

A LEVEL

Examiners' report

PSYCHOLOGY

H567

For first teaching in 2015

H567/02 Autumn 2020 series

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.



Reports for the Autumn 2020 series will provide a broad commentary about candidate performance, with the aim for them to be useful future teaching tools. As an exception for this series they will not contain any questions from the question paper nor examples of candidate answers.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from OCR.

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

Paper 2 series overview

This series did not see the same range of performance as previous years, with fewer candidates earning the higher end marks, however it was clearly not a typical year. Knowledge and understanding of core studies was a strength, and there were some really good efforts to apply psychological ideas to the source in Section C. Evaluation and analysis of methodology was better than evaluation and analysis of areas and perspectives – the latter being something that our candidates often found challenging.

<i>Candidates who did well on this paper generally did the following:</i>	<i>Candidates who did less well on this paper generally did the following:</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrated sound evaluation skills • were able to apply their knowledge and understanding to a novel source to good effect • applied their knowledge of research methods explicitly to core studies • were able to draw meaningful comparisons between different perspectives and different studies • showed secure knowledge of different issues and debates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • didn't attempt all questions • had limited knowledge on how to compare different perspectives • demonstrated only a basic knowledge of how psychology can be applied in real life.

Section A overview


Candidates tended to show relatively accurate knowledge of the core studies and so they performed well on questions requiring descriptions. When they had to be more analytical in their responses, this tended to differentiate between candidates more.

Section B overview

Most candidates demonstrated a reasonable knowledge of the two perspectives they were questioned about. Some ably made links to concepts such as applications, usefulness and holism. Only a few candidates were able to compare the two perspectives in a meaningful way although most candidates made a good effort to attempt the highest scoring question on the paper.

Section C overview

Most candidates could make relevant links between what they knew already and the content of the source provided. They were also relatively successful at making suggestions to deal with the issues raised by the source. However, candidates did not find it as easy to evaluate their own suggestions with many of their points being simplistic. There was a tendency for them to focus on practical problems when we were hoping to see more focus on higher level theoretical issues.

	<p>AfL</p>	<p>Provide students with a list of issues that can be used when evaluating their suggestions in Section C. This list can be taken directly from the mark scheme. Not all of the issues will be relevant every time but students can learn and use it as a 'check list' of the kinds of things they should be considering in their response.</p>
---	-------------------	---

Themes in candidate responses

Candidates showed good use of psychological terminology and this was often used in an appropriate context. The length of candidates' responses often matched the demands of the question although this was less the case with higher tariff question where candidates tended to offer breadth but not depth. Command words were well understood with most candidates making the effort to address the demands of the questions.

Comments on responses by question type

Low tariff questions

These were better answered than higher tariff questions, often because they required knowledge and understanding rather than higher order skills.

Level of response questions

Questions that required longer responses tended to be structured in the right way but did not always contain relevant content. Points needed to be better developed in the way expected by the mark scheme.


Source questions

Candidates generally made a good effort with these with some candidates obviously well practised in addressing these types of question.

Common misconceptions


Common misconceptions on this paper included candidates:

- Believing they could compare core studies on the area they represented or their broad aims. Candidates need to be comparing procedure or findings.
- Assuming all ethical issues apply to every study. They need to be more selective.
- Assuming that different perspectives can be compared on their principles and concepts when looking at similarities and differences.
- Assuming that different perspectives can be compared on issues which apply to all perspectives or areas as they are so broad e.g. they are both useful.

	Misconception	<p>When candidates were comparing the behaviourist and psychoanalytic perspective in the exam, a number of them made points of comparison that pertained to the core studies associated with each perspective rather than considering the perspective themselves e.g. comparing Chaney et al with Freud on factors such as methods used, sample size, control of variables, etc. Although it would be acceptable, for instance, to compare the perspectives on their use of experimentation and use the studies illustratively, this is not the same as writing about the studies without any real reference to the perspectives.</p>
---	----------------------	---

Key teaching and learning points – comments on improving performance

- Candidates need to be able to compare approaches on issues and debates which are relatively specific to that pairing e.g. one is holistic while the other is reductionist, both support the nurture side of the debate, both take a scientific approach.
- Candidates need to learn to go beyond practical considerations - such as time and money – when evaluating their suggestions in Section C.
- Candidates need to be able to distinguish between individual, social and cultural diversity rather than discussing them collectively when looking at the contributions of core studies to our understanding.

	OCR support	<p>For support on how to distinguish between individual, social and cultural diversity see https://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/283477-how-the-contemporary-study-changes-our-understanding-of-individual-social-and-cultural-diversity-teacher-guide.pdf</p>
---	--------------------	--

Guidance on using this paper as a mock

This paper is an appropriate paper to use as a mock as it represents a range of questions that can be asked in any exam. Obviously, the questions will not be repeated and the source is novel but important skills can be practised such as comparing studies, comparing approaches and applying knowledge and understanding. It may be that some questions pertain to studies which have not been covered yet, in which case they can be normally be substituted by a study from the same area.

Supporting you

Review of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our review of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If university places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications.

Supporting you through 2020-2021

Our priority is supporting you and your students this autumn and to support you as you prepare for summer 2021 exams. We'll update our [website information](#) regularly with resources, guidance and key information.

Take a look at our support for:

- [Teachers](#)
- [Students](#)
- [Exams officers](#)
- [Assessment specialists](#)

Keep up-to-date

We are sending a weekly roundup to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. All our courses for the academic year 2020-2021 are being delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our [website](#) or visit [OCR professional development](#).

Signed up for Exambuilder?

ExamBuilder is the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals and Functional Skills qualifications. See the full list of available qualifications in the [sign up form](#).

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an [Interchange](#) username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our Customer Support Centre.

General qualifications

01223 553998

general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

Vocational qualifications

02476 851509

vocational.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

 ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/

 ocr.org.uk

 [/ocrexams](https://www.facebook.com/ocrexams)

 [/ocrexams](https://twitter.com/ocrexams)

 [/company/ocr](https://www.linkedin.com/company/ocr)

 [/ocrexams](https://www.youtube.com/ocrexams)

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



I like this



I dislike this



OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2020 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.