candidates were those who outlined a replicable way to measure aggression (eg including full details of the coding scheme employed in observational assessments) and then went on to present a well balanced evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the suggested measure in context. There were also some excellent descriptions of how aggression could be measured, allowing full replication, but very little or no evaluation. Many candidates used techniques from the Bandura Core Study when detailing ways to measure aggression, but there were also some very inventive, creative and original ideas proposed. Some responses referred to irrelevant information / details about general aspects of the method (sample, sampling, design features).

11. Most candidates seemed knowledgeable about the difference between an independent and repeated measures design but did not always express themselves clearly. Higher scoring candidates made reference to different conditions of the independent variable in distinguishing the difference between the two different designs.

12. Candidates who demonstrated they knew the difference between an independent and repeated measures design in the previous question generally coped well with this question, although some did not contextualise their answer. Higher scoring candidates used examples (more often from the research outlined) to clarify their response.

## G542 Core Studies

### General Comments

The paper seemed fair and accessible to all candidates. Overall there was a good range of scores across both candidates and the paper. Few rubric errors were evident and there were less 'no responses' than in previous series. To achieve higher marks in both Section A and Section B it was necessary for responses to be contextualised. There was some evidence of formulaic answers which did not specifically address the question set.

In Section C Part (b) of both questions 17 and question 18 required candidates to demonstrate their understanding of psychology and how a particular approach can be used to explain particular behaviours. Part (d) of both question 17 and question 18 produced better quality responses than in previous series with many candidates finding many more reasons why something can be considered a strength or a weakness and providing appropriate evidence to support identified strengths and weaknesses

There were some examples of handwriting which were difficult to decipher. Such candidates may be eligible for access arrangements. Some candidates did not show a good understanding of general injunctions such as identify, outline, describe and key definitions such as sample, qualitative data, control.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Section A

1. This was a very well answered question. The best responses gave a clear outline of the ways the participants were tested.
2. This question differentiated well. Weaker responses referred to either how the symbols were selected for inclusion on the lexigram or how Kanzi and Mulika's symbol use was classified. Few responses showed understanding of the necessity for behavioural concordance.
- 3(a). The question was well answered.
- 3(b). This was a well answered question. Some responses showed confusion over the terms 'representative' and 'generalisable' and some responses lacked adequate detail to gain the full 2 marks.
- 4(a). The question was well answered.
- 4(b). This question was well answered. Some weaker responses referred to a possible problem with the way Hans' father interpreted the data, rather than Freud, as required by the question.
- 5(a). Many candidates gave good responses. Some weaker responses failed to either show how the evidence supported Piaget's theory or stated how the study supported Piaget's theory without providing any evidence.
- 5(b). This question differentiated well. Many responses focused on Piaget and Samuel and Bryant's methodology which was not what the answer required.
6. This was a very well answered question. Some weaker responses confused the aggression arousal stage with the final stage and some described the final stage.

7(a). This question was very well answered.

7(b). This question was very well answered, with few reference to 'eye' instead of 'visual field'.

8. There were some very good responses relating to the association between patterns of REM and dream content.

9(a). This question differentiated well. Responses that referred to 'spatial awareness' rather than 'spatial memory' did not achieve full marks. Some responses referred to long and short term memory which was not a function of the hippocampus focused on in this study.

9(b). This question differentiated well. The best responses gave a clear explanation for why taxi drivers and non-taxi drivers were used.

10. Many candidates were able to identify and describe an appropriate control. Few were able to explain why it was a control and contextualise their answer in relation to helping behaviour. Some responses showed confusion between the terms 'control' and 'independent variable'.

11(a). Many candidates gave excellent responses. Stronger responses outlined one way in which the study had high ecological validity and made a comparison to a real prison. Other responses explained why the study had ecological validity without showing how this was done eg the environment was made to look like a real prison.

11(b). Again many candidates gave excellent responses. In a similar way to 11(a) some weaker responses gave examples of how the study had low ecological validity but failed to make it clear why the example made the study have low ecological validity eg the study was filmed by the BBC. Other responses explained why the study had ecological validity without showing how this was done eg it was not done in a real prison.

12. There were some good responses. Some weaker responses referred to the post interview responses in relation to how harmful participants thought the shocks were - this gathered quantitative, not qualitative data, as participants were asked to apply a 14-point rating scale. Some responses confused qualitative and quantitative data.

13. This question was very well answered.

14. Most candidates were able to identify two appropriate ethical issues. Responses which were contextualised gained higher marks.

15(a). This question was very well answered.

15(b). This question was very well answered.

## **Section B**

16(a). Most candidates were awarded at least one mark on this question though some failed to give a clear, fully contextualised answer eg Piliavin: The aim was to study helping behaviour.

16(b). Many candidates gave excellent responses here and showed a good awareness of the format required to achieve full marks. Generally, descriptions of the samples were full and thorough, and therefore achieved the maximum three marks. Descriptions of Savage-Rumbaugh's sample were weaker than those of Maguire's or Piliavin's. Some candidates did not relate the identified weakness to the aim of the study eg Maguire: All participants were male and right handed so results cannot be generalised to those who are female and/or left-handed and no link to the fact that hippocampal structure may therefore be different. Others referred to inappropriate weaknesses such as the sampling method or ethical issues with the sample.

16(c). This question differentiated well. Candidates referring to Piliavin tended to score better in this question part than those who chose Maguire or Savage-Rumbaugh. Generally, those who chose Savage-Rumbaugh were unable to describe the procedure adequately in relation to the indoor environment, the outdoor environment, formal testing and Sherman and Austin were rarely mentioned. Some unsophisticated responses were given in relation to Maguire eg all participants had MRI scans and these were then examined using VBM and pixel counting.

16(d). Very few candidates were able to give good responses in relation to the findings of the Savage-Rumbaugh study. A number of weak responses were seen in relation to Maguire's study eg taxi drivers were found to have increased grey matter density in the posterior hippocampus and decreased grey matter volume in the anterior hippocampus. Candidates should ensure that their responses are accurate eg some candidates who chose the Piliavin study stated '90% of helpers were male'. This should have been '90% of FIRST helpers were male'.

16(e). This question was an excellent differentiator. There were some good responses and many candidates had sound structure to their responses, attempting to give examples of both how their chosen study was and was not reliable. Both sides of the argument were not required to gain full marks. Few responses showed understanding of the term 'reliability' and many confused the term with 'validity'.

16(f). This question differentiated well. As in the previous session, this question was generally well answered with some good changes suggested and appropriate evaluation points made. There was a notable imbalance between description and evaluation with many evaluation points being very basic and failing to show any real understanding of the implications of suggested changes eg have a larger sample which means it will be more representative and so the findings will be more generalisable.

### **Section C**

17(a). Most candidates phrased their answer as an assumption. Many candidates failed to link the assumption to behaviour eg everyone is unique and so no-one can be considered as 'average'.

17(b). This question was an excellent differentiator. Many responses did not address the question, instead trying to explain why, by taking the individual differences approach, there can be no such term as 'abnormal'.

17(c). As in previous series, many candidates did not support their identified strength/weakness with an appropriate full example eg both Griffiths and Rosenhan's studies had high ecological validity as they took place in a natural environment.

17(d). Candidates seemed better prepared for this question than in previous series. There were fewer study and/or methodology-specific responses than in previous series and many gave responses that allowed them to access at least the third band and score between seven to nine marks. As in previous series however, some of the strengths/weaknesses were merely identified, not identified and justified, and many supporting examples did not support/illustrate the identified strength/weakness.

18(a). Most candidates phrased their answer as an assumption. Candidates showed understanding of the idea of life-span rather than simply relating the assumption to childhood. However, there were many candidates who did not link the assumption to behaviour eg everyone goes through distinct stages between birth and death/individuals develop through an interplay between nature and nurture.

18(b). This question was an excellent differentiator. Many responses did not answer the question and merely referred to how Bandura's study showed that if children observed aggressive behaviour, they were likely to imitate it – there was no reference as to how this links to the developmental approach. Many candidates gave a social approach answer rather than a developmental approach answer.

18(c). Again, as in previous series, many candidates did not support their identified strength/weakness by an appropriate full example eg both Bandura and Samuel and Bryant used laboratory experiments. Bandura showed children's aggression through the use of aggressive and non-aggressive models and Samuel and Bryant had different tests for conservational ability.

18(d). Candidates seemed better prepared for this question than in previous series. There were fewer study and/or methodology-specific responses than in previous series and many gave responses that allowed them to access at least the third band and score between seven to nine marks. As in previous series, some of the strengths/weaknesses were merely identified, not identified and justified and many supporting examples did not support/illustrate the identified strength/weakness. Many candidates referred to 'reductionism' as a weakness which is incorrect (unless used in relation to the focus being mainly on children) as both nature and nurture influences are considered within the framework of the developmental approach.

## G543 Options in Applied Psychology

### General Comments

The paper appeared fair and reliable, with no obvious flaws or inconsistencies. There were few rubric errors. A good range of marks was accessed. Candidates with better knowledge of the material and well-practised skills performed best whereas those with gaps in knowledge and skills found it harder to access the higher marks available. A majority of candidates did seem able to make a good attempt at four questions.

The general quality of candidate responses varied from impressive insight and developed lines of argument to quite poor construction and poor response to the specific question posed. Both the level of knowledge and the skill in using this knowledge produced wide variation, as well as level of detail and understanding. Candidates continued to be thoroughly prepared. Marking is mindful of the expectations of standard of a typical 17/18 year old with the wide specification coverage and level of demand; hence the level of detail required for a good mark is not as exacting as may be feared by some. 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 previously.

There is a clear improvement in student engagement with the material. As stated, better candidates answered the question asked, whereas others did not (eg Q3a saw better candidates describe the stages, refer to the context of a jury and maybe reference specific research such as Hastie whereas weaker students identified three stages in generic decision making; Q4b saw better candidates make the research specific to the context and stuck to limitations as the question requests). Some candidates merely outlined research, where better responses used the research as support or evidence and made it directly relevant to the question.

Part (b) responses showed great variation. The skill required is 'application of knowledge and understanding' which has a different emphasis 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 was further agreed that a consistently strong band 2 response would access the top band.

Weaker responses made general points without the necessary application/contextualisation which was needed to take responses to higher bands. This was typified in pre-learned evaluative comment that lacked anything beyond a superficial understanding of the material. Part (b) responses improved when candidates went beyond being overly descriptive and points were well expressed in the context of the question. Some evaluation terms may be being over-complicated and it was suggested (in January's report) that a simpler understanding may be acceptable for this level. This appears to have produced some marked improvement, notably Q1b and Q9b, for example.

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

### Comments on specific questions.

1(a). Better answers showed a clear understanding of what social cognition is, how it can be used to explain criminal behaviour and/or exemplified this with research, most notably Gudjonsson and Bownes. Weaker responses did not have a good grasp of social cognition, maybe not indicating understanding by referring, for example, to blame, attribution or how it could explain criminal behaviour.

1(b). Better candidates not only identified where research was more or less valid, but commented on (evaluated) it. Marks were not awarded for commenting on non-cognitive explanations or failing to relate the research to crime.

2(a). There were many good responses to this question. These candidates not only referred to 'the bigger picture', but described what this means in terms of profiling. Some candidates' descriptions were confused or unclear. Some lacked detail; others were anecdotal and often not obviously top-down topology.

2(b). Most candidates knew what qualitative and quantitative meant, better candidates were able to consider how they are more or less useful when creating a profile.

3(a). Most candidates were aware of Hastie's three stages. Better candidates outlined these stages with direct references to juries. Candidates who did not mention the courtroom context or made broad bland generic statements were unable to access the top marks.

3(b). Better candidates either addressed ethical issues and applied them to the context, or looked at the ethical considerations inherent in chosen studies. Studies wider than the three on the specification were readily accepted, such as Castellow's research into attractiveness of defendant, or the ethics of using screens and videotapes with children giving evidence. When candidates did not achieve higher marks this was mainly due to lack of context, or referring to influences themselves rather than to research.

4(a). Good responses either described what the probation was, or successfully emphasised the 'how' part of the question, supporting with reference to research. Again, accessing top marks could be achieved by directly addressing the question as an alternative to detailing facts.

4(b). For most candidates this was a straight-forward evaluation of research such as that investigating restorative justice, probation or 'looking deathworthy'. This may have been surrounding issues such as validity, reliability and ethnocentrism. Other good responses considered methodological limitations such as those to do with sample. Weaker responses gave opinions about probation or restorative justice itself without reference, incidental or otherwise, to research. Further, some candidates drifted into general evaluation rather than sticking to limitations (eg suggesting the research was valid, or that it was not ethnocentric).

5(a) was very popular and generally well answered. Better responses recognised that health belief suggests what determines health behaviour and described the components that help to determine it. Weaker responses did not display such understanding or go much beyond identifying some, if any, of the components of the model.

5(b). No 'right' response was sought, but that the candidates could support their claims. eg better responses may have suggested that an internal LOC may suggest free-will, or others that any LOC is deterministic but the ability to change suggests free will.

6(a). Better candidates described the self report methods and related them to stress, often exemplified by research, or used relevant research to directly address the question.

6(b). Good responses drew comparisons, either similarities or contrasts, as the question requests. Weaker responses provided "side by side" descriptions of different measures of stress and did not really compare.

7(a). This question was mostly well done using statistical definition, cultural definition (deviation from norm), failure to function adequately and deviation from ideal mental health. ICD/DSM could be used, as long as the emphasis was on the symptoms defining the dysfunctional behaviour. Simple diagnostic classifications alone do not specifically address the question, and so typified weaker responses.

7(b). Many good responses addressed differences in classification systems, the unreliable application to different cultural groups, inconsistencies from one country/culture to another in recognising or interpreting maladaptive behaviours, where research took place and its implications for drawing conclusions are examples of ways that better marks were accessed.

8(a). Better responses described the features and stages of CBT. As long as the cognitive and behavioural elements were explicit then responses were credited. The biggest error here is that some candidates offered purely cognitive suggestions with no behavioural component whatsoever.

8(b). The question was generally well answered. The best responses were able to refer to research into effectiveness of treatments. Other good responses described treatments, then discussed how legitimate, convincing and wide-ranging were their claims of effectiveness. Weaker responses drifted from effectiveness to general evaluation; or describing treatments and ending with a '....and it worked' statement.

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 they 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. However, some candidates appeared to be unfamiliar with the matched pairs design. Many candidates gave concise, replicable descriptions of a practical project based on the research question. Popular option choices were a) sleep and memory for everyday objects, b) listening to music and solving mathematical problems and e) noise and crossword puzzles. 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. 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 in section B could be very brief. It is pleasing to note that candidates make more use of research from the A2 options unit in the June series as an over-reliance on AS studies can limit the scope of the responses. However, the AS studies were used to good effect in some candidates' responses.

## Section A

1. Most candidates framed an appropriate hypothesis but some did not fully operationalise both variables. Some candidates described a null hypothesis or a correlational one.
2. This question was marked out of 13 +6. The full range of marks (13) and (6) were awarded.

Replicability: 13 marks were given for the description of the practical project and its replicability and appropriateness. The method was clearly described although it was not always fully replicable. Some candidates failed to give details of the sample and the sampling method and many candidates missed out details of materials used. It is not sufficient for candidates to say they will give participants five maths problems to complete with no indication of the nature of the problems, their complexity or how they were scored. It is important that candidates describe research that falls within BPS ethical guidelines. Although some research was described using 10-15 year olds, most candidates are aware of the need to use participants over 16 years of age.

Design: Six marks were awarded for design and feasibility. Matching was variable; most candidates described some form of matched sample but few candidates fully described the matching process. Many candidates matched on gender, age or IQ without explaining how this was carried out. Some candidates used relevant matching criteria such as mathematical ability and some used characteristics which had little relevance such as hair colour, eye colour, glasses or no glasses or date of birth. Stronger candidates justified their matching criteria and explained how they matched participants across two conditions. Some candidates described three or more conditions for matched pairs.

3. The question attracted accurate responses and most candidates clearly knew the advantage of this design. Strong candidates identified an advantage and explained how the advantage arose in the context of their project.

4(a). For full marks candidates needed to include equal to or less than.

(b). Stronger candidates gave accurate responses and rejected the Null explaining why in the context of both variables. A minority of candidates who did not write an accurate answer to Q4(a) wrote an accurate answer to Q4(b).

5. The majority were able to give an alternative design; very few gave an alternative method such as an interview. Repeated measures design was the most popular answer and was described in the context of the practical.

6. Stronger responses demonstrated knowledge of ethical guidelines and identified an appropriate issue explaining how this could be dealt with. Weaker responses identified an ethical issue but not in the context of the research project.

7. The majority of responses identified a 'variable' and explained how this could be controlled. Weaker responses identified a variable though not in context of the project, or did not explain how the variable could be controlled.

## **Section B**

8(a). Most candidates could describe the cognitive approach clearly and with some degree of accuracy. They referred to mental processes and compared the human mind to a computer. There is no need for examples from the cognitive approach to gain full credit.

8(b). Loftus and Palmer was the most popular choice of cognitive research in this answer and better candidates were able to explain why the study was 'cognitive'. Marks were awarded from all bands.

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

8(d). Most candidates were able to make some distinctions between the cognitive approach and the behavioural perspective and support this with appropriate evidence, commonly Watson and Raynor for the behavioural perspective or Bandura. Strong responses focused on the difference between the assumptions of the two approaches although this was not the only way of achieving top band marks. Candidates could gain full marks with two well described comparisons if they were supported by appropriate evidence from both approaches. Many candidates were awarded marks in the top band for this question.

8(e). The majority of candidates were able to give good definitions of freewill and determinism but many failed to go on to discuss them. Stronger candidates wrote points related to predictability of behaviour or psychology as a science. For top band responses the candidates need to refer to both sides of the debate.

9(a). Good responses referred to aspects of a snapshot study other than the short length of time it takes such as not showing changes over time. Weaker responses were brief and repetitive.

9(b). A wide range of research was cited but Milgram, Bandura, Baron-Cohen, Sperry and Loftus and Palmer were popular choices. Very little research from the A2 specification was cited. Candidates need to explicitly relate the description of research to the nature of snapshot studies.

9(c). Candidates need to discuss the strengths/limitations of conducting snapshot studies 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 rapidity and cheapness.

9(d). Good responses discussed several points of comparison between experimental and case study methods eg types of data collected, reliability, validity, demand characteristics, ethics and samples. The better candidates supported these points with accurate, appropriate evidence.

9(e). Candidates should avoid anecdotal and/or list like answers stating the ways that longitudinal research is useful. Stronger candidates wrote responses making points on useful to developmental psychologists, useful to show changes in behaviour, or less useful because of participant attrition and cited appropriate research to support their arguments. There is no requirement to cite research to support the arguments but it may help a discussion to do so.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2012

