

**GCE**

**Psychology**

Advanced GCE A2 **H567**

**OCR Report to Centres June 2017**

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2017

## About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2017 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful
- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection
- points of advice 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.

The report also includes:

- An invitation to get involved in Cambridge Assessment's research into **how current reforms are affecting schools and colleges**
- Links to important documents such as **grade boundaries**
- A reminder of our **post-results services** including Enquiries About Results
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our Active Results service and CPD programme
- A link to our handy Teacher Guide on **Supporting the move to linear assessment** to support you with the ongoing transition

## Understanding how current reforms are affecting schools and colleges

Researchers at Cambridge Assessment<sup>1</sup> are undertaking a research study to better understand how the current reforms to AS and A levels are affecting schools and colleges.

If you are a Head of Department (including deputy and acting Heads), then we would be very grateful if you would take part in this research by completing their survey. If you have already completed the survey this spring/summer then you do not need to complete it again.

The questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes and all responses will be anonymous.

To take part, please click on this link: <https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/KP96LWB>

## Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on [Interchange](#). For more information on the publication of grade boundaries please see the [OCR website](#).

## Enquiry About Results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our Enquiry About Results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If university places are reliant on the results you are making an enquiry about you may wish to consider the priority 2 service which has an earlier deadline to ensure your enquires are processed in time for university applications.

## Further support from OCR

### activeresults

Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/getting-started-with-active-results>



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

<https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cambridge Assessment is a not-for-profit non-teaching department of the University of Cambridge, and is the parent organisation of OCR, Cambridge International Examinations and Cambridge English Language Assessment

## **CONTENTS**

### **Advanced GCE A2 (H567)**

#### **OCR REPORT TO CENTRES**

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
H567/01 Research methods	4
H567/02 Psychological themes through core studies	9
H567/03 Applied psychology	13

## H567/01 Research methods

### General Comments:

Overall candidates performed well and were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of research methods in response to the questions. Higher achieving responses tended to be distinguished by increased detail, with spontaneous inclusion of examples that focused more specifically on the question rubric and, where appropriate, contextualised their answer to the research proposal outlined.

It was evident that some candidates struggled with some terms and concepts from the specification content (e.g. 'hypothesis testing' in Q24a and 'manipulation of variables' in Q24b). It is worthy of noting that in order for candidates to be fully and best prepared for the examination, all aspects of the specification should be covered. Section A especially contained a lot of terms and highlights the importance of being familiar with appropriate terminology (perhaps through the creation of a glossary).

It is also important to ensure candidates have had practice in the design and implementation of their own practical activities. This should hopefully reinforce their knowledge and understanding of research methods in general, as well as some of the specific terms and concepts they could be assessed on. It also enables them to comment on how conducting their own research has helped in the planning of novel research presented on the day of the examination. Students should be encouraged to draw specifically and explicitly on aspects of how they have planned their own practical activities when justifying the implementation of each specific required feature (RF) in response to the generic extended (15 mark) question on this paper (see more specific comments in relation to this for Q17 later in the next section). It is hoped that this would also be an enjoyable experience where students can be creative and inventive in their approach to research and data collection.

It is also important to be aware of the need (and the opportunity afforded) to reinforce the learning of research methods through the core studies. Finally, the use of examples to illustrate points made, and to convey clearer understanding in response to questions requiring definitions, (e.g. question 16a) should be encouraged.

In **summary**, some good advice is to:

1. Ensure all aspects of the specification are covered (use the specification document as a checklist)
2. Understand the importance and value of answering in context
3. Encourage the use of examples to aid clarification and provide more detailed responses
4. Be aware of the need to (and value in) conducting practical activities related to each of the research methods/techniques and ensure students are aware that the knowledge and understanding gained from such experiences will be required to answer questions in the exam (and that these will not necessarily be exclusive to just the extended (15 mark) question).

**Comments on Individual Questions:**

<b>H567.01   Research methods   June 2017</b>	
<b>Principal Examiner's Report To Centres</b>	
<b>Question</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Section A</b>	
1	Mostly correct responses
2a	Mostly correct responses
2b	Mostly correct responses, but occasionally some candidates chose option C (12) indicating they would use the total sample size (rather than sample size per condition)
2c	Mostly correct responses
2d	Mostly correct responses
2e	Some candidates struggled with this question and it shows the importance of preparing to answer questions requiring knowledge of the criteria for the selection of an inferential statistical test.
3	Mostly correct responses, although some did choose option D (>>) instead
4	Many candidates struggled with this question and it shows the need to be knowledgeable about the many different types of reliability. One suggestion is to incorporate this in to the teaching of the core studies and the practical activities undertaken.
5a	Some candidates incorrectly chose option C (positively skewed)
5b	Responses to the previous linked question influenced performance here, with candidates who chose the wrong option for the previous question usually selecting a wrong choice option here also.
6	Mostly correct responses
7	Some candidates struggled with this question and it shows the importance (but also opportunity) of reinforcing learning of research methods through the core studies
8	Choices made by candidates in response to this question revealed some confusion between inductive and deductive reasoning.
9	Mostly correct responses
10	Some candidates incorrectly chose option A (25), perhaps because 25 represents a quarter of 100
11a	Mostly correct responses
11b	Mostly correct responses
12	Some candidates incorrectly chose option B (open)
13	Mostly correct responses
14	This proved to be quite challenging for candidates and once again shows the importance of the need to be knowledgeable about the many different types of reliability.
<b>Section B</b>	
15	Most candidates were able to write a clearly phrased aim for the study. However, this sometimes lacked clarity when attempts were made to write this as a hypothesis with reference to manipulated variables. This shows the importance of recognising the different types of research methods/techniques and being able to recognise which have formal hypotheses and which have general aims.
16a	Some candidates struggled with this question and did not convey enough knowledge to distinguish between a standard structured interview and a semi-structured one. The best responses identified that a combination of some pre-determined questions, together with some new questions derived as the interview unfolds in response to the predetermined ones, was involved.
16b	Candidates who struggled with the previous linked question also found this one

	difficult. Once again, some candidates did not provide enough information to distinguish between a standard structured interview and a semi-structured one. This was even true of some candidates who achieved full credit in the previous question as the use of examples provided did not always make it clear that some questions would originate from responses made as the interview unfolds.
16c	Some candidates simply referred to features of a standard interview (or even more generally a self-report questionnaire) here, referring to things such as the ability to obtain a lot of information and the risk of demand characteristics. The best responses here focused on things unique to a semi-structured interview, such as the flexibility afforded by being able to ask new, additional questions as the interview unfolds and the opportunity to obtain information that would not otherwise be possible through the use of a standard interview.
17	<p>This question needed candidates to refer to four required features (RFs) as part of explaining how a piece of research could be conducted in the specified area (this is a consistent rubric for the 15 mark, extended writing question on this paper.) To achieve high band marks each required feature needed to be addressed (an explanation provided about how it would be used / implemented), justified (a rationale for why it was being used in the prescribed way) and linked to the candidates own practical work in some way. The highest achieving responses addressed each required feature in context, in turn and in a detailed and clear way justifying the decisions made in relation to each required feature in context of the research to be conducted. They then went on to make explicit reference to their own practical work they had conducted to explain how this had informed them of the way to plan the proposed research. 'Explicit reference' requires some details relating to what the research was about (the research question / hypothesis that was investigated).</p> <p>Candidates could not access the higher marks if they did not address each required feature (or if they did not address it in context) or if they failed to justify their decisions and didn't make explicit reference to their own practical work. Some candidates seemed to find RF2 ('your questionnaire') quite challenging and were often 'lost' amidst the addressing of RF3 ('open and closed questions'), or responses here were even completely absent. The best responses in relation to this RF outlined some general features of the questionnaire to be used, such as the total number of questions to be asked, the style/mixture of the questions, where/how it would be completed (at home or online for instance) and whether it would be completed anonymously.</p> <p>A really good tip to help structure candidates' responses to this question is to use a separate paragraph for each of the four RFs so they are clearly distinguishable. It is also important to realise that the main demand of the question is to address each RF. If this is not achieved it becomes difficult (if not impossible) to fulfil the other demands of the question fully (justifying the decisions made in relation to how the RFs have been addressed, and demonstrating how the candidates own practical activities have informed their decisions in how the RFs have been addressed).</p>
18	There were a lot of good responses to this question, referring to things such as the ability to obtain rich, detailed, qualitative information about things that would be difficult (if not impossible) through any other research method. Good responses also tended to acknowledge potential demand characteristics, and the influence of social desirability when enquiring about potentially sensitive and embarrassing things. However, some candidates did not always answer in context.
<b>Section C</b>	
19	Most candidates were able to select and present two findings from the data table provided.
20a	Most candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge of how to calculate the



	mean, but some did not go on to present their answer correctly to two decimal places.
20b	Similarly here, most candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge of how to calculate the mean, but some did not go on to present their answer correctly to two significant figures (and some confused significant figures with decimal places).
20c	Due to the error in the question paper, all candidates were awarded the full 2 marks.
21a	<p>This proved to be a challenging question, even though the formula for standard deviation had been provided in a previous question (2b) in Section A. The best responses were characterised by a logical, step-by-step approach of the five key stages involved (subtraction of the mean from each individual score, squaring of this result, summation of these values, division by sample size and finally square rooting). Not all candidates approached the question in this way, with some combining two or more steps in one, which was still creditworthy. For example, saying that you would <i>divide the total of each individual score minus the mean by the sample size</i>. However, this did sometimes get confusing and could be ambiguous. Some candidates also did not seem to appreciate the importance of performing each step in the correct sequence in terms of the effect on the outcome of the overall calculation, and proposed combining/merging some of the steps without an appreciation of the effect of this. For example, some suggested adding all individual scores together first then subtracting the mean from this value, then squaring the result.</p> <p>Although seemingly difficult and complex at first, the standard deviation is essentially a straightforward concept in that it is simply the mean of by how much each individual score differs from the overall mean score (mean of the mean difference in effect). It is also worth conveying to students at the time of explaining this that it is a very useful statistic that provides something in addition to the mean (knowledge of this had implications for understanding and responding to the next two questions).</p>
21b	Some candidates incorrectly assumed the standard deviation could inform us about the overall performance within each condition in terms of how well or not participants had done, claiming that a high figure for the standard deviation indicated better performance.
21c	The misunderstanding about what the standard deviation informs us evident in some candidates' responses to the previous question was apparent again here, when discussing what the calculation of the standard deviation for each condition informs us. The best responses here acknowledged and reported that the standard deviation for the 'stood-up group' (1.72) indicated that there was less variation in the scores obtained in the maths test in this condition than in the 'sat-down group' where the standard deviation was higher (5.60). They went on to explain how this may suggest that standing up may have had a similar effect in how participants performed compared to sitting down where the scores varied much more, suggesting if affected how well some participants did much more than others.
22a	This question revealed the need to be knowledgeable about the criteria for the selection of non-parametric inferential statistical tests. Even those candidates who were correctly able to identify the test sometimes struggled to provide a rationale for their choice (implying that a guess had been made). The best responses were those that correctly identified the test and provided a rationale in context (e.g. explaining that it was an independent measures design, as there were a different group of participants in the 'stood-up' condition compared to the 'sat-down' condition).
22b	This proved to be a challenging question. Many candidates were aware of the basic principle of ranking in that it involves assigning numbers to denote position in an ordered sequence. However, not many acknowledged that for the Mann Whitney U test this involved ranking the data collectively as one whole group. It was

	impressive that some candidates clearly did understand this and some even providing the 9 correct ranks for the data (not that this was necessary to achieve full marks here). This demonstrates the need and importance of not only making sure students are aware of the criteria for the use of the inferential statistical tests, but actually practice having a go at performing some calculations using them.
23	Most candidates were able to provide appropriate examples of relevant advantages and disadvantages in response to this question (with many stating that quantitative data is easier/more flexible to analyse but does not inform us about reasons why the data occurred as it did). However, some candidates lost marks by not contextualising their answer.
24a	This proved to be a challenging question with some candidates simply making comments about testing in general. The best responses were those that referred to the predictions made by both the alternative and null hypothesis in context. Really sophisticated responses went on to explain how researchers try to obtain data that enables the null hypothesis to be rejected so that the alternative hypothesis can be upheld.
24b	The best responses here first explained the principle of studying cause-and-effect through changing one (independent) variable to see if it has an effect on another (dependent variable). They then went on to identify what the independent variable in the study was and then outlined how it had been operationalised across the two conditions of 'standing-up' compared to 'sitting-down'. Some candidates mixed up the independent with the dependent variable. This reveals the importance of understanding key terms – here 'operationalise' and 'variables' in the context of conducting research.

## H567/02 Psychological themes through core studies

### General Comments:

Most candidates were well prepared for the examination, demonstrating knowledge and understanding of the twenty core studies in the A level specification. The assessment differentiated well; producing the full range of marks. The paper seemed fair and accessible, and most candidates answered all questions within the time allowance and in fact using additional sheets to complete their answers. Many candidates had an impressive depth of knowledge of the core studies but the application to the questions was not always explicit or relevant.

### Section A

A wide range of marks was achieved on these questions but most candidates were able to apply their knowledge and understanding to the questions and answer them in the context of the core studies.

### Section B

Candidates were required to apply their knowledge and understanding of the core studies to the key debate of 'psychology as a science'. They did this with varying degrees of success. Questions 9c and d were particularly challenging for some candidates, but better responses were able to achieve top marks by displaying higher level skills of analysis. Candidates with a good knowledge of the material which was applied well to specifically addressing the question performed best whereas those who took the question as a trigger to write anything in that area, or with gaps in knowledge, found it harder to access the higher marks.

### Section C

Some candidates found this section challenging. However, most candidates rose to this challenge and were able to apply their psychological knowledge to the novel source. More than ever, the ability to respond to the specific question posed was the greatest means of differentiating the range of scores of candidates.

### Comments on Individual Questions:

#### Section A

1a: Many candidates showed little knowledge of the pilot tests and so could not give a clear explanation of why Bocchiaro carried out these tests prior to the main study. A number of candidates outlined the function of the comparison group within the Bocchiaro study.

1b: The majority of candidates were able to give complete answers for this question and were awarded both marks. They had a good understanding of ethnocentrism and were able to apply the concept to the Dutch students in Bocchiaro's study. Where full marks were not given, the answer generally lacked context to the study (some referred to Germany/America as the culture). When this question was incorrectly answered it was often due to references to sample bias rather than ethnocentrism.

2a: Many candidates were able to describe how two of the community variables in Levine's study were measured. They often referred to correct variables wealth/population size/ culture

type. Sometimes details of the measure were inaccurate or little detail was given for example on population size measurement. With economic status/wealth, many candidates referred to GDP instead of PPP. When PPP was identified many answers reflected understanding by identifying it as Purchasing Power Parity.

2b: Many candidates knew that Levine's study informs our understanding of cultural diversity in helping behaviour. When providing an explanation of how the study informs our understanding of cross cultural altruism, many answers lacked depth by not providing comparisons or fully elaborating on the evidence given – for example, they stated that the wealth of the country was related to helping behaviour. Strong responses did include statistics relating to the core study but these were not necessary for full marks. This question was good at discriminating the higher ability candidates as they were able to thoroughly review an explanation.

3a: Higher scoring responses were able to recognise the demand of the question and provided both elements of a laboratory experiment (manipulating the independent variable and controls) while also putting the context in from the Loftus and Palmer study. This question allowed candidates the ability to express their understanding of psychological research methods in the context of the core studies. Many candidates did not achieve full marks on this question by only identifying one feature.

3b: The majority of candidates achieved full marks on this question as they were able to give a weakness of laboratory experiments in the context of the core study. Most candidates referred to the lack of ecological validity and went on to explain why that was a weakness in the context of watching video clips of staged crashes.

4a: Most candidates were able to gain full marks by identifying the key features of Social Learning Theory: observation of behaviour of role models and imitation of that behaviour.

4b: Generally well answered, when errors were made by candidates, it was due to a lack of context given relating to the core study.

5: Many candidates who did not score highly in this question were unable to identify the developmental feature of Lee's study (Cross-Sectional) design and made comments relating to a longitudinal design (inaccurate for Lee's study of development). Many candidates were able to highlight the area of investigation and provide context for the study (on truth and lie telling), but without correctly identifying the design, were unable to access marks. Another common error was focusing on differences between cultures which gave a social rather than developmental feature of the study.

6a: Links to validity were often weak, and little understanding of Sperry's study was demonstrated with the lower scoring responses – for instance, simple reference to 'internal validity being improved with a controlled environment' without a link to the context of the study.

6b: To gain full credit, candidates needed to refer to both the inferior frontal gyrus and the ventral striatum and correctly link them to a group high/low delayers. Many candidates were able to do this.

7: Better candidates were able to identify a difference and elaborate on that difference. They then went on to give appropriate evidence from both of the studies. Some candidates gave differences that were weak in structure and muddled. More commonly, candidates contrasted the two studies rather than provide a clear comparison. Many candidates referred to the sample as a difference, for instance cats/kittens versus taxi drivers/non taxi drivers. Clear identification of a difference is needed with this question rather than candidates simply discussing the two studies separately without clearly stating 'A difference between Blakemore and Cooper's study and Maguire's study is the sample used.'

8a: Most candidates could identify the two key elements of the Oedipus Complex: a young boy's sexual desire for the mother and fear/hatred of the father. References to opposite sex and same sex parents limited some answers as they were not providing information relating to the complex belonging only to boys.

8b: Many candidates could clearly outline evidence from the case study of Little Hans going through the Oedipus Complex, commonly the giraffe fantasy but partial answers failed to link the evidence to a feature of the Oedipus Complex.

## Section B

9a: Many candidates knew the opposing positions of the 'psychology as a science' debate but should try to avoid giving list-like answers in place of providing the two opposing positions for the debate. Many candidates described one position of the debate, normally for psychology as a science, but could only gain two out of four marks if they didn't mention the alternative position.

9b: Full marks were obtained by giving two clear reasons for challenging the view that psychology can be considered a science, each with a link to a core study. Many candidates described Freud's study of Little Hans and stated reasons for psychology not being considered a science – for instance, subjectivity or lack of falsifiability. However, many answers did not make clear links to the core study. Some links were brief and did not thoroughly reflect the points made - for example 'Freud's research collected qualitative data on Hans' without referencing what the data was. Such responses demonstrated limited application of knowledge and as such could not access the higher marks.

9c: Candidates were required to discuss the extent to which psychology can be considered a science and so needed to make both positive and negative evaluation points. Many candidates discussed their points fully and supported them with relevant evidence from appropriate core studies. Some candidates used study focused answers which did not answer the question explicitly, and this limited the amount of marks which could be awarded. When giving evidence for their points, weaker responses did not detail their evidence enough to support the points made and little elaboration was given.

9d: For an 8 mark comparison question, candidates should identify two clear points of comparison – similarity/difference which they elaborate and then support with relevant evidence from two appropriate core studies. Many candidates only made one comparison point or failed to make any comparison points and simply described evidence from two core studies. Some candidates used inappropriate studies to support their points or used inappropriate detail from the study which did not match their point. A well-structured answer differentiated the better candidates from weaker ones.

9e: Many candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of reductionism and gave an explicit description of how the biological area is reductionist using appropriate supporting evidence.

## Section C

10a: Many candidates gave a good reason for the division of students into a superior and inferior group that was clearly expressed.

10b: Most candidates applied the principles of operant conditioning or self-fulfilling prophecy as a reason why blue-eyed students exceeded their predicted grades, and explicitly referred to the source in their answer. However, any appropriate response was given credit.

10c: Most candidates could identify two ethical issues that were not upheld in the source, namely protection from harm and lack of informed consent / deception. However, some

candidates did not elaborate on the issue or describe it in the context of evidence from the source.

10d: Most candidates had good knowledge and understanding of a reason for the blue eyed children 'going along with the situation' and often used the teacher as a legitimate authority figure as the reason.

10e: This was a good question to access candidates' psychological knowledge of the social area. Many answered reasonably well. Some candidates were very general in their overview of the social area and did not recognise the demand of the question. Some only referred to an 'environmental' or 'situational' impact as opposed to a social/presence of others cause.

10f: Candidates were required to describe two changes they could make to the experiment in the source. Any suggested change was acceptable but many of the suggested changes were not described and simply stated 'get informed consent', not how or from whom. Also changes were not always clearly changes relating to the source, with some candidates stating 'same amount of blue and brown eyes' or 'collect scores from tests'.

10 g: Where the changes suggested in 10f were clear and feasible, the implications were discussed more coherently and with relevant psychological content. Many candidates had difficulty discussing the implications of their suggestions in a balanced way, and most of their points seemed to be negative. Candidates should be encouraged to make changes to the source material that will be of benefit in some way so that they can discuss a range of positive and negative points. Most candidates discussed the implications of both changes they had suggested and did this in the context of the source material.

## H567/03 Applied psychology

### General Comments:

There seemed to be an adequate amount of time for the paper as most candidates attempted the whole paper and did not miss any questions.

There were very few candidates appearing to know very little or relying on anecdote. There were no obvious inconsistencies between questions nor were any rubric errors common. A good range of marks was accessed.

The general quality of candidate responses was very varied, the best showing impressive insight and developed lines of argument while some displayed poor construction and a less specific response to the question posed. However, knowledge was generally good; it was the skill in using this knowledge which produced most of the variation, as well as level of detail. Marking is mindful of the expectations of standard of a typical 17/18 year old with the wide specification coverage and demand of the exam; 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. Issue by issue, point by point, allows evaluation to be developed with supporting research as part of that evaluation. As teachers we have a dual task of educating and nurturing fascination and curiosity as well as how to pass exams and the two are not necessarily mutually exclusive. There is a good student engagement with the material.

New to centres and candidates is the level of practical, application questions. Question 2 is such an example, where better candidates framed their response in terms of advice they would give to Richard and Wendy, which went beyond merely reporting what they knew.

Option questions (Q5/Q6/Q7/Q8) were very varied in their requirements of candidate levels of response. Part (a) sought to combine good knowledge with knowledge of detail, used to achieve an explicit response to the question. Better responses achieved this, and most candidates could give an account of the key study, but many struggled to relate it convincingly to address the title.

Part (b) tests analysis and evaluation. Most candidates attempted this, but it is here that the greatest differentiation between candidates was found. For some there were pre-learned responses, and these tend to fall foul of not providing a direct response to the question. The next demand was relating answers to research; some responses were more convincing than others in this. Making a number of clear evaluative points tended to take responses into the second (8-11) band. Few candidates manage to consistently develop these by relating to the injunction (command words). The centres who develop the skills of "discuss", "assess", "To what extent...." are the centres whose candidates excel the most.

Part (c) requires practical suggestions founded upon psychological knowledge. Theory from the classroom or textbooks is not sought. The knowledge need not be explicit but should be apparent. This is very different from providing anecdotes.

### Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

1a - Very well answered with the majority of candidates getting 2 marks. They identified the failure and gave an example, such as behaviours that were incorrectly seen as insane, for example, the journal writing.

1b - Many candidates wrote about the pseudopatients as participants (which was credited) whereas strictly speaking the doctors and nurses were the participants. Candidates could describe and exemplify appropriate issues (informed consent, harm, right to withdraw); better answers included a discussion – for instance, consent could not be obtained from the staff as this would have invalidated the research.

2 - Most candidates could give varying description of schizophrenia, positive and negative symptoms; however only the better responses engaged with the scenario and showed they understood the term 'psychotic'.

3a - Often well answered. The most common options picked were drug treatment and ECT. Many candidates could describe in detail how SSRIs worked, generally better than those with the task of outlining ECT.

3b - Candidates seemed competent in readily identifying a strength and a weakness, locating them, and referring them specifically to the context of the question. As with Q1b, however, the injunction (command) to 'discuss' was often overlooked.

4 - More candidates did seem to struggle with this question than any other on the paper. If they did clarify what constitutes 'science' then responses were compromised by assessing medical model explanations or by considering treatments rather than explanations. Answers rarely engaged with the "to what extent" part of the question.

Options: nearly all candidates offered Crime and one other option.

### **OPTIONS PART (a)**

In all the Options questions (part a) Assessment Objective 1 was mostly better displayed than Assessment Objective 2. Candidates had learned the key studies well and then attempted, some better than others, to apply this to the question asked.

Child	Crime	Environment	Sport
Better responses appreciated the point of the key research by Wood et al. Most could give an outline of what happened, but few answers were detailed or explicitly explained the findings. Fewer still focused on the applications in terms of scaffolding strategies such as demonstration, frustration control, reduction in degrees of freedom, recruitment, etc.	Most candidates could give an outline of Raine et al.'s murderers' brains study, showing good knowledge of detail. A small number, however, wrote about other biological background studies. This seemed unique to this option. Methodological details of the study were well described (although MRI often cited rather than PET). Results and their implications were not so well described – candidates often suggested high	Lord's research was well described in general. However, the outcome in terms of attitude and behaviour was less well described. Some candidates mistakenly assumed positive messages gave the highest behaviour change. Better responses noted that all experimental conditions led to significant increase in recycled items but that the best came from negative personal messages. Weaker responses did not go on to address	Most candidates could describe Zajonc et al.'s studies into cockroaches. Better responses showed understanding of the results in relation to drive theory, and those that made this connection were more likely to make a direct and detailed link to sport in their answer. Easy/difficult (dominant response) tasks were recounted against the presence of audiences, or none. Many candidates, however failed mention sport at all or did so only briefly/obliquely. Weaker responses failed to



The best responses understood that the study informed scaffolding strategies that could be used in the classroom.	rather than low activity in pre-frontal cortex for example or which side of the amygdala had less activity and which more. Better responses could describe a number of brain differences and explain the implications of these for crime (impulsivity, low IQ, fearlessness etc)	the application element of the question explicitly. Mid-range responses did so but with weak links from study detail to question application (addressing the demand of the question). The best responses did this and made good connections between the study's findings and the way they could be used to increase recycling.	describe the conditions in detail and failed to fully show how audiences affect the performance of the cockroaches in the easy and difficult tasks.
---	---	--	---

### **OPTIONS PART (b)**

Most candidates used a PEE model to present two or three points in their responses. Candidates commonly made evaluative comment with reference to studies, but few elaborated or discussed these assertions, so top band responses were few.

Child	Crime	Environment	Sport
Nature –nurture. Most candidates did a “this one’s nature and that one’s nurture” which naturally linked their evaluation to research. Better responses concluded with an interactionist argument. Piaget’s stages and the age differences in Wood et al. were used well to support a nature argument, as was Vygotsky’s MKO and the role of the tutor to support a nurture argument. Weaker responses tended to mix up their answer as they seemed unclear as to what nature was and what nurture was.	Methodological issues. Better responses used the methodological strengths and weaknesses of the key and wider research to answer the question. Middling responses tended to identify problems (for instance, “it’s hard to study criminals using self-report as they cannot be trusted to tell the truth”) without exemplifying or substantiating their points. Typical of weaker responses was to be prepared for reductionism, determinism and freewill and usefulness for this topic area and were going to write about these and call them methodological issues, which rarely bore fruit.	Individual-situational. As with nature-nurture most candidates did a “this is situational because and this is individual because” type answer. Better responses supported one or other argument with relevant evidence (usually using Lord to support a situational argument). Some used individual-situation interchangeably with nature-nurture, which didn't always work particularly well. The dark green - light green distinction worked far better.	Validity. Most answers were able to identify different types of validity (population validity and internal validity) and link these to the key research. For ecological validity, home advantage and the Michael's study of pool players in a university bar were used.

### **OPTIONS PART (c)**

Part (c) was generally the best answered part of the options. This was encouraging as it was the biggest departure from the legacy specification. Candidates have embraced the idea of making practical, real-life suggestions, with better ones clearly drawing their ideas from a sound base of psychological knowledge.

Child	Crime	Environment	Sport
Revising in silence allowed Grant's context – dependent memory study to be included as a suggestion, which helped the candidates to support their responses with empirical evidence. Recommended books tend to list strategies without detailed supporting studies, so candidates tended to suggest mnemonics, acronyms, mind maps etc. The appropriateness of the examples of application for 15-16 year olds exam revision varied somewhat.	Better responses made use of nutrition/combined programmes of nutrition exercise and cognitive skills using the studies from Olds/Raine to support their suggestions. Lots of fish oil and Omega-3 was suggested. Candidates who had not studied these as their chosen strategies often turned to less ethical applications, including castration and sterilisation of potential criminals. Plastic surgery was referenced with candidates often struggling to make this a legitimate suggestion. Not smoking or drinking alcohol whilst pregnant was a better presented suggestion; less good were those that weren't biological, lacked feasibility or, for ethical reasons, would not be suggested.	As the client group was primary school children a lot of strategies were suggested using reinforcement and role modelling, using core studies as supporting evidence, which again was perfectly legitimate and credit worthy. Candidates made good suggestions including imaginative application of operant conditioning or Social Learning Theory; the best responses were thoroughly contextualised, referring to assemblies, sticker charts, etc., as well as examples of antecedent and consequent strategies.	Many candidates figured that the given scenario was going to require that Lizzie managed her arousal for playing in front of a crowd, and a variety of methods were suggested including breathing exercises, biofeedback, practising so that skills become dominant tasks (so would be enhanced by crowd), practising in front of a crowd, using rituals/music to control her arousal. Others suggested imagery. Some candidates struggled to offer convincing support for the suggestions they had made.

## **About OCR**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body. We provide qualifications which engage people of all ages and abilities at school, college, in work or through part-time learning programmes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, OCR's core purpose is to develop and deliver general and vocational qualifications which equip learners with the knowledge and skills they need for their future, helping them achieve their full potential.

© OCR 2017

## **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 2017

