GCSE

Psychology

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J611**

OCR Report to Centres June 2014

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

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

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

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

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

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Psychology (J611)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

B541 Studies and Applications in Psychology 1

General Comments

This series showed some real improvements in candidate performance. It was really pleasing to see so many questions attempted and nearly all candidates addressing all questions - even the most challenging ones. Performance on stimulus and source questions was especially strong, and these seem to be a useful way of assessing candidates' knowledge and, to some extent, understanding. Candidates are also getting increasingly better at structuring responses around the question with some awareness of the number of marks on offer. It was notable that there were fewer examples of candidates confusing theories and studies, and although there were not as many questions focused on applications in this paper where they did arise they were generally tackled well. Candidates seem much better at recognising when evaluation is required, often giving high quality answers in response - for example, including evaluation in Q24, evaluating rather than describing in questions such as Q15, and making criticisms explicit in questions such as Q23.

Comments on individual questions

Question No:

Q1:   Most candidates were able to correctly name the three phobias associated with the clients' symptoms. Most errors were due to candidates not being able to 'diagnose' acrophobia, or due to their poor spelling of this particular phobia. A few candidates suggested 'agoraphobia' here even though it was already in the table.

Q2:   The vast majority of candidates earned the second mark although some offered their own stimulus rather than choosing one of the two in the source. Most candidates earned the first mark as well although a common error was to answer with 'instinctive preparedness'. This was essentially a comprehension question and some candidates need to be reminded to take care with what should have been two straightforward responses.

Q3:   This question presented candidates with few problems, with nearly all demonstrating accurate knowledge of the Watson & Rayner study, and earning full marks.

Q4:   Another well-answered question with nearly every candidate knowing one of the key limitations of the Watson & Rayner study.

Q5:   Some candidates were able to firstly identify a criticism - the most common being the behaviourist theory cannot explain the development of phobias in the absence of direct experience - and then expand on this, often by suggesting an alternative explanation (e.g. the role of instinct, indirect learning). However, most candidates tried to earn a second mark by offering an example - this rarely worked as they simply ended up repeating their first point albeit in a different context. The best responses offered explicit criticisms, while in weaker responses, criticisms were more implicit. The weakest responses relied on 'turning around' the statement before the question, e.g. suggesting 'phobias are not learned'.

Q6:   Most candidates were able to identify an appropriate therapy, with flooding being by far the most popular choice. Thereafter, many candidates earned a further mark for an additional detail. In the case of flooding, candidates were not always clear enough on the fact that clients are confronted with their worst possible fear as opposed to any fearful situation. Another common error was for candidates to suggest that clients

eventually realise their phobias are irrational - when the therapy is more behavioural (forming a new association) rather than cognitive. A good number of candidates gave very detailed and accurate responses, but some did not secure the four marks as they did not apply the therapy to Yvonne's phobia or did not do so explicitly enough.

Q7: Most candidates secured full marks here by demonstrating sound knowledge of the stages of information processing. Of the three stages, encoding was most likely to be mismatched.

Q8: Many candidates scored well across this question, using the source effectively. Part (d) saw the highest number of incorrect responses out of the four parts because a significant number of candidates made reference to 'information fading away' rather than it being 'pushed out'. In some instances, candidates did not use the source to answer part (a) and part (b) - e.g. a number of candidates responded with '7 +/- 2 chunks' for the first part.

Q9: This question elicited a full range of responses. At the top end, candidates selected two distinct criticisms and explained them well. Some candidates limited their marks by choosing criticisms they were not able to adequately expand on, or ones that were too bland - e.g. the model is too simplistic - or ones that overlapped with each other. When candidates potentially have a number of criticisms to choose from, they should be encouraged to take time and make good choices.

Q10: Although attempted by most, some candidates did not seem very familiar with the findings of Terry's study. Candidates who did score tended to do so mostly on part (a) followed by part (b). A common error on part (b) was either for candidates to not make it explicit that there was only a primacy effect and for them to wrongly suggest there was only a recency effect. Only a minority of candidates were able to explain the difference in conditions and score on part (c). Instead, the vast majority just described differences again. Candidates that focused on explaining the primacy effect for part (c) could not earn marks because this effect was common to both conditions and therefore not a difference between them.

Q11: Although the majority of candidates did well and scored full marks here, a number incorrectly identified the last statement as 'true'.

Q12: Many candidates scored well on this question, mainly by acknowledging a boy's desire for his mother and his subsequent fear of castration. Candidates were less successful at describing the outcome of this and although many knew that boys developed their gender identity, they were not explicit about this being through identification (as opposed to processes such as imitation or mere association). Candidates who earned full marks often focused on the unconscious nature of the process too. Some candidates continue to be coy about recognising a boy's lust (using terms like 'love', 'liking' or 'keen on') which unfortunately stops them earning a key mark.

Q13: Most candidates were able to earn at least one mark here. Better answers often identified a generic limitation of case studies and then considered it in the context of the Diamond & Sigmundson study. However, too many responses identified an issue with the study without really explaining why it was an issue in terms of method or findings - typically issues surrounding the timing of Bruce's gender assignment, the presence of a twin brother, and the parents' awareness of their daughter's true sex. One common error was to focus on ethical issues with reference to Bruce's gender reassignment rather than with reference to the way research took place. Another relatively common error was to focus on the fact it was a one-off case even though this had been precluded by the question (essentially to encourage candidates to demonstrate understanding of other limitations).

Q14: Most candidates earned both marks here with nearly every candidate getting part (b) correct. On part (a), some candidates crucially missed out the reference to 'expect' while others decided to reword the reason, often to their detriment - e.g. there were a number of clumsy references to demand characteristics.

Q15: The best answers to this question explored a number of criticisms of the theory, often considering evidence that challenges the biological explanation of gender development. A number of candidates had the gist of the main criticisms but could not always express them clearly enough. Some candidates limited their marks by first recognising that the theory ignores the effect of environmental experiences but then going on to describe the effect of learning and experience rather than continuing to focus on the theory under discussion. Common misunderstandings persist in some candidates' responses - for example, that biological theory does not explain atypical gender development, nor explain androgyny.

Q16: Candidates clearly know the Bickman study well, with the vast majority correctly identifying all three of the features of the study out of the list provided.

Q17: Most candidates understood what this question was asking for, but those that scored both marks had a clearer focus on the study itself, contextualising the problem of gender bias in this kind of research.

Q18: Part (a) of this question was answered correctly by nearly all candidates. Part (b) also saw many candidates getting the mark, although a common error was to identify desperation for cash as a dispositional factor. It was part (c) where only a few candidates scored marks. Some candidates knew that the authoritarian personality was associated with a strict upbringing but not many could go on to express this in psychodynamic terms instead using social learning to explain the link. Most responses were either commonsensical or inappropriately made explicit reference back to the source.

Q19: This question elicited a full range of responses with most candidates scoring around the middle. Nearly all candidates demonstrated some knowledge of the role of situational factors in obedience, however the best responses clearly and explicitly showed the effect of their chosen factors on obedience levels and then went on to explain thiseffect (a requirement for the top band anyway). Milgram, Hofling and everyday events were used effectively to illustrate the effects of a range of factors although some candidates did labour the effect of one or two factors by giving multiple examples. Candidates need to guard against listing concepts or ideas in descriptive responses, as it can impact on the quality of communication, which is part of the judgement when banding responses.

Q20: The majority of candidates could define the two measures of attachment by correctly matching the two boxes. 'Separation protest' was mismatched more than 'stranger anxiety'.

Q21: It was unusual for candidates to score just one mark (compared to no marks) on this question, as most appeared to know that the relevant children were Child A and Child B - however, some got them the wrong way around when deciding who had experienced deprivation rather than privation. This might suggest that these terms continue to be muddled up by some candidates.

Q22: Many candidates found this a challenging question with most not scoring any marks. Although many demonstrated they had the gist behind the behaviourist explanation of attachment, few candidates directly addressed the question. Even when candidates used the right concepts (e.g. reward, strengthening) they then failed to score because they related it to something other than attachment - e.g. stickers for potty training. What

was often absent from one-mark answers was the idea of the reinforcement being mutual - recognising that carers are rewarded by the bond as much as the infant.

Q23: Most candidates scored three marks here, showing they were able to offer one good criticism as well as a more basic one. Candidates who chose to criticise the concept of monotropy nearly always scored two marks with criticisms of the critical period earning both marks more often than criticisms of the role of instinct. Again, this a lesson in candidates making the right kind of choices given the marks on offer.

Q24: Most candidates made a good effort to attempt this essay question with very few candidates missing it out. The standard of responses obviously varied but tended to match the performance on the rest of the paper. The best responses were well planned, coherent and accurate. Candidates demonstrated impressive knowledge of the procedure used by Haven & Shaver, although there was more variability in the detail and clarity of the findings. However, findings were nearly always included somewhere. Nearly all candidates offered some evaluation of the study, showing this is now a well-established skill in this GCSE, but some only covered one or two of the most obvious limitations - e.g. gender bias, tendency to lie. Many responses contained a good range of relevant evaluation points but what differentiated them was the quality. Some candidates showed an impressive ability to take each of their evaluation points and develop them by explaining the limitation and then relating this to the outcomes of the study. Where candidates did score zero, it was often because they described another study besides Hazen & Shaver - most notably Ainsworth's attachment research. Candidates need, therefore, to be clear that there is only one core study per topic and that it is rare that they get to describe (and evaluate) a study other than that one.

B542 Studies and Applications in Psychology 2

General Comments

Although outcomes were not as good as on Unit 1, this unit still demonstrated some improvements in candidate performance. It was good to see so many questions attempted and nearly all candidates addressing all questions. As with Unit 1, performance on stimulus and source questions was especially strong. Knowledge and understanding was generally strong on this paper, but the only question on applications (Q9) was not done well. In contrast to Unit 1, the question assessing evaluation skills seemed to challenge candidates more - suggesting that the skill is dependent on what they are being asked to criticise or consider the limitations of. Having said this, there was evidence of well-developed evaluation skills coming from the more able candidates.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Q1: Most candidates named all four stages accurately but what was supposed to be an easy question did catch a number of them out. A common error was to identify the 'concrete stage' and 'formal stage' without reference to 'operational'. Candidates also struggled to name the sensori-motor stage and there were some interesting variations of its name e.g. sensory mentor stage.

Q2: The majority of candidates was able to successfully match the children to the relevant feature of cognitive development. Candidates were most likely to get part (b) wrong, identifying Abdul as being egocentric rather than Pippa.

Q3: Most candidates earned two marks here - either for a well-elaborated criticism of one their chosen features or for two brief criticisms of each of their chosen features. The main issue here was that candidates' criticisms did not always follow on logically from the identified feature, thus limiting them to one mark per criticism. There was a particular issue distinguishing between invariant and universal stages when it came to evaluation of them.

Q4: Candidates who chose to describe the core study in this topic - Piaget's conservation of number experiment - scored best on average. However, there were some decent descriptions of alternative experiments, most notably the 'three mountains' experiment. The best responses clearly identified the sample, covered the procedure accurately, and described the findings in specific detail. Weaker responses made lots of assumptions about the reader's knowledge, offering very vague descriptions. Having said this, nearly all candidates did address the question set.

Q5: Not surprisingly, the vast majority of candidates found this question straightforward and were awarded all four marks. A common error was to describe the emotion displayed in a face (e.g. stern face, sad face) rather than how it is displayed. Just a few candidates missed the point of the question and gave some examples not related to non verbal communication - e.g. blushing.

Q6: Nearly all candidates demonstrated some knowledge of evolutionary theory, but some did not focus on the demands of the question - e.g. focusing on survival rather than reproduction. Where candidates scored one mark it was usually for recognising that NVC played a part in appearing attractive or signalling attraction rather than for recognising it is an innate process. Some candidates made the mistake of being too colloquial in their response - for example, referring to flirtatious behaviour rather than mating behaviour.

Q7: Candidates demonstrated excellent understanding of the concepts of social learning with nearly every candidate correctly answering all three parts of this question.

Q8: Nearly all candidates understood the question well enough to focus on findings rather than procedure. The weakest responses were very generic and did not refer to the relevant cultures. Most candidates made the link between Japanese people and eyes, and American people and mouths. Indeed, many candidates were able to earn a second mark by elaborating on this either in terms of what was measured in the Yuki et al study or what was generally concluded. The best responses, scoring three marks, tended to explain the findings in terms of socialisation.

Q9: This question caused problems for a number of candidates, with a significant minority omitting the question. Answers scoring zero marks tended to make reference to people socialising (e.g. at parties) rather than recognising that social skills training (SST) is a technical procedure. The majority of candidates scored just one mark - either for outlining where SST may be used or why it may be used. Only a minority of candidates went on to outline how it might be used by focusing on techniques such as modelling, role playing and reinforcement. There were some very detailed responses to the question, identifying the various stages of SST, although some candidates had to be limited to two marks because they did not contextualise their responses - i.e. they did not refer to the learning of non verbal communication and/or their chosen area of application.

Q10: Nearly all candidates earned both marks here, demonstrating good understanding of the perceptual constancies. Shape constancy was mismatched much more than colour constancy.

Q11: Most candidates were able to identify two depth cues, helped by the fact that all were present in the source. Those candidates that earned further marks made clear reference to the picture, using terms that related to distance and depth. Common errors included applying a different depth cue to the one identified (height in plane and relative size were commonly confused in this sense) or not using a comparative (e.g. saying that the bride and groom were further away but not who or what they were further away than).

Q12: This question was answered well with most candidates earning both marks on offer. Typically, good responses identified a bias present in the sample and then made reference to the issue of representativeness and/or generalisability.

Q13: This was designed to be a challenging question and this was reflected in candidates' responses with only a small number scoring both marks. Most candidates had some idea of what bottom-up processing was but were unable to adequately express this. Too many definitions applied equally to bottom-up processing and top-down processing (e.g. data first enters the eyes and is then sent to the brain) or focused on what bottom-up processing is not rather than what it actually is. Good responses made references to the process being data-driven and/or immediate and/or instinctive/natural.

Q14: Most candidates were able to identify correct sentences in both parts but there was a tendency for some to give more than one sentence and here the examiner could only assess the first sentence offered.

Q15: There were some impressive responses to this question and, indeed, where candidates did score, the majority scored all three marks. Popular evaluation points focused around the constructivist theory's over-emphasis on the role of experience relating this to the perceptual abilities of new born babies, our common view of the world, and the fact humans fall for the same illusion again and again. As with previous series, some

candidates did not follow the command and described rather than evaluated the theory resulting in zero marks.

Q16: There was a reasonably even spread of the three scores on this question. Two mark answers tended to focus on the cultural or historical dimensions of definitions of crime often earning the second mark for an appropriate example to illustrate the point. One mark answers often made the same point without example, or made implicit points related to intention and damage. A common theme in responses scoring nothing was that candidates were focusing on problems of measuring crime rather than defining crime.

Q17: Many candidates showed good knowledge of the traits associated with the criminal personality and this was worthy of one mark. However, very few focused on the demands of the question and considered how these might be measured or investigated - or if they did, they were very vague, e.g. using phrases such 'look to see if they are over-optimistic, impulsive and pleasure seeking'. Many candidates scored zero. Two common errors were to focus either on investigating brain dysfunction or on facial features associated with crime. It was therefore obvious that some candidates were unable to make the distinction between criminal behaviour and the criminal personality.

Q18: Nearly every candidate was able to apply their knowledge of social learning theory to the source and got both parts right.

Q19: The majority of candidates scored full marks demonstrating sound knowledge of the limitations of Mednick et al's study. A large number of candidates also earned two out of the three, but there were no obvious patterns to what they were getting right or wrong.

Q20: There was a good spread of mark across the responses to this question. Most candidates demonstrated some understanding of the biological theory of crime with just a few assuming it explained crime through learning. Most candidates who earned marks focused on the genetic basis of criminal behaviour. Better answers expanded their response to consider brain dysfunction with some very good responses that clearly identified the function of different parts of the brain and then related this to behaviours and traits associated with crime. Many candidates made reference to facial features although this only attracted one of the marks on offer. Candidates need to be aware that examiners are looking for coherency in responses like this and so candidates who listed features of the theory without linking them were likely to be limited to the middle band and four marks.

Q21: The vast majority of candidates responded correctly to the three statements showing good knowledge of these humanistic concepts.

Q22a: Most candidates were able to earn at least one of the two marks by making reference to the individuals' ability to make choices about behaviour and thoughts. Those that elaborated on this and contrasted it with ideas associated with determinism often got a second mark. A common mistake was to define free will in terms of right to choose rather than ability to choose.

Q22b: A number of candidates struggled to define self actualisation - some did not understand the concept at all, while others could not articulate what they knew. Those that scored on this question often wrote about the matching of self concept and ideal self. Those that scored both marks expanded to write about ideas such as innate drives or progressing through a hierarchy of needs.

Q23: There were some very good responses to this challenging question. Those candidates that started with a broad criticism - such as stating that humanistic theory is unscientific - often found it easier to develop the point by going into more specific detail. A number of candidates did not follow the demands of the question and offered a number of criticisms although the examiner would only assess the first one. Most candidates did not score on this question - the question was missed out more than most others. Others did not score because they described the theory rather than criticised it, or their criticisms were not valid. For example, a common error was to suggest that the theory ignored individual differences which is, of course, a gross misunderstanding of humanism.

Q24: Most candidates made a good effort to attempt this essay question. The standard of responses obviously varied and tended to match the performance on the rest of the paper. The best responses were well planned, coherent and accurate. Candidates demonstrated impressive knowledge of both the procedure and findings of Van Houtte & Jarvis' study although it was easier to earn marks for the findings. Nearly all candidates offered some evaluation of the study showing this is now a well-established skill in this GCSE, but some only covered one or two of the most obvious limitations - e.g. cultural bias, tendency to lie. Many responses contained a good range of relevant evaluation points but what differentiated them was the quality. Some candidates showed an obvious ability to take each of their evaluation points and develop them by explaining the limitations and then considering their impact on the study. Where candidates scored zero, if was often because they gave a very vague description about a study looking at the value of pets with none of the necessary detail.

B543 Research in Psychology

A significant number of candidates showed a good level of knowledge and understanding of conducting research in psychology.

A very high proportion of candidates attempted all the questions on the paper demonstrating the paper was accessible to almost all candidates. Candidates are encouraged to pay particular attention to the method requested in section B, as some candidates are still seen to be designing alternative methods to that requested (for example, interviews, experiments and observations when the questionnaire method has been asked for).

In section A, candidates are encouraged to utilise the source material more effectively. Key features of the source can be used to illustrate responses and to demonstrate a good level of understanding throughout. Application is a key feature of this paper and as such candidates are encouraged to pay particular attention to those questions which demand contextualisation.

In section B, candidates are encouraged to focus on continuity between the questions to avoid muddled or contradictory designs. Candidates are also encouraged to avoid repetition in their responses across questions. Credit for one aspect of a design can only be achieved once.

Candidates need to avoid using generic examples. In this paper, an explanation of extraneous variables was required and the most commonly seen error was where examples of extraneous variables such as weather or dietary requirements was given. Neither was applicable to the investigation in the source.

Candidates are also encouraged to pay particular attention to the command words in questions and go beyond the mere identification of a concept or evaluative point, when a description, level of interpretation or explanation is required. Likewise, the use of circular and tautological definitions should be avoided.

Finally, candidates are encouraged to indicate when they have used additional pages to complete their answers and to make sure they are numbered correctly in the margin.

Section A

Q1   Few incorrect responses were observed for this question with the majority of candidates recognising the aim of the study in the source. Few candidates stated a hypothesis or phrased the aim in the past tense.

Q2   Generally a well-answered question. Many candidates were able to predict that there would be a difference in student performance and identify both variables correctly. There were instances where candidates referred to a 'correlation' or 'relationship' and / or failed to identify both variables. On occasion aims and null hypotheses were seen.

Q3 (a)   A range of responses was identified for this question. Whilst many candidates could identify the sampling method used in the source, some candidates confused the sampling method with sample or gave definitions of opportunity sampling or named an alternative sampling method.

Q3 (b)   Responses to this question varied. Many candidates were able to provide a generic problem pertaining to the use of opportunity sampling but fewer were able to elaborate on their responses demonstrating how or why their identified disadvantage was a specific problem to this sampling method. Candidates who failed to achieve marks often gave disadvantages of the sample size.

Q4 A range of responses were observed for this question. Although many candidates were able to show an understanding of what a target population is, very few were able to encompass the entire concept, explaining that it is group of people the results are applied to or that the sample is drawn from this wider population. Some candidates were successfully able to use the information given in the source to illustrate their understanding of a target population.

Q5 (a) A very well-answered question with almost all candidates correctly identifying repeated measures as the design used in the source.

Q5 (b) Many candidates were able to give good, contextualised descriptions of a disadvantage of using repeated measures but many failed to actually identify the disadvantage. The result of this was that many descriptions could have applied to any of practice effects, order effects such as boredom or tiredness or demand characteristics. Such responses could only gain partial marks. One error observed was repetition between responses to Q5(b) and Q8 whereby candidates were seen to repeat their responses in both questions.

Q6. Generally a well-answered question with many candidates correctly identifying the independent and dependent variables from the study in the source. Where errors were made, the independent variable was confused with the dependent variable and vice versa. Candidates are encouraged not to draw more than the number of lines stated in the question.

Q7 The majority of candidates were able to provide an appropriate feature of either a laboratory or a field experiment and then gave the opposite feature. For example, saying one is controlled and one isn't or that one has ecological validity and one doesn't. Additionally some candidates compared different features. In either instance only partial marks could be awarded. Candidates are encouraged to go beyond the mere identification where an explanation is required. The use of tautological definitions was also seen whereby candidates would describe laboratory experiments as taking place in a lab.

Q8 The majority of candidates were able to demonstrate an understanding that the use of the same tests served as a control, to make it a fair test or to reduce the effects of extraneous variables. Fewer candidates achieved full marks for failing to correctly identify why or how it acted as a control in relation to the independent variable (the colour of the paper).

Q9 A well answered question with almost all candidates identifying quantitative data.

Q10 A very well-answered question. Many candidates gave clear elaborated responses that went beyond restating the results. It was pleasing to see so many candidates successfully interpreting the results in relation to the alternate hypothesis.

Q11 A very well-answered question with almost all candidates correctly identifying the three ethical issues. Where errors were made, the most common response was to confuse deception with the right to withdraw.

Q12 Whilst many candidates were able to state that an extraneous variable was something that affected the results of a study, very few were able to state that it is a variable that is not the independent variable that could affect the dependent variable (if not controlled). Responses merely stating that it is something that cannot be controlled was common seen. Many candidates gave generic examples of extraneous variables such as the weather. Such answers could not be credited.

Section B

Q13 (a) Generally a well-answered question. Many candidates were able to show that a null hypothesis predicts that there would be no gender differences in levels of addiction to computer games and were able to identify both variables correctly. There were instances where candidates referred to a 'correlation' or 'relationship' and / or failed to identify both variables. On occasion aims, alternate hypotheses or research questions were seen.

Q13 (b) (i) This was generally a well-answered question. Where errors were made candidates often identified the type of question they would use (open or closed) instead of giving an example of a question.

Q13 (b) (ii) Many errors were made on this question. Many candidates gave responses explaining why they had used the actual question given in 13(b) (i) instead of explaining why they chose the TYPE of question. Candidates are encouraged to read the question carefully to avoid misinterpretation.

Q13(c) Responses to this question varied greatly. Few candidates achieved full marks by including at least three relevant features of how the questionnaire could be carried out or through failing to make any reference to gender. In addition, despite there being some very good responses, many candidates failed to show an understanding of the questionnaire method. Responses referring to using interviews or to conducting observations and experiments was commonly seen. Candidates need to be careful not to give details of the procedures that have been assessed in previous parts of the questions (ie repetitions of the questions stated in 13 (b) (i), or reference to how they would present their data, which could not be credited here as it belonged in question 13(f). Candidates are encouraged to be mindful of contradictory procedures in light of information provided in other question parts. Candidates were often seen giving justifications for their procedure which could not be credited as the focus of the question was HOW not WHY. Candidates are also encouraged to go beyond just stating (a sampling method for example), and actually showing how they would use the procedure to carry out their investigation.

Q13(d) There were some good answers here with candidates describing the term social desirability, saying how this might affect the investigation and contextualising their answer in relation to computer games addiction.

Q3 (e) Responses to this question varied. A key feature of section B is continuity and as such candidates are encouraged to contextualise their responses in light of their investigation's design. Many candidates were seen to offer strengths that contradicted their design; offering a strength of using open questions when they have stated using closed questions in Q13(b) (i) and Q13 (c) for example, and thus could not achieve credit. Some candidates failed to show knowledge of the strengths associated with using the questionnaire method and relied heavily upon time or cost.

Q13 (f) A generally well-answered question. Most candidates said they would use a bar graph though some failed to show how this would allow the researcher to compare the two genders. There were a few instances where candidates said they would use a scattergraph and some candidates focussed on how data would be collected or analysed as opposed to being presented. Such responses failed to gain credit.