

**GCSE**

**Psychology**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J611**

**OCR Report to Centres June 2015**

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.

OCR 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 2015

# CONTENTS

## General Certificate of Secondary Education

### Psychology (J611)

#### OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
B541 Studies and Applications in Psychology 1	4
B542 Studies and Applications in Psychology 2	8
B543 Research in Psychology	12

# B541 Studies and Applications in Psychology 1

## General Comments:

Performance on this particular component was strong this year with many candidates showing impressive understanding of not only the course content but also the demands of the assessment. In general, candidates interpreted many of the questions to good effect and responded with careful answers that clearly attempted to target the marks on offer. Although evaluation skills continue to improve, these were often better where questions explicitly focused on them. Where candidates had to organise the evaluation themselves - for example, in an essay - it tended to be weaker. Some candidates got theories and studies muddled with significant consequences for some. Application questions were recognised by most candidates but some came unstuck when asked for one example or specific examples. Indeed, overall, candidates could get better at offering the exact number of features or concepts that are required by a question. Candidates performed better on Memory and Atypical Behaviour this series, with Attachment and Obedience being the weaker topics.

## Comments on Individual Questions:

### Q 1

Nearly every candidate was able to match the stage of information processing with the correct example.

### Q 2(a)

Most candidates scored full marks on this question. Where candidates scored 2, it was normally because they did not offer the 'sensory store' as part of their answer - often replacing it with another key concept from the Memory topic or occasionally from other topic areas (e.g. stages of Piaget's theory). The most common error was to list three of the stages of information processing, despite the fact these had been the focus of Q 1.

### Q 2(b)

Most candidates were able to at least score 1 on this question, normally by recognising the role of rehearsal in transferring information from STM to LTM. Better responses also explained the role of rehearsal within STM or linked it to prevention of decay.

### Q 3

Overall, this question was answered well with almost every candidate getting part (d) correct. The most common error was to get the answers to (b) and (c) the wrong way suggesting some confusion between accessibility and availability problems in memory. On part (a), some candidates offered more than the word 'faded' showing they needed to read the question carefully. On this part, there were even some candidates that offered the name of one of the characters in the source.

### Q 4

Most candidates were able to specifically name an appropriate memory aid which was an easier way of earning the first mark - although a description was creditworthy too. Use of cues was the most popular memory aid. However, many candidates struggled to earn the second mark where they had to explain how that memory aid work. Most candidates relied on (further) description. It is worth noting that the function of some memory aids are easier to explain and that candidates should make careful selections on that basis.

**Q 5**

Many candidates scored full marks here, with the best answers offering two concise and precise limitations. There was a tendency for candidates to criticise the sample in ways which were either not pertinent to the investigation (e.g. cultural bias, sample size) or not correct (e.g. gender bias, participant variables). Candidates need to be careful that they are offering clear criticisms with questions like this - a description of a feature of the study (e.g. he did the study in controlled conditions, he used students) is not enough.

**Q 6**

This questions presented few problems for candidates with nearly all earning both marks.

**Q 7(a)**

Most candidates understood that they needed to only focus on procedure and, unlike previous series, there were very few examples of them making reference to findings. Most candidates could write something about the sample (which earned a mark) and many also made reference to at least one of the commands issued (again worth a mark). The most problematic area was where candidates made reference to the independent variable. Although most candidates knew and could name the three different types of uniform being tested, they could only earn a mark where they made it clear and explicit that the *same* person/people tested (wore) all three outfits.

**Q 7(b)**

The majority of candidates recognised that their limitation had to relate to the use of a field experiment in Bickman's study with only a few offering more general limitations e.g. pertaining to the make-up of the sample, or the sex of the participants. The most common limitation offered was the lack of control of extraneous variables with many candidates contextualising this by making explicit links back to Bickman's study. Lack of consent was another creditworthy limitation but candidates did find this more challenging to contextualise in a clear way. A number of candidates only earned one mark because either their limitation was too generic or too specific.

**Q 8(a)**

Although most candidates demonstrated understanding of what this question was asking for - there was much variability in the quality of answers. Better responses were more psychological in their response making references to different styles of culture (e.g. collectivist vs individualistic) and developing this by explaining the difference and its impact on levels of obedience. Some candidates showed impressive knowledge of the obedience rates of different countries using the Milgram model, but then needed to explain why, for example, Spanish people may be more obedient than Australian people. Weaker responses were vague and/or common sense in their approach. Some responses were too basic - simply stating that some cultures obeyed more than others i.e. with no attempt to redefine culture or say why it had an influence.

**Q 8(b)**

Where candidates did know what consensus was, this often led to well developed responses that clearly explained how and why the majority may influence the minority when it comes to obedience. However, compared to part (a), candidates showed less understanding of what this question was asking for.

**Q 9**

Most candidates were able to score at least one mark on this question. The most common, and probably the most straightforward responses, focused on the role of dispositional factors and how these are ignored by the theory of situational factors. Some of these responses scored just one mark because they were repetitive rather than developed. It was possible to score marks by looking at the validity or ethics of the research around situational factors but if candidates took this route, they needed to clearly relate this back to the theory. Candidates should also be

careful not to make nonsensical statements such as 'the theory lacks ecological validity' when it is research that lacks ecological validity which then impacts on the value of the theory.

**Q 10**

Candidates tended to either score two or nothing on this - in others words, they knew the names of the two measures from the specification or did not. Some candidates attempted to outline the measures, but the question's command asked them to name. A very common error here was for candidates to offer two types of attachment. It was surprising that more did not realise their mistake when they moved onto Question 11 which was about types (where many went on to score full marks having scored zero before).

**Q 11**

Lots of candidates scored all three marks demonstrating that they knew the types of attachment and how to apply them. The most common error was to muddle the two types of insecure attachment. Another common error was to forget to use the word 'insecure' along with the words 'ambivalent' and 'avoidant' which stopped candidates earning the marks.

**Q 12**

Many candidates scored all three marks here with the last statement being the one that candidates were more likely to get wrong where they did not.

**Q 13**

The majority of candidates focused on evaluation only, with fewer examples of overlong or sole descriptions of theory. It was possible to earn marks for descriptive comments but only where they were used to make an explicit link to a criticism (e.g. monotropy vs multiple attachments). Candidates do need to try to be clearer about Bowlby's idea of a critical period and how that is challenged by concepts such as the sensitive period, or evidence that shows new child-carer bonds happening after the age of three. There is a similar problem around deprivation/privation where candidates are not always clear that they should be discussing the effects of these phenomena rather than the processes themselves. It is also not enough to just quote cases like the Czech twins as a challenge to Bowlby, candidates should explain why/how they are a challenge.

**Q 14**

This 'applications' question presented more of a challenge this series as it was asking for one way in which research has been applied rather than a number of ways or rather than one area of research. Better responses began with a broader application (e.g. change in hospital policy, helping children to settle into nursery) giving more opportunities to describe initiatives/procedures beyond this. Where candidates began with something quite specific (e.g. skin-to-skin contact following childbirth, flexible visiting hours when children are in hospital) they often struggled to develop their answer further. There were, again, a lot of examples of candidates giving bland (e.g. skin-to-skin attachment helps bonding) or inaccurate (e.g. allowing parents to stay overnight in hospital prevents deprivation) explanations of initiatives/procedures.

**Q 15**

There were some candidates who did score full marks here. There was also a range of wrong answers affecting all parts. Some candidates could not distinguish between a stimulus and a response, and many listed both stimuli and responses for each part.

**Q 16**

For many candidates this was a straightforward question with most earning both marks. Occasionally, the named phobia and outline did not match or the candidate failed to refer to fear (or similar) in the outline. A significant minority of the candidates stayed with the source and referred to Jenson potentially developing a fear of needles - an answer that did not fit with the demands of the mark scheme.

**Q 17**

There were some very good accounts of the evolutionary theory here, with candidates demonstrating sound knowledge of alternative theories. Where social learning theory was offered by some candidates, the quality of response was more variable.

**Q 18**

The vast majority of candidates understood that they needed to describe and evaluate a study here (as opposed to a theory) with nearly every candidate choosing the core study by Watson & Rayner. The vast majority of candidates scored in the middle or top band due to their detailed descriptions of both procedure and findings as well as being able to offer valid criticisms of the research. The best responses used psychological terminology to good effect whilst weaker responses tended to contain inaccuracies (e.g. age of child, what conditioned stimulus was, how the phobia was conditioned) or omitted findings. Some candidates did misread the question and wrote an essay on one theory of atypical behaviour. Often these were strong candidates who wrote detailed, but ultimately irrelevant essays, underlining the importance of learning appropriate exam technique and taking time to read questions carefully.

**Q 19**

There was evidence of candidates not 'reading ahead' on this parted question, with a number of candidates offering too much detail in parts (a) and (b) and then using this again in part (c). Overall, candidates were clearer on their definitions of sex than gender. Better answers to part (c) focused on the physical versus the psychological, or on sex being fixed while gender is open to change (although) candidates had be careful not to be too repetitive here if they were going to earn both marks. Some distinctions were implicit rather than explicit and limited to one mark. A significant minority of candidates got the features of sex and gender muddled.

**Q 20**

Both parts were answered correctly by nearly every candidate. Some did not refer to the source as required.

**Q 21**

Most candidates were able to offer limitations that related to use of the case study method e.g. lack of control of variables, unrepresentative samples. The best responses put these in the context of the Diamond & Sigmundson study, which was a requirement for the second mark in each case. Some candidates identified specific problems with the research which sometimes related to the case study method and therefore got credit.

**Q 22**

Candidates demonstrated impressive knowledge of the biological explanation of gender development covering a range of key ideas such as the role of chromosomes and gonads, the effect of hormones on brain and behaviour and the evolutionary processes behind this. This resulted in many candidates earning all five AO1 marks. Where they did not, it was often more to do with quality of expression rather than a lack of detail. There was more variability in standard of evaluation. Although many criticisms centred around the biological theory ignoring the role of the environment, the best responses illustrated this through a number of pertinent examples (e.g. the rise of androgyny, individuals changing gender roles, cross-cultural variations) related back to specific features of the theory. A common error when evaluating was to launch into overlong descriptions of alternative theories - this only gained credit when it was done in a comparative way. A common misunderstanding was candidates believing that the biological theory cannot explain atypical gender development when it clearly can by reference to atypical chromosome patterns or atypical exposure to hormones.

## **B542 Studies and Applications in Psychology 2**

### **General Comments:**

This component elicited a full range of responses from some outstanding performances at the top end and some disappointing ones at the other where candidates demonstrated very little psychological knowledge, relying on common sense far too much. Compared to B541, an equivalent unit, outcomes were not as strong suggesting that candidates were not as well prepared for this particular component, even to the extent that they were answering similar types of questions to quite different standards. There were also a number of scripts where candidates did not respond to certain questions - mostly higher tariff, higher scoring ones. Where candidates did well, they showed a strong insight into how they are assessed in this exam as well as the knowledge and understanding required to do well. Theories and studies continued to be muddled by some candidates, and there was still some misunderstanding of what constitutes an application. Candidates performed best on Perception and Criminal Behaviour this series with The Self and Cognitive Development being the weaker topics.

### **Comments on Individual Questions:**

#### **Q 1**

Nearly every candidate knew the perceptual constancies and scored both marks here.

#### **Q 2**

Most candidates were able to identify the example of perceptual set which referred to Suzi looking more attractive than normal but fewer identified the one about Max mistaken other people for her. Some candidates made the mistake of stating features of perceptual set (most obviously expectations and motivation) rather than quoting the examples from the source. Candidates do need to take care to quote precisely and concisely from the source with these kinds of questions.

#### **Q 3**

Most candidates were able to offer some outline of an advertising technique, with subliminal messages being the most popular by far. However, a number of candidates went on to outline a completely different technique having named subliminal messages to start with. Better responses focused on the impact on perception whilst weaker responses focused on the impact on sales which was not relevant here. A common error was to refer to other cognitive processes such as memory and attention which were not creditworthy given the topic is Perception.

#### **Q 4**

Most candidates were able to identify the correct depth cues illustrated by the picture and comments in the source. Part (d) presented the biggest challenge to candidates with a significant number offering 'superimposition' as the depth cue. A number of candidates failed to earn marks because of incomplete or inaccurate terms e.g. 'linear' or 'linear perception'. Candidates who suggested the first depth cue was 'height in a plane' (as many did) were given the benefit of the doubt but there is generally an expectation that candidates should be able to accurately recall the terms listed in the specification.

#### **Q 5**

Most candidates focused on the instruction to evaluate, with very few examples of candidates making the mistake of describing constructivist theory. Indeed, there were many very impressive responses. Better responses picked up on the reference to 'experience' in the strap line and used this to structure their answer with a lot of candidates choosing to focus on the challenges presented by new-borns with perceptual abilities, the recurring effect of illusions, and the fact

that we perceive the world in similar ways despite our unique experiences. Some candidates needed to make their criticisms more explicit rather than leaving the examiner to 'fill in the gaps'.

**Q 6**

Most candidates were able to select the relevant phrases from the source and earn both marks.

**Q 7**

The majority of candidates could offer a valid criticism of either the idea of universal or invariant stages and, indeed, some criticisms could apply to either. A smaller number of candidates could develop their criticism to earn a second mark, with some failing to because they tended to repeat their first point. A small number of candidates offered a generic criticism of Piaget's theory rather than one that focused on stages - such responses could not be credited.

**Q 8a**

A good proportion of candidates earned a mark here - either by outlining body schemas or object permanence. Naming features was not enough given the command, and neither was giving the age span or the position of the stage. Only a minority of candidates earned both marks as most did not go into enough detail about the key features of the stage.

**Q 8b**

Again, there were no marks given for the age span or the position of the stage. However, there were marks on offer if two or more features were named which is the way most candidates earned a mark. However, it was noted that candidates were not able to outline key features such as abstract thought or hypothetical thinking - suggesting they knew of the features but did not really understand them. Very few candidates earned full marks on this basis. A common error here was for candidates to cover features that would have developed in the previous stage e.g. conservation, decentration, linguistic humour, etc.

**Q 9**

Nearly all candidates offered Vygotsky's theory as an alternative and when they did not (e.g. offering social learning theory or evolutionary theory) it was rarely relevant to cognitive development. Most candidates could outline the key ideas behind Vygotsky's theory (e.g. role of more knowledgeable others, role of cultural tools, scaffolding, ZPD) however responses only earned full marks where there was a coherent link made between different features - this was a relatively rare occurrence.

**Q 10**

Many candidates scored full marks by placing the correct terms in the gaps. However, a common error was to choose 'formal' rather than 'concrete' for the last gap.

**Q 11**

This straightforward question challenged only a few candidates who tended to describe a feature of the study rather than be explicit about why it was a limitation. However, the vast majority were able to state something relevant with the problem of repeat questioning being a popular response.

**Q 12**

Candidates who earned both marks here tended to make reference to the non-verbal communication being instinctive (or similar) according to evolutionary theory, and then went on to give an example of how particular gestures or expressions contribute to survival - normally focusing on the fight response although there were answers that focused on the flight response instead. Candidates often missed out on marks because they were not specific enough about how survival is supported, or they did not relate fight/flight clearly enough to non-verbal communication. Another common error was for candidates to write about non-verbal communication in relation to reproduction rather than survival. A significant minority of candidates negated relevant examples by referring to learned behaviours.

**Q 13**

This question presented few problems for candidates with almost every candidate correctly matching the social learning terms with the outline.

**Q 14**

Most candidates understood what this question was asking for, and there were two ways of addressing it - either by offering two distinct gestures/expressions used by different but carrying the same meaning, or by offering one gesture/expression but with a different meaning depending on the culture. Some candidates were limited to one mark because the comparison was implicit - often because the candidate was referring to a culture other than their own, and did not think to reference their own culture. Other candidates did not earn a second mark as they wrote about what another culture did not do, rather than what it did do to convey a particular message.

**Q 15**

A good number of candidates scored full marks here by offering two valid limitations in context. Sometimes, contextualisation was either not clear or not present and this limited marks. A very common error was to suggest that Yuki et al's study was culturally biased for only using American and Japanese students which revealed their lack of understanding of the nature of cross-cultural research.

**Q 16**

Responses were quite divided here between those that scored well and those that did not. Most candidates answered the question with reference to social skills training and those that went on to give technical details of its different stages often scored three or four marks. Some candidates found their mark limited to three because they had not described social skills training in the context of learning new non-verbal behaviours. Weaker responses only offered an area where social skills training would be applied and/or a goal or outcome the training which limited them to one mark overall. Very weak answers gave an example of using non-verbal communication in everyday life rather than writing about how research is actively applied.

**Q 17**

Most candidates could give two facial features associated with criminals, with just a few quoting low foreheads again.

**Q 18**

Many candidates scored full marks here - normally by stating that many crimes go unreported followed by two valid reasons why. Indeed, referring to unreported crimes was the popular way of answering this question and often led to better responses. Candidates who focused on counting crimes often could not write enough for more than two marks, and those that focused on the effects of time or culture often ended up writing about problems of definition rather than problems of measurement.

**Q 19**

Most candidates could identify relevant parts of the brain and their normal function with many candidates covering this more than they needed to. The key to earning high marks was to relate the dysfunction of different parts of the brain to specific criminal or deviant behaviours. Marks were also awarded for causes of dysfunction and for definitions of dysfunction - two things that often contributed to full mark answers. Overall, answers were full of content so that differences in marks were more related to quality and accuracy of response.

**Q 20**

Nearly all candidates offered Mednick et al's adoption study here. Most candidates could detail the procedure reasonably accurately although a common error was to assume all adoptees studied were convicted criminals. There was less clarity when describing findings. Those candidates that referred to statistics often got the actual figures right but could not state what

they actually measured i.e. the percentage of adoptees with criminal convictions in that subgroup. There was also a tendency for candidates to emphasise less relevant findings from the study. A significant number of candidates also failed to be explicit about which set of parents had more influence on criminality - candidates should not assume the term 'parents' implies biological parents when describing adoption studies. Evaluation points were accurate and well described in most cases, with gender and cultural bias being popular issues to raise. A common error was for candidates to describe and evaluate the biological theory of criminal behaviour (despite having answered questions on it previously). This was sometimes done by strong candidates suggesting they had not read the question carefully enough rather than misunderstanding it completely.

**Q 21**

Most candidates understood what this question was asking for, although there was a tendency for some candidates to outline the findings as well. Many candidates scored at least two on this question with features such as the methodology, the sample, and the variables often gaining credit. A common error was for candidates to suggest that participants were divided, rather than matched, on family background. A number of candidates also stated that participants were divided into pet owners and non-pet owners, even though this was negated by the question.

**Q 22**

The majority of candidates could correctly identify the statements as either true or false, with the first statement having most of the incorrect responses.

**Q 23**

Responses were very divided here - between answers that demonstrated a detailed and technical knowledge of the nature of counselling and those that were either too generic or too anecdotal. Although a good number of candidates earned three marks by including many key features involved in the counselling process, only a minority of candidates earned full marks by including an overarching statement about the philosophy or outcome of the process. Some candidates had the wrong focus and offered content more fitting to the essay question that followed e.g. explaining the origins of low and high self-esteem.

**Q 24**

This question elicited a full range of responses. At the top end, candidates were able to accurately outline a range of key concepts associated with the humanistic theory of self which were also related to each other in a coherent way. This was accompanied by a series of evaluation points that questioned the usefulness of the theory often relating to its lack of scientific rigour. Middling responses tended to also be strong on description but found the evaluation more challenging - either meaning it was minimal or that a number of invalid points were made. For example, a common error was to suggest that humanists ignore individual differences, or ignore the role of nature. Towards the bottom end, key concepts tend to be listed with brief descriptions and little linkage between them. The weakest responses scored very little - often zero - because they tended to be anecdotal without any real psychological substance.

## B543 Research in Psychology

### General Comments:

Some real improvements in candidate responses were seen this series. Once again a very high proportion of candidates attempted all the questions on the paper demonstrating that the paper was accessible to almost all candidates.

It was particularly pleasing to see many questions that appeared to be inaccessible to candidates in previous sessions, being answered very well in this series. Overall, candidates are evidencing their understanding of some of the more complex concepts such as reliability and assessing it, as well as being able to provide detailed evaluations, for example of sampling methods.

Candidates remain to be encouraged to utilise the source material in section A more effectively and to use the nature of all of the questions to guide them with the more challenging questions. For example, many candidates identified a scatter graph as the most appropriate type of graph the psychologist would use, but failed to recognise a correlation was being hypothesised in question 2.

In section B, candidates are encouraged to focus on continuity between questions to avoid muddled or contradictory designs. Candidates are also encouraged to avoid repetition in their responses across questions. Credit for one aspect of a design can only be achieved once. Candidates are finally encouraged to pay particular attention to the method required by this section, candidates transferring correlations from section A to section B was commonly seen, or conducting a questionnaire with no elements of the experimental method, despite the required instruction to design an experiment.

Candidates remain to be encouraged to pay particular attention to and use the command words in questions to guide their response. Generic definitions of concepts such as standardisation were seen, as opposed to describing how it could be achieved as required by the question.

When candidates are using the additional pages, clearly labelled questions in the margin is essential. On many occasions there was no indication that additional space has been used or the incorrect question numbers were used. This was a particular problem in section B where candidates were seen to just refer to their answers with '14' with no indication of which question 'a-f' they were answering.

### Comments on Individual Questions:

#### Question No.

#### Section A

**Q1.** Few incorrect responses were observed for this question with the majority of candidates recognising the aim of the study in the source. Few candidates made errors by referring to finding out about 'feelings towards homework' or phrased the aim in the past tense or gave a statement of the results.

**Q2.** Responses to this question varied. Many candidates were able to achieve partial marks by accurately identifying the variables. Fewer candidates were able to recognise that the study in

the source was a correlation and erroneously predicted a difference between the two variables. On occasion aims, null hypotheses and statements of results were also seen.

**Q3. (a)** A very well answered question with a good majority of candidates correctly identifying random sampling as the method used in the source.

**Q3. (b)** Generally a well answered question with many candidates identifying a strength pertaining to the use of random sampling *and* explaining why or how it is a strength. Confusion with opportunity sampling was seen on a rare occasion.

**Q4.** Many errors were made on this question. Candidates were frequently seen to name just 'students' as the target population without localising it to the students from the psychologist's school.

**Q5.** The majority of candidates were able to identify the variable in relation to examination grades but very few were able to identify the ratings of enjoyment as the second variable. Some candidates labelled the co-variables as the independent and dependent variable which was not credit worthy.

**Q6.** A well answered question which produced a good range of responses. Almost all candidates were able to offer a feature of structured interviews, although fewer were able to offer a feature of unstructured interviews which was distinctively different. Some candidates provided one feature and the opposite feature or failed to identify which type of interview they were describing.

**Q7.** Whilst many candidates were able to identify a strength of using interviews, fewer candidates were able to go beyond this mere identification and explain how or why it is a strength. Some candidates gave two strengths independent of each other with no elaboration on either. In this instance only one strength could be credited.

**Q8.** A very well answered question, with almost all candidates recognising the type of data as being qualitative.

**Q9.** This question produced a range of responses. Whilst many candidates were able to state or define one ethical issue the psychologist would need to consider, fewer were able to go beyond this and explain how or why this would make it ethical. Candidates are encouraged to focus on the command words in questions as some candidates named or defined several ethical issues without explaining any. Some confusion with ethic and ethnic remains to be evident as does confusion between ethical issues with candidates naming one but offering descriptions of another.

**Q10.** Many errors were made on this question with candidates offering a wide variety of incorrect responses such as line graph, bar charts or correlation graphs. Fewer candidates gave a scatter graph as the correct response.

**Q11.** Although candidates were able to offer some evidence of understanding of ecological validity, many were poor at articulating it in a logical way that applied to the study in the source and so were only able to achieve partial marks. Confusion was seen with candidates mixing up high and low ecological validity or by using inappropriate examples to illustrate the concepts which were not taken from the context of the source.

**Q12.** Generally a very well answered question with candidates offering good contextualised responses. It was pleasing to see a good level of detail and explanation in this question where candidates were seen to provide elaborative responses. Candidates are encouraged to avoid the use of tautological definitions whereby the concept of social desirability was illustrated by saying 'socially desirable'.

**Q13 (a)** This question produced mixed responses with some candidates confusing the concept of reliability with validity and with accuracy.

**Q13 (b)** This was generally a well answered question with many candidates referring to repeating the procedure as one way of checking the reliability of his results. Fewer candidates went beyond this to show that a comparison of the results would be needed to check for consistency. Very few candidates utilised the source for guidance here and did not refer to the use of the tape recordings of the interviews to establish reliability.

## Section B

**14 (a)** This question produced a mix of responses. Candidates were often seen transferring the correlational design from section A into their hypotheses stating no relationship / correlation rather than difference here, and as such were only able to achieve one mark for accurately identifying the variables. On occasion, the independent variable was not operationalised and candidates just referred to 'music' as opposed to type or change in music. Some alternate hypotheses were seen rather than null as required by the question. Candidates who kept their hypotheses simple were more successful than those who over complicated it and produced muddled or inaccurate responses.

**14 (b)** Almost all candidates were able to achieve 1 mark for accurately identifying the dependent variable. Fewer achieved the second mark where music was stated as the independent variable and mirrored from their hypotheses in 14 (a). Some candidates mixed up their variables by switching them round.

**14(c)** A range of responses was identified for this question. Whilst many candidates could name or outline one way of selecting shop(s) / shoppers, very few could encompass the entire sampling method for both and the sampling frame for either to obtain full marks. Some candidates transferred material from the source in section A and stated that they would use random sampling by drawing names out of a hat without any reference to the sample in question. Responses such as these were not credit worthy.

**14 (d)** Responses to this question varied greatly. Few candidates achieved full marks by including at least three separate features of how the experiment would be carried out. Despite their being some very good responses, many candidates merely made statements rather than describing how the experiment would be done. For example, candidates were seen to name ethical issues or state that they would use an independent / repeated measures design with no elaboration. Responses such as this appear list-like and do not demonstrate an understanding. Candidates need to be careful not to give details of the procedure that have been assessed in previous parts of the questions (repetitions of question 14(c)). Transference from section A occurred here where candidates provided descriptions of conducting correlations on the data and looking for patterns or relationships or drawing scatter graphs. On occasion, candidates ignored the request to design an experiment and replied on explaining how they would carry out questionnaires with examples of question types or the type of data they would collect. Finally, candidates were often seen giving detailed justifications for their procedure which could not be credited as the focus of the question was **how** not **why**.

**14 (ei)** Variations in responses to this question was plentiful. Candidates remain to rely on vague generic extraneous variables which have no place in the context of the investigation. Continuity is central to this section and as such candidates are encouraged to think in context of their designs to ensure their suggestions are both relevant to its purpose and feasible. There were, however, some very good suggestions which were both innovative and showed imagination.

**14 (eii)** This was one of the lowest scoring questions and the highest number of no responses across the whole paper. The most common error was candidates giving definitions of standardisation as opposed to giving a way of achieving it. Where candidates made efforts to suggest a way of achieving it, they failed to go beyond stating the variable they would keep constant throughout their investigation and thus failed to show how or why this would achieve standardisation.

**14 (f)** This question was also one of the lowest scoring questions with candidates showing very little knowledge of the strengths of using the experimental method. Many candidates relied on responses referring to being able to collect the data for themselves or that they could gain results to support their hypothesis. Where correct strengths were seen, they often merely stated the strength without going beyond to show how or why it is a strength in context of the investigation. For example, candidates would often say it had higher ecological validity without recognising that it was a field experiment, or they showed an understanding that it enables the test of cause and effect without giving any explanation of what this entails.

**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 2015

