



GCE

Psychology

Advanced GCE A2 **H567**

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2018 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 links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**
- Link to **grade boundaries**
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our Active Results service and CPD programme

Reviews of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our reviews 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: <http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/>

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on the [OCR website](#).

Further support from OCR



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/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/getting-started/>



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>

CONTENTS

**Advanced GCE A2 Psychology
(H567)**

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
H567/01 Research Methods	4
H567/02 Psychological Themes through Core Studies	10
H567/03 Applied Psychology	15

H567/01 Research Methods

General Comments:

Overall, this year, the standard of responses was sound. There was a wide range of responses, suggesting the paper differentiated appropriately. Higher achieving candidates were distinguished by their more extended, detailed responses 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 and worthy of noting that in order for candidates to be fully and best prepared for the examination that all aspects of the specification should be covered. It is also important to ensure that candidates have had practice in the design and implementation of their own practical activities (including an analysis of the data collected and conclusions reached from this). 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 and enable them to comment on how conducting their own research has helped in the planning of novel research presented on the day of the examination. 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. It would also be a good idea to produce a glossary, commencing early in the course to facilitate understanding of the many terms and concepts (many of which candidates will not have encountered previous to studying psychology). In general, the use of examples to illustrate points, convey understanding better and enable elaboration should be encouraged. Finally, it is important to realise that a comprehensive understanding of inferential statistics and how they are interpreted is required and a realisation that there may be the need to perform some calculations in response to some questions.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A Multiple choice

Question	Max.	Comments
1	1	Many correct responses to this question, but of those that were not correct all the other (incorrect) options featured, indicating there is some confusion not only about what quasi experiment involves, but also the difference between independent and dependent variables.
2	1	Mostly correct responses for this question
3	1	Mostly correct responses here, acknowledging that extraneous variables interfere with the interpretation of how the IV has effected the DV and should ideally not feature in the research.
4	1	Mostly correct responses, although some confused target population with sample (the people you actually get data from), selecting option D
5	1	Mostly correct responses here
6	1	There was a varied response to this question, indicating there is still some confusion amongst some candidates about the different types of reliability.
7	1	This question required a good understanding of the process of conducting inferential statistical tests and shows the importance of

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

Question	Max.	Comments
		covering this fully when preparing candidates for the exam. Many struggled with this question.
8	1	Responses to this question revealed that some candidates did not know what secondary data referred to.
9	1	The term 'significant result' should have been familiar to candidates having covered what 'probability and significance' refers to in the context of inferential statistics, but some candidates struggled with this question.
10	1	Mostly correct responses here
11	1	Responses to this question reveal that some candidates are not conversant with the way that practical reports are written up and the use of formal sections and sub-sections for documenting specific parts of the research undertaken.
12	1	Mostly correct responses for this question
13	1	Responses to this question revealed that many candidates were not aware of the different specific types of rating scales that they need to know about, which made what should have been a relatively straightforward question much more challenging for some.
14	1	Mostly correct responses for this question
15	1	In order to do well on this question candidates needed to be aware of what was involved in different types and levels of data, which clearly some were not.
16	1	This question revealed that some candidates were not familiar with the process of conducting inferential statistical tests and understanding their outcomes. It reveals the need to prepare candidates by getting them to actually undertake some calculations using these tests in order to become more conversant with them and understand what the outcomes mean.
17	1	Mostly correct responses here
18	1	It was pleasing that there were many correct responses to this question requiring a knowledge of standard deviation and how the preliminary step in this calculation is the variance, but also an understanding the mathematical concepts of squares and square roots.
19	1	Both these questions reveal the need to be aware of research methods in the context of the core studies, and recognise how delivery of component 2 can facilitate and enhance learning of the content of component 1.
20	1	

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

Section B Research design and response

Question	Max.	Comments
21	2	Most candidates were able to state a clear aim for the study. However, some phrased what they wrote like a formal hypothesis, even with (incorrect) mention of variables at times. This highlights the importance of being able to distinguish between aims and hypotheses and recognise the types of research methodologies each is used for.
22	15	<p>Responses varied a lot to this extended (yet predictable in its format) question, with many candidates finding it difficult to achieve the higher band marks. The best responses were characterised by taking each of the four required features in turn, writing a separate paragraph relating to each one. Firstly, demonstrating understanding of what was involved and how to address it for the research presented. Next by justifying the decisions made regarding how to address it. Finally, drawing upon the candidates own experiences of conducting research themselves and how they learned from this how to conduct the research presented. All of this needed to be discussed in context to obtain marks in the highest band. It should also be noted that the candidates own experiences of conducting practical activities (especially the one using the same research method, which here was observation) should be evident in their response to each required feature in terms of how this has helped inform their decision making for the planning of the current proposed research.</p> <p>There was also much variation in how candidates demonstrated knowledge and understanding of each of the individual required features (RFs). The best responses were characterised by first defining what the RF was / referred to (eg for RF1, what the difference between a participant and non-participant observation was) before going on to describe exactly how the RF would be addressed in the proposed research. Often candidates here did not provide enough detail (eg in relation to RF1 just naming stating that participant observation would be used) without explaining how. Nearly all candidates were able to identify and describe appropriate behavioural categories to use in relation to RF2. RF3 caused the most problems and demonstrated the biggest lack of understanding. Some candidates clearly did not understand the difference between time and event sampling, with some identifying one, then describing another. Even candidates that did know the difference often did not provide enough detail about how the chosen technique to observe behaviour would be used (eg just saying behaviour would be recorded every 5 minutes, but not for how long, or over what total duration). For RF 4, many candidates referred to the use of a coding scheme or basic tally chart of some type, which was fine, provided it was described in sufficient detail.</p> <p>In general, it was acknowledged that there was some degree of overlap between the different individual RFs (eg especially in relation to RF4) and that some candidates (especially those including a lot of detail in their responses) may have included details related to one RF in response to another already discussed. This was acceptable and creditworthy, providing each RF had been addressed at the end of the overall response to the question.</p>

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

23	6	Candidates should be reminded that when the question rubric specifically asks for two things, only the first two things presented can receive credit. Responses here typically included reference to problems that different individual observers may have in interpreting behavioural categories in the same way as each other, the benefit of using of standardised pre-determined behavioural categories within a structured observation and the training of observers in the use and interpretation of such categories. There is still some confusion amongst candidates between test-retest reliability in general and inter-rater reliability, with some incorrectly making reference to the difficulty of obtaining the same findings if the study was to be repeated on a different day at a different time or on a different mode of transport. Inter-rater reliability is about the ability of two or more observers to look out for and record the same behaviours in the same way. It would not be expected (indeed highly unusual) if the same findings were to be obtained if the study was to be repeated.
24	6	Most candidates performed very well on this question being able to outline a strength and weakness of the use of the observation method (although some did not do so in context). The vast majority referred to aspects that would make the ecological validity of the study high, although some did not provide enough detail or elaboration (saying little more than high ecological validity because it was a natural setting). Many candidates, for a weakness made incorrect references to the ethical issue of consent, which was not creditworthy here if (as was the case for the majority of candidates) they were describing research to be conducted in a public place (eg a train). There are other, appropriate weaknesses of the observation method (eg problems being able to see / record behaviours clearly) that should have been considered and highlights the need to cover the strengths and weaknesses of the different methodologies in more detail and with more sophistication, rather than a superficial learning of a generic list.
25	6	Many candidates struggled with this question and responded with reference to ethical issues in general. The best responses were characterised by discussing how participants could be protected from harm (eg not made to feel anxious by making it obvious they were being observed) and providing details of an appropriate debrief (eg explaining to participants at the end that they had been observed, what the purpose of this was for and providing an opportunity to address any concerns they may have, such as worrying about realising they had been watched etc). It was not enough just to refer to harm and the use of a debrief by name only. This question revealed which candidates were familiar with the 'new' BPS guidelines on ethical considerations in research and the different categories now used.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

Section C Data analysis and interpretation

Question	Max.	Comments
26(a)	3	Most candidates were able to calculate the mean correctly, but some lost a mark by not presenting the final answer to two significant figures.
26(b)	2	Most candidates were able to calculate the median correctly
26(c)	1	Most candidates were able to identify the mode correctly
27(a)	4	Most candidates were able to calculate the range for the males and the females correctly, and show workings. It was acceptable here to use the +1 variation of the process for determining the range. Some candidates also interpreted the question as requiring the overall range (aggregated across all the males and females' ratings collectively), which was also creditworthy.
27(b)	3	Overall, this question was poorly answered and showed a quite widespread fundamental lack of understanding in how to interpret the range. Many candidates confused the range with the mean, making comments that related more to the mean when attempting to reach a conclusion. Even those who demonstrated awareness of what the range really is often discussed things in general (ie stating there was more variation in the ratings given by females), rather than discussing things in context of the research scenario provided. This highlights the importance of covering even the more basic statistical concepts in sufficient detail and in an applied context so that candidates appreciate more fully the information that can be gained from the use of such statistics.
28(a)	5	It was pleasing that many candidates were able to correctly calculate Chi square. Candidates who used variations on the formula provided (eg conversion in to fractions) were credited, provided each individual cell value was correct and the overall Chi square value. It was also acceptable to work with and present the overall answer to any number of decimal places. However, it was noticeable, that some candidates made errors when choosing to present to a certain number of decimal places in how they rounded up or down (which has implications for the overall Chi square value arrived at).
28(b)	2	This question highlighted the importance of practising using the inferential statistical formula on the specification to become fully conversant with the various steps and stages involved in determining significance. It was clear that some candidates had done this and then found this a relatively straightforward question to answer. However, others struggled and did not seem to know much / anything about the concept of degrees of freedom, which was essentially in being able to arrive at the correct answer to this question.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

28(c)	2	Some candidates in response to this question provided the full, formal statement of statistical significance that would appear in the write-up of a practical report when citing the outcomes of the Chi square test ($X^2 = 5.01$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$). Others interpreted the question as asking for a more general, informal presentation of the outcome of the Chi square test. Both types of response were credited. However, some candidates omitted this question altogether showing the need to cover this when explaining what happens after the outcome of an inferential statistical test has been performed.
29	4	Most candidates were able to successfully work out the respective ratios in response to this questions and show some appropriate workings.
30	6	Most candidates were able to evaluate the population validity of the research presented using two or more relevant points. However, some used points that were either inappropriate, or not true. For example, referring to demand characteristics affecting how honestly participants would complete the questionnaire, and claiming that random sampling had been used (when there was no reference to this in the research scenario presented). The best responses made a relevant point first (eg overall sample size) then went on to discuss the implications of this in the context of the research undertaken.
31	3	Many candidates here simply presented a finding from one of their own practical activities undertaken, rather than a conclusion (interpretation of a finding) as the question asked for. Not only this, some candidates incorrectly made reference to the study presented on the question paper (with some even using the actual data provided) and not an outcome from one of their own practical activities. It is important therefore to note that questions other than the extended 15 mark one can also require candidates to utilise the knowledge and experience acquired from conducting their own practical activities, and that there may be specific questions related to any aspect of this (ie it will not just be limited to the 15 mark question on the paper).

H567/02 Psychological Themes through Core Studies

1. General Comments:

Candidates responded well to Section A, showing a good range of knowledge and understanding of the core studies and high levels of recall where appropriate. In this section, candidates need to get better at judging the level of detail needed for each question given the marks available so they avoid writing too much as well as too little. The responses in Section B were more varied with some well answered questions such as the extended responses on ethics to some poorly answered yet predictable questions such as the one where they were required to compare two approaches. In Section C, many candidates showed pleasing insight into the article and applied their learning from psychology to good effect. The evaluation of their chosen techniques for changing a behaviour was notably stronger this year with more sophisticated analyses that centred around psychological ideas rather than the more basic practical ideas.

2. Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1ai

Most candidates scored both marks here demonstrating sound knowledge of quasi experiments. Candidates limited to one mark either did not make explicit reference to the term independent variable in their answer, or only quoted one condition of the IV (invariably autism/Asperger's).

Question 1aii

This question tended to be answered well or poorly. Common errors were to quote conclusions rather than findings, to only refer to one of the groups tested (normally participants with autism/Asperger's rather than two), or to quote findings from the Eyes Task. The latter was only appropriate when candidates wanted to explain how the findings demonstrated concurrent validity – although this type of response was rare.

Question 1b

Nearly all candidates could demonstrate some understanding of longitudinal studies whether explicitly through use of definition or implicitly through use of Freud's study. Full mark responses were obviously able to do both ie demonstrate knowledge and then apply.

Question 2a

This elicited a range of responses with most candidates able to score at least two marks – normally for referring to intelligence testing and the sample tested. However, there were a number of detailed and accurate responses that clearly addressed the demands of this question with a good focus on the idea of measuring differences.

Question 2bi

The majority of candidates gave a correct response here although a significant minority offered opportunity sampling as the answer.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

Question 2bii

Most candidates could give a valid reason for the interviews but only some could go on to explain the purpose behind this as demanded by the command word.

Question 3

Most candidates demonstrated some understanding of the developmental area as well as relevant knowledge of Bandura et al.'s study meaning two marks was a common score. However, only some candidates could make a clear enough link between the two for the third mark.

Question 4

Nearly every candidate was able to answer this question correctly earning both marks. Some candidates did write much more than was required however.

Question 5a

Another well answered question with the vast majority scoring full marks. Candidates tended to lose marks not because they could not identify variables that were standardised but because they were not always explicit about how they were standardised.

Question 5b

This was the question that candidates found most challenging in this section. There were some good efforts to compare to the two studies - either in terms of showing how understanding has changed or how it has not, or sometimes both. However, too many candidates relied on just outlining the two studies with no effort to make a link between them. This is despite a clear pairing of the studies within the specification and a clear instruction to consider how contemporary studies (like Grant et al.'s) have changed our understanding, if at all. Many candidates were not well prepared for this type of question.

Question 6a

This was a reasonably well answered question with most candidates earning themselves two of the marks available. Most candidates knew to only focus on the research method, with most getting credit for identifying the type of experiment and experimental design used. Marks were also credited for the IV, DV and any control.

Question 6b

Again – reasonably well answered with most candidates earning two. Sometimes this was because only two key features of the condition were offered or because there were enough features covered but they lacked clarity or detail, meaning the mark was capped at two.

Question 7

This was a straightforward question for many candidates with answers commonly focusing on sample, presence/absence of authority figure, and ethical differences. A common error was to

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

quote a difference already given in the question eg obedience versus disobedience/whistleblowing.

Question 8a

The majority of candidates were able to give a definition of free will, and many went beyond the idea of individuals having choice or control to earn a second mark – for example by contrasting with determinism or by making reference to concepts such as responsibility or unpredictability.

Question 8b

Most candidates scored two marks here, usually by accurately quoting findings from Lee et al.'s study and demonstrated how these could be linked to cultural determinism. Better answers also demonstrated a more explicit understanding of the concept of determinism. Weaker answers tended to show a muddled understanding of findings of the study.

Question 8c

Although most candidates scored around the middle here, there were some very insightful answers that showed understanding of the link between the area of individual differences and the nature of socially sensitive research, illustrating this through effective use of relevant core studies. A common error was to confuse unethical research with socially sensitive research and this was most notable where Freud's case study of Hans was used and the focus was on the boy himself rather than any potential wider consequences of the research.

Question 8d

Most candidates scored two here – either by offering two valid weaknesses but without adequate illustration, or by offering one weakness (applied to a study) which was creditworthy while the other was not. Commonly credited weaknesses focused on unrepresentative samples, subjectivity, or a lack of scientific rigour in general. However, there were common errors too – such as assuming the area is reductionist – this is further confused by a frequent misunderstanding of the concept ie a number of candidates seem to believe a theory is reductionist simply because it ignores other theories. Even if this were true, this would a weakness that applied to all theories and this was a problem overall – that selected weaknesses were not specific to this area eg candidates suggesting it is unethical or socially sensitive as an area when this equally applies to all other areas.

Question 8e

This was the most poorly answered question on the paper with many candidates unable to meet the demands of the question. Although most attempted it and knew they had to find either differences or similarities between the two approaches, the similarities or differences were frequently not creditworthy. A very common error was to contrast the aims of the two approaches but this rarely gave a genuine point of comparison. Other common errors included suggesting that they represented completely different sides of the nature/nurture approach, that they were both reductionist (again linked to a misunderstanding of reductionism), and that they were both deterministic. Similarities were often not specific enough to these two approaches and could apply to any pairing of approaches eg both being unethical, both being useful. Of course, if the differences/similarities were not valid then the use of evidence could not get credit either which meant a number of candidates scored zero. Answers that earned marks tended to focus

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

on differences rather than similarities, such as scientific versus unscientific, determinism versus freewill, holism versus reductionism, focusing on the individual versus making generalisations, interactionism versus nurture. A number of candidates completely misunderstood the question and identified differences or similarities which allowed them to compare studies from the different approaches eg suggesting both areas used experiments, or that one area used small samples while the other used large samples.

Question 8f

Most candidates knew something about Chaney et al.'s findings and earned a mark this way with many then making a general point about usefulness or something more specific often applied to medical compliance. Many candidates did not explore the question far enough to earn all three marks.

Question 8g

As expected, this question elicited a variety of responses, which clearly followed a normal distribution. Most candidates were able to outline a number of ethical issues, illustrating each one with a relevant study (while covering a range of studies). The discussion part was more limited with few candidates going beyond the argument for breaking ethical codes in the interest of valid results. Better answers raised more discussion points (eg cost-benefit analysis, the reputation of psychology, ways of addressing breaches of ethics). The best answers were clearly focused on the social area in general; explaining why this particular area of research is vulnerable in terms of certain ethical issues eg the need for deception, the likelihood of causing distress. Weaker responses tended to be study led and therefore raised ethical issues almost by chance rather than using them to structure their response. Candidates also needed to guard against making brief references to studies – it is important that they demonstrate clear knowledge and understanding of the features of a study, which are pertinent to the debate.

Question 9a

This question elicited a wide range of responses although most candidates were able to identify two relevant issues, which they then linked to the source with cross-cultural helping and obedience to authority being popular issues. The best answers developed these issues either through explanation of the issue or through applying in some depth to the article. A common error was to focus on the characters in the article rather than the article as a whole – for example, suggesting that it was unethical of the American athlete to ignore the Mexican runner or by expressing concern at for the American athlete due the article being published.

Question 9b

Candidates were generally successful at using the article to illustrate both sides of the individual/situational debate demonstrating an implicit understanding. However, better responses also demonstrated an explicit understanding of the debate by outlining the two arguments.

Question 9c

Most candidates earned at least two marks because they demonstrated sound knowledge of the Piliavin et al. study although spent too long detailing the study given that the command word was 'outline'. The question also asked for ways in which the study could relate to the article but often candidates only explored one way. The best answers made a number of links by referring to

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

both article and study, often looking at features such as cost-reward analysis, the role of blame/responsibility, same race helping, and proximity.

Question 9d

Most candidates scored around the middle range of marks on this question, as they were able to outline two ways of encouraging positive helping behaviour with some degree of contextualisation with positive reinforcement and modelling being both popular and valid suggestions. Weaker responses tended to be vague focusing on ideas such as education, training programmes or changing culture/ethos with no real detail of how this would be achieved. Stronger responses were able to give plausible examples of how positive helping behaviour would be encouraged supported by psychological evidence and/or concepts. A common problem was that candidates were not always obvious what their two suggestions were making it difficult for examiners to distinguish between different ideas. It is important for candidates to structure their answers clearly in response to questions like this, especially when examiners are instructed to assess the first two ways only.

Question 9e

Although not common, this was one of the questions most likely to be omitted. However, where candidates did attempt a response, it often scored marks around the middle range often by raising one or two issues associated with each suggestion from 9d. The weaker responses were focused on practical issues such as time and expense. The strongest responses applied a range of debates as part of the evaluation – for example, considering the role of nature over nurture, free will over determinism and the risks of over-generalising and ignoring individuals.

H567/03 Applied Psychology

1. General Comments:

The paper was generally consistent and broadly accessible. Some candidates struggled with Szasz in section A, whereas others showed the simple understanding required and readily accessed the marks available. Section B was generally well addressed with candidates seemingly well prepared in this, the second year of the current specification. There were no obvious inconsistencies between questions nor were rubric errors common. A broad range of marks was accessed.

The quality of candidate response was a main factor in differentiating between candidates, the best showing precision in detail and/or understanding, clarity of argument, and responses which directly addressed the question asked (notably Q4 about determinism, for example). Weaker responses displayed poor construction and a less specific response to the question posed such as generally outlining a study rather than using it to address the specific demands of the question (such as Q3 referring to Rosenhan). 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/understanding. Marking is mindful of the expectations of standard of a typical 17/18 year old. More significant in differentiating award of marks is the extent to which candidates responded to the precise demand of the question. As indicated last year, 'issue by issue, point by point' allows evaluation to be developed with supporting research as part of that evaluation. **Better responses used supporting research well and a key feature of poorer marks was broad (therefore limited) assertions with lack of supporting evidence.**

Section B is much more consistently addressed than last year.

Part (a) sought to assess knowledge (better in Q6 and Q7) and understanding (Q5 and Q8). Again, knowledge of the studies was rarely an issue; good selection of knowledge of detail, used to achieve an explicit response to the question distinguished the better candidate.

Part (b) tests analysis and evaluation. Most candidates have a go at this but candidates struggled to convincingly relate research to their responses. Supporting a number of clear evaluative points sends 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. The suggestions should endeavour to provide explicit operation, of exactly what to do, not merely broad suggestions. Theory from the classroom or textbooks is not sought. Supporting theoretical knowledge needs to be apparent if not explicit.

2. Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A – Issues in Mental Health

Q1a – Candidates were able to name a specific disorder and the vast majority were able to give a non-biological treatment. Very few, though some, mentioned a biological treatment such as ECT or drugs. Popular responses included reference to CBT, flooding and systematic desensitisation. Some were very well written with good use of terminology while others were quite brief and somewhat vague in their description of the treatment. For example, SD not referring to relaxation techniques or CBT referring to little more than challenging thoughts without saying how.

Q1b - An accessible question that allowed candidates to consider strengths and weaknesses of the chosen treatment. Most candidates were able to suggest one strength and one weakness (with supporting evidence), possibly explain it but rare was the candidate who would go on to 'discuss' the points they had made and illustrated.

Q2a Szasz points about the medicalisation and politicisation of mental illness were often cited, but ability to explain how he defends the claim varied dramatically. Some candidates confused his view with that of Rosenhan or believed that Szasz thought there was such a thing as mental illness but it was in fact a physical illness. Better responses addressed the claim that mental illness was a myth.

Q2b Many candidates struggled with the skill of evaluating. The more helpful structure of response suggested how Szasz's argument could be defended and then how it could be criticised. This was a sensible way of approaching the question and there was some thoughtful, sensitively handled discussion. Too many commentaries were shallow. Such as, "we know there are physical symptoms so Szasz must be wrong to say it doesn't exist."

Q3 This question proved to be the most difficult to access for a large number of candidates. Too many merely described the study; others made an attempt to address the question but often did not do so. This is the question that attracted the most NR marks.

Those who were more successful may have talked about individual diversity between the doctors and the real patients, the patients seeing the pseudo patients differently to the medical professionals, none of whom questioned the assigned diagnostic label. In terms of social diversity, some candidates were able to say that the pseudo patients were treated very differently in the hospital as all their behaviour was viewed in the context of their diagnosis whereas similar behaviour outside the hospital would attract no such attention.

As for cultural diversity, candidates may have received credit by pointing how mental disorder can be (mis) diagnosed in a particular country/culture.

Q4 Candidates who gave a clear description of the determinism-freewill argument and then illustrated this with (usually) biological/environmental arguments for determinism

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

and then cognitive explanations using the choice to go into therapy as an example of the freewill argument gained the most credit here.

Many candidates suffered from superficial understanding. For example, environmental factors are freewill because “you can choose where you live” or because biological factors do not account for 100% of cases this does not mean that the illness is not determined, it is just determined by an interaction of biological and environmental factors.

Section B – Options (2 options were required)

Option 1 Child Psychology

Q5a Lots of responses knew the details of the procedure of the study as well as the percentage results found. Many mentioned that the MZ twins had higher concordance rates than the DZ twins. Some suggested both had high concordance rates. Better responses displayed a good attempt to explain the biological factors affecting intelligence. The weaker responses tended to lack depth and gave some inaccurate details and findings.

Q5b This question seemed to pose more challenges for candidates than might have been expected. Many candidates made relevant points to do with validity of IQ tests, cultural bias within them, possible sampling bias, etc.. However, these were not always illustrated with convincing examples. Candidates would at times stray from methodological issues into debates. Stronger responses evaluated both IQ testing, tests as well as research surrounding the testing. Weaker responses tended to just evaluate IQ testing generally and some of this was vague without a specific test being given. Popular issues included validity, reliability, ethnocentrism (often with good reference to Gould/Yerkes) and ethics.

Q5c Many candidates were able to give some ideas for Nasra to use in her recruitment process. Good responses suggested specific IQ tests and described exactly what type of IQ these tests measured. Some did then link this to the specific skills that might be required in a computer games company. Weaker responses were very brief and often did not provide links to the stem.

Option 2 – Criminal Psychology

Q6a Good detail of the study provided and a number of responses were aware that it was the Brummie accent, black defendant who had committed a blue collar crime that was rated the most guilty as well as the Brummie accent per se. Many candidates believed the black defendant and the blue collar crime as separate independent variables were also rated the most guilty although Dixon did not find this in his study. Quite a few candidates referred to the halo effect and/or cite additional research illustrating other ways in which the characteristics of a defendant can affect whether they are found guilty. Some candidates confused the details of the Dixon study with other studies from background research.

Q6b Better answers identified issues (such as consent, confidentiality, protection from harm) and linked these to the study by Dixon or other studies from this topic area. Top candidates suggested that mock trials with mock juries create an ethical framework for

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

studies of the courtroom and linked their answers to this point throughout. Once more, however, this question posed more challenges than might have been expected. Often relevant points would be raised (with social sensitivity being accepted as an ethical consideration), but instead of **relating these to research** and making use of mock trials, too many candidates would discuss them in relation to hypothetical research within actual courtrooms, seeing the defendant as the participant. Such an approach held candidates back and led to answers lacking evidential support, as there was no reference to research at all.

Q6c – There were many good ideas given for Alan to improve jury decision making. Popular responses included putting the defendant behind a screen, having the defendant's testimony given by someone with a RP accent and training the jurors prior to the case in issues surrounding inadmissible evidence as well as the potential to show bias. Some candidates gave ideas about improving the appearance or voice of the defendant but this was not creditworthy as this would not improve jury decision making but instead would make it bias in favour of the defendant.

Option 3 – Environmental Psychology

Q7a This question was generally well answered in terms of description of the study and its findings. Better candidates gave a full account of the procedure and controls used to assess the effect on patients' recovery. The question asked about hospital design and the study suggests patients recover better with a window with a tree view while recovering. The suggestion to incorporate this into any hospital design should be straight forward, and was for many. On the other hand, numerous variations from foliage to woodland scenes and more were provided, including building the hospital in green spaces patients could walk in. This wouldn't work for the bed-bound (eg Post-surgery) patients.

Q7b Candidates had a generally good understanding of validity – responses considered internal validity (eg standardisation as a positive: nurse blind to conditions extracting data from notes, data collected retrospectively so not affected by subject reactivity), population validity (negative = only one type of surgery, only in Pennsylvania where health care may not be representative of the USA). The most common type was ecological validity, most candidates commenting that the study was conducted in a real life setting (real hospital, real patients).

Q7c This question attracted some imaginative responses, with candidates drawing on material from across the environment topics to suggest how Jon could design the new part of town. Candidates typically would make a wide range of suggestions within their answers, referring to green spaces, defensible space, noise and distance from airports, cul-de-sacs, the height of buildings, etc.). Better responses included evidence from the key research or other psychology literature to support their answer.

Option 4 – Sport and Exercise Psychology

Q8a Candidates were mostly able to outline in detail the procedure and sample for this study. Most candidates could explain that MG-M imagery correlated with self-efficacy and self –confidence. When it came to the benefits of imagery very few candidates worked out from the results that all types of imagery correlated ($p < 0.01$) so any form of imagery would have the benefit of improving motivation by improving self-efficacy and

self-confidence. However, most could suggest that MG-M imagery would benefit athletes (although it was not always clear from the answers if the candidate knew the difference between MG-M and any other type of imagery). The better answers focused on motivation as the benefit, with weaker responses failing to make the link with motivation but instead suggesting improved performance, which was not shown in the study as the study is about sports motivation.

Q8b Better candidates could give a good definition of reliability in the context of sports motivation. There is still confusion amongst candidates about repeating a study and replicability. The better responses recognised that challenges to validity can mean we would fail to get consistent results on replication (eg population validity - narrow age range, only one sport, meaning we may not get reliable findings as we replicated on a different age range or a different sporting scenario; also challenges to internal validity as self-reports were used that could have been affected by social desirability or demand characteristics might mean that we would fail to get similar results on retest)

Most answers did not use examples beyond Munroe-Chandler et al.

Please note that Munroe-Chandler **et al** should be referred to as they, not he, more so as Krista Munroe-Chandler is a woman.

Q8c This question attracted some imaginative and well-developed responses, with candidates drawing on material from across the sport topics to suggest how Debbie could try motivating her players. Candidates typically engaged well with the scenario and would make a wide range of suggestions within their answers (eg to do with use of imagery, intrinsic and/or extrinsic motivation, positive reinforcement, self-efficacy, team cohesion, etc.).

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 2018

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)

The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office:
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2018

