

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/11

Core Studies 1

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as aims, sampling, procedures, results, conclusions and various aspects of evaluation such as criticism and applications. However, **Section A** of this particular paper appeared to present particular challenges to candidates from some Centres, notably on **Questions 11, 14 and 15(b)**. Where appropriate, candidates should know about both quantitative and qualitative results of each study. Although some candidates were aware of the concept of experimental design and how it applied to a specific study, these are also areas in which the majority could improve.

There have now been several sittings of the new specification and the majority of candidates seemed to have learned the correct studies. A few, however, are still writing about studies that are not on the specification (such as Loftus and Palmer rather than Loftus and Pickrell and different Maguire and Baron-Cohen studies than the one required). It is pleasing to see, however, that the vast majority of candidates attempted both questions in **Section B** as required. However, especially in **Question 17**, many candidates focused on description of the study itself, which was not required, rather than focusing on the approach specified by the question.

Question 1

- (a) **Milgram:** This question was well answered and there were some good answers that framed the aim as a test of the dispositional/ situational hypotheses, which worked well. Some answers, however, were very vague such as 'to see if people would follow an authority'.
- (b) Although many candidates were able to give relevant answers, many could have improved their response by indicating why the finding they reported did or did not support the aim – it was important to link the two.

Question 2

- (a) **Haney, Banks and Zimbardo:** Candidates needed to explain why volunteering is ethical (without this, comments about this concept were only worth 1 mark). As the question asks *how* the results supported the aim, those candidates who simply stated that the results 'did' or 'did not' support the aim earned 0 marks as they were not answering the question. The answer needed to be specific to the method of recruiting participants given in the question. Many vague, general answers could have applied to any sampling method, so could not score marks. Similarly, references to bias caused by motivation due to payment were not relevant (as they refer to this particular study not using newspapers for recruitment specifically). Those candidates referring to the method being cost-effective need to recognise that, whilst this may be true it is not a psychological justification and, since this is a psychology paper, this type of answer is not appropriate (here, or in other, similar questions).
- (b) There was a tendency for candidates to give vague disadvantages that could apply to any method, e.g. 'it was possible to deceive the potential participants' or 'they could have had mental health problems'. Their answers needed to apply specifically to the technique of acquiring a sample from a newspaper advertisement. The response 'you might have too many responses' did not earn credit as it is not a disadvantage.

Question 3

- (a) **Piliavin:** Many candidates found this question difficult and incorrect answers often simply stated that the study *did* provide evidence for the diffusion of responsibility hypothesis (which, overall, it does not). Other candidates were able to offer the correct response, and to identify that this was simply because no diffusion of responsibility was shown.
- (b) It was nice to see that candidates could answer this question, indeed some were able to observe that the results in fact showed the opposite – that 7-person groups were consistently faster to respond than 3-person groups. However, some candidates were unable to earn any marks at all here, especially if their answer to part (a) was incorrect.

Question 4

- (a) **Tajfel:** There was a tendency for candidates to describe the procedure of the study rather than the matrices specifically. Those candidates who did focus on the matrices typically scored 1 or 2 marks.
- (b) This question was moderately well answered, although the response needed to be related to the study to earn both marks so candidates could have improved their response by explaining the advantage of using quantitative data *in this instance*. For example 'you can do graphs' is too general.

Question 5

Bandura et al: Quite a lot of candidates' answers focused on strengths of the study rather than strengths of the observation, so many scored no marks at all.

Question 6

- (a) **Freud:** Many candidates focused on the study rather than the question, so missed stating the obvious – that the information came from little Hans *himself*, though *questions* asked directly to him by his father.
- (b) Even when candidates did not gain full marks in part (a), some were able to gain marks here as they were aware of the advantages of the self-report method. However, many candidates could only gain one mark here, for example by stating very simple advantages, such as saying 'in depth', detailed etc.

Question 7

Langlois: Many answers were too simplistic or incomplete, e.g. 'preferred attractive faces' or 'preferred their own sex faces'. It is important for candidates to explain what this is in comparison to. Other candidates appeared not to know any results at all from the study.

Question 8

- (a) **Nelson:** Many candidates had a poor understanding of this study. Others simply rephrased the question, so appeared to have some knowledge but were not answering the question. They therefore scored no marks.
- (b) Some candidates focused on the 'ethics' element of the question and ignored the 'consent' aspect, thus gave answers about the way the experiment had been made child-friendly. Stronger candidates were able to explain that the children themselves could not understand enough to give consent, so it had to come from a parent/guardian.

Question 9

Schachter and Singer: Some candidates gave good answers here, others, however, mistakenly gave the levels of the independent variable.

Question 10

- (a) **Dement and Kleitman:** Although this question was quite well answered, correct but partial answers were common, such as 'to see if eye movements related to dreams' = 1, which earned 1 mark. To elaborate these, candidates needed to say 'to see if *the direction of* eye movements related to dream *content*'. A small number of answers simply said 'to investigate the stages of sleep' or similar, so scored no marks.
- (b) This question was also generally well answered. Where candidates only scored one mark this was often because they tended to give simplistic answers which just restated the aim in the form of evidence, rather than actually providing additional information from the results of the study, either descriptive or numerical.

Question 11

- (a) **Maguire et al:** There was considerable confusion with this concept. Candidates need to be aware of the nature of different experimental designs and the way that these are used in the various experimental studies. A repeated measures design is not simply a situation in which tests are repeated, it is specifically where each participant is tested in each condition/level of the IV. Thus, answers which described repeated and repeating routes, such as taxi drivers repeating the same routes day after day demonstrated no understanding of experimental design, so scored no marks.
- (b) Typically, candidates who did not understand the nature of a repeated measures design did not score marks here, although some earned a serendipitous mark for observations about validity in relation to individual differences.

Question 12

- (a) **Demattè:** There were many appropriate answers, but some candidates confused procedures relating to ethics, such as ensuring that participants were not allergic to any other odours, with control procedures, such as ensuring that the participants had a normal sense of smell. Others simply restated the levels of the IV (that the experimenters controlled the smells and the pictures) without saying how each instance was kept the same, which also earned no marks. The olfactometer itself was not a control procedure, although its capacity to administer exactly equivalent measures of the scents to every participant/in every condition was a control measure.
- (b) Better candidates were able to identify the importance of reliability and validity. However, in order to earn more than 1 mark, candidates had to demonstrate an understanding of one or other of these terms i.e. to explain how controls increased reliability or validity – hence many candidates only gained 1 mark here.

Question 13

- (a) **Rosenhan:** Answers here were generally good, although accurate recall of the percentages of different behaviours was uncommon. Some candidates reported qualitative examples, but these were often of interactions with psychiatrists rather than nurses.
- (b) There were also some excellent answers here, as candidates demonstrated their ability to come up with their own explanations, as well as those put forward by Rosenhan.

Question 14

Billington: It is not only experiments which have hypotheses, or samples, therefore these are not defining characteristics.

Describing the study was not sufficient to earn a mark – the answer had to explain why it was an example of the experimental method. As a consequence, few candidates scored marks here. Where candidates did offer suitable responses, they generally did not contextualise their answers so could only gain one of the two available marks.

Question 15

- (a) **Veale and Riley:** This question was typically well answered, with candidates identifying either a questionnaire or a question-type from the questionnaire, and an example.
- (b) There was a tendency to answer about how the data were collected rather than about the data themselves, thus scores on this part of the question were much lower than for part (a).

Question 16

This question produced some good answers, although essays often lacked detail or balance and some candidates did not really seem to understand the concept of ecological validity, with a few writing entirely – and inappropriately – about ethics. Candidates were able to suggest a range of appropriate ideas beyond those in the mark scheme, for example:

Dement and Kleitman: It was ecologically valid because the participants did, in fact, sleep and dream (despite the situation), because we do sometimes recall our dreams and describe them to others, the participants slept in a bed in a room that was dark and quiet (as they would at home) and went to the lab to sleep at their normal bedtime. We even get woken up by alarm clock bells or even fire alarms in the middle of the night. Previous studies had also shown that people woken up in REM return to REM, so they would not have been disturbed that much, especially as they generally fell back to sleep quickly and had quite a long night's sleep. However, it was not ecologically valid because the participants may have been accustomed to drinking coffee or alcohol, so to not do so was different for them, we do not normally sleep with wires attached to us, nor are we normally observed while we sleep. And fire alarms are uncommon.

Held and Hein: It was ecologically valid because the kittens were kept most of the time with their siblings and mother, so they had normal social development and could move around normally most of the time. They could even move their legs and head a bit, like they would be able to when in the apparatus. It was not ecologically valid because kittens normally see and play with all sorts of things so these kittens could not.

Thigpen and Cleckley: These answers were typically the weakest, although even here candidates were able to make sensible suggestions about whether a psychiatrist's office was a normal environment for a person with a disorder (arguing either way), the distance from her home and the absence of the normal social context (her husband and family).

Question 17

There were few very good answers to this question. Many candidates, inappropriately, gave strengths and weakness of the study rather than of the approach illustrated by the study. Some candidates, however, demonstrated excellent understanding, for example making observations included in the mark scheme and others, such as the following:

Mann et al: Strengths of the cognitive approach such as controls are illustrated by the standardised video clips used, and this made the study replicable, e.g. the second coder coded the same clips for some suspects. Another advantage in cognitive studies is that both qualitative and quantitative data can often be collected, although in this case only quantitative data, such as blink frequency, were collected. A disadvantage with the cognitive approach is that studies are often unethical as deception must be used to avoid demand characteristics although in this case all that had to happen was that the coders did not know which were lying or truth telling segments of the video.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/12
Core Studies 1

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 10 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- For **Section A**, a 2 mark answer that has the command term 'describe' - candidates should ensure they provide enough detail to score both marks, rather than a partial, very brief or vague answer. Detail is not required for questions with the command to 'Identify'.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question, **(a)** and **(b)** before beginning to write an answer to ensure that the answers to both question parts are not the same.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

Many marks can be lost in paper 1 examinations if candidates use poor examination technique. Candidates should read carefully and ensure they follow the advice given in the key messages above. If this advice is followed it will result in marks being gained because of good examination technique, which can improve an overall grade.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates were able to achieve at least 1 mark for this question by stating that the study was about false memory. Fewer candidates scored the second mark, which was easily achievable if some elaboration had been added to the basic answer. For example, stating that the aim was to **implant a false memory** scored 2 marks, as did 'implanting a false memory for something that never happened'.
- (b) Quite a number of candidates scored no marks at all for this question part. Some of these candidates assumed that the question referred to the work of Loftus and so writing about eyewitness testimony and 'broken glass' was common. Crucially the question stated 'in this area' meaning the area of false memory. Some candidates could not provide an answer at all, showing that they were not familiar with the introduction to the original study. Some candidates did score full marks, and these correct answers mentioned that earlier research had looked at how post event information causes errors in recall of previously acquired information i.e. retroactive inhibition.

Question 2

- (a) This question asked candidates 'What is meant by obedience'? A few candidates provided a word-for-word definition from the Milgram study itself, but whilst this in some ways was impressive, these candidates often did not show they understood what this terminology meant. Writing 'in your own words' is preferred because it is more likely to show understanding and should save time if not learning a definition. Many candidates scored full marks when stating simply that obedience is carrying out the command of someone in higher authority.

- (b) Obedience in society is desirable for a number of reasons, and most candidates wrote about maintaining law and order in society, allowing people to live together harmoniously, or interacting successfully socially. Many candidates gave examples, such as obeying a teacher in a classroom, not breaking traffic laws, or not committing crimes.

Question 3

- (a) Two components were needed for full marks here, and one mark was allocated to each component. First, the sampling method used by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo to select participants was needed and the answer was either self-selecting or a volunteer sample because participants chose to respond, and the second mark was for *how* this was done, which was through a newspaper advertisement. Some candidates correctly identified both components but many failed to identify the sampling method, or incorrectly suggested it was random, opportunity or quota.
- (b) Two components were also required to answer this question and candidates should always ensure they answer both components. Firstly the question asked candidates to give **one** disadvantage of this sampling method, i.e. the sampling method described in part (a) and secondly this had to be related to the Haney, Banks and Zimbardo study. Many candidates failed to score marks, either because they could not identify the sampling method itself (and so could not give a disadvantage) or because they failed to relate the disadvantage to the study.

Question 4

- (a) Most candidates scored at least 1 mark when writing that discrimination is a 'negative' **behaviour** towards another person (or persons) that belongs to an out-group. Some candidates made the important distinction that prejudice is the attitude whilst discrimination is the action or behaviour.
- (b) There were two types of answer to this question: those providing a basic but correct answer and those providing a correct answer which used appropriate terminology from the study itself. Those in the former category stated for example 'the in-group gave more points to themselves than to the out-group.' Those in the latter category typically wrote 'although the boys in the in-group could opt for maximum in-group profit, they did not, instead choosing the maximum difference option'. The first answer scored 1 mark, whilst the extra detail and knowledge of the study in the second answer scored 2 marks.

Question 5

- (a) This part of the question asked simply What is meant by an 'experiment'. A good answer would mention that the IV (independent variable) is manipulated, extraneous variables are controlled and the DV (dependent variable) is measured and so cause and effect can be concluded. Whilst many candidates had a variation of this, many others appeared not to know what an experiment is, often assuming that doing *any* study is an experiment. Other candidates opted to identify types of experiment and because describing types did not answer the question, no marks were scored.
- (b) Candidates were asked to identify and outline the experimental design used in the study by Bandura et al. Some candidates did not know the term experimental design; often suggesting the method instead i.e. that it was a laboratory experiment. Other candidates correctly stated that it was an independent groups design because different participants were in each level of the IV. An answer that was also correct was that it was a matched groups design because participants in each level of the IV were matched for pre-existing levels of aggression.

Question 6

- (a) Although a number of candidates answered this question part vaguely, a significant majority of candidates used appropriate methodological jargon. For example, some answers stated simply that it was to avoid bias, but many others explained that this was an important control, some even explaining that counterbalancing was used to avoid any left right bias that the child might have.
- (b) A small number of candidates incorrectly drew a conclusion from study 1, because they did not read the question fully, but most candidates provided a correct conclusion from study 2. The perfect answer was that infants prefer attractive black faces over unattractive ones, the same finding as with white faces, showing that attractiveness is not affected by sex of infant, colour of face or maternal attractiveness.

Question 7

This question caused confusion for many candidates because they did not read the words of the question carefully. The question focused specifically on consent, whereas many candidates wrote about harm, right to withdraw and other issues instead.

- (a) For part (a) the ethical guideline of consent was followed by obtaining consent from parents (1 mark) as the children were too young to give consent themselves because they would not understand (1 further mark).
- (b) For part (b) the guideline of consent is important because it ensures that any participant is aware of what will happen in a study **and** they have agreed to it. In this study the parents had the study explained to them and they agreed to allow their child to participate. Many candidates wrote vaguely and incorrectly about ethics protecting human rights, and some even suggested that ethics exist to protect the researcher from participants who might take legal action against them!

Question 8

- (a) This question part wanted candidates to outline **one** method that was used to record the responses of the participants in the study by Schachter and Singer. Importantly the question asked for an outline (and not just identification) and so some description was required. For example, candidates answering “observation” scored just 1 mark, whereas those answering “observation through a one way mirror” scored 2 marks because of the additional information going beyond mere identification. Also acceptable were answers such as “self-report on a number of scales”. Some candidates choosing the latter answer often added examples of questions from the rating scales which conformed the awarding of the maximum mark for this question.
- (b) In order to score maximum marks for this question part candidates had to contextualise the advantage, meaning that the advantage had to be related to the study itself. Without this, a maximum of 1 mark was allocated. For example, stating that “covert observation allows natural behaviour of participants to be observed” scores 1 mark and the addition of “and so in this study it could be observed whether the participant behaved angrily or euphorically with the stooge” would score the additional 1 mark. It is essential, therefore, that candidates ensure they read questions carefully and answer everything that is required.

Question 9

Observations of participants were made in various ways and many candidates were able to outline two successfully. A number of candidates did not address the important word ‘observations’ in the question, writing incorrectly about recording content of dream into a tape recorder, for example. Some candidates thought that sleeping participants were observed through a one-way mirror. This is incorrect. Data was gathered by attaching two or more electrodes to the scalp and near the eyes, which were connected to an EEG recorder in the next room. The researchers would *observe* the EEG record to see which stage of sleep each participant was entering or leaving.

Question 10

- (a) This question was often not read carefully before students wrote their answers. Many candidates incorrectly described the whole procedure of the Maguire et al. study, often describing the tasks participants were asked to do. The question asked focused specifically on the PET *scanning procedure* and nothing else. The scanning procedure involved participants being injected 12 times, eight minutes apart, with H₂¹⁵O (heavy or radioactive water) which indicated cerebral blood flow in active areas of the brain.
- (b) A small number of candidates incorrectly gave an advantage of the Maguire et al. study itself, but most candidates scored the full 2 marks available. Many commented on the scientific nature of the technique in that it is reliable i.e. it performs in exactly the same way each time it is used, and also often mentioned was that it is not affected by human subjectivity.

Question 11

- (a) For this question, as with others, two components were required to score full marks. The first was to give a description of what is meant by 'quantitative data' and the second to give an example of quantitative data from the Dematte et al. study. Nearly all candidates correctly stated that quantitative data involves numbers and so scored one mark, and most candidates scored the second mark when referring to ratings of facial attractiveness, for example.
- (b) There are a number of advantages of quantitative data. For example, it is reliable, and it is relatively more objective and less subjective than qualitative data. Another advantage is that it can be used in statistics, and allows comparisons be made. Marks were awarded according to the quality of answer and the understanding shown. An answer with nothing more than the words "it is scientific" without elaboration, for example, scored no marks. On the other hand, those writing that "it allows numbers in the conditions of an IV to be compared and statistically analysed, such as the comparison of attractiveness scores for the smells rubber and geranium" would score the full two marks without any doubt.

Question 12

- (a) This question caused a few problems for a number of candidates because they did not write about the reasons Rosenhan identifies in his paper as the question required. Some candidates guessed and sometimes this paid off, but much more often it did not. As two reasons were required for 2 marks, answers did not need to be detailed. One correct answer is where Rosenhan states: '...normality and abnormality are not universal. What is viewed as normal in one culture may be seen as quite aberrant in another.' Another is where Rosenhan refers to the interpretation of 'normal' behaviour in an abnormal way because of the context (the hospitalisation) in which it takes place.
- (b) Most candidates scored full marks in response to this question. A few gave brief (1 mark) answers, such as 'note-taking', but most gave some elaboration saying what the behaviour was *and* how it was interpreted such as 'queuing early for lunch being interpreted as oral acquisitive behaviour'.

Question 13

- (a) This question asked: What is 'multiple personality disorder'? Most candidates provided a correct definition, stating that it describes a condition in which multiple distinct identities or personalities are present within the same individual.
- (b) This question asked candidates to think and to speculate when asking to compare a person with multiple personality disorder and having different sides to their own personality. Most candidates scored full marks for this question part when stating with MPD patients tend not to recall memories of the other personality; a person with different sides always remembers what the other sides do, think and say.

Question 14

- (a) Nearly all candidates scored full marks when writing that females will empathise more than males and have lower systemising scores than males. Marks were awarded either for the comparison between empathising and systemising in females; or for the contrast between what is more common in females compared to males. A few candidates wrote too little and 'females systemise' is clearly worth a mark less than those candidates providing the contrast.
- (b) Yet again there was misinterpretation of the question. Candidates often read 'Describe one problem with the study' rather than the actual question which was 'Describe one problem *with the conclusion* from the study'. As the conclusion had been given as the answer to part (a) this should have been a straightforward question. It was for many candidates who, when writing 'it is a generalisation and there are individuals who are atypical for example many females are systemisers rather than empathisers', scored full marks.

Question 15

- (a) Data was gathered on 'motivation before looking in a mirror' in two main ways. Firstly there was a Likert-type 5 point scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree) used to answer a number of statements such as 'I look in the mirror to see how I feel'. Two marks could be achieved for providing at least two aspects of this first way. The second way data was gathered was at the end of the scale there was an open-ended question asking for anything else that a participant would like to add.
- (b) Many candidates did not read the question and wrote too much detail. These candidates thought they had to give an advantage and relate it to the study and then give a disadvantage and relate it to the study. The question was only out of 2 marks and no example or relating to the study was required. These candidates did score the full 2 marks out of 2 but wasted time by writing detail that was not required. One advantage is that self-report data allows participants to express how they feel and one disadvantage is that participants may not be honest when answering questions.

Question 16

This question part wanted candidates to evaluate one of the named studies in terms of its reliability. There were four types of answer: (i) some candidates did not consider reliability at all, instead describing the study in its entirety. If reliability was not mentioned, then no mark could be awarded. This was most evident in candidates who chose to describe the study by Freud. (ii) Some candidates defined reliability but could not give any examples from the named study. (iii) Some candidate addressed reliability in relation to the named study but decided that either the study was reliable or that it was not, without considering strengths (aspects which are reliable) and weaknesses (aspects which are not). (iv) Some candidates answered the question set and considered a balance of points in relation to reliability and the chosen study.

Answers across these four types scored mark ranging from zero for answer type (i), through to the full, ten out of ten for those of type (iv). Candidates should be mindful to answer the question set and not some pre-prepared descriptive answer.

Question 17

As always, candidates are advised to read the question carefully before starting to write an answer. This question asked for a discussion of strengths and weaknesses of observations using examples from one of the listed studies. Like **Question 16** types of answer could be identified: (i) candidates who did not answer the question about strengths and weaknesses, instead *describing* the study in its entirety. Occasionally a mention was made of observations but nothing that was evaluative. No marks were awarded to this type of answer. (ii) A mixture of answers here with some candidates writing about the strengths only, or the weaknesses only of observations, but not using any examples from the chosen study. Some candidates gave lots of examples from the chosen study but could not identify a general point. Typically an answer would be "one strength of an observation is, for example in the study by...". Answers in this category often scored no more than half the available marks. (iii) Candidate who gave both strengths and weaknesses and used examples from the chosen study, i.e. who answered the question correctly, and these candidates scored at the top end of the mark range, often with ten out of ten marks. Some candidates appeared to choose their favourite study whether it would help in an evaluative answer on observations or not. Candidates are reminded that **Section B** questions are not about describing a study, but using the study to support evaluative points. The evaluation and issue are of prime importance and the study is there to provide illustrative examples only.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/13

Core Studies 1

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as aims, sampling, procedures, results, conclusions and various aspects of evaluation such as criticism and applications. In **Section A** of this particular paper a small number of questions presented particular challenges to candidates from some Centres, notably **Questions 9(b), 12(a), 13 and 15(b)**. Where appropriate, candidates should know psychological concepts that are relevant to each study, such as 'experimental design' and 'pilot study'. Although some candidates were aware of the concept of experimental design and how it applied to a specific study, this is an area in which the majority could improve.

There have now been several sittings of the new specification and the majority of candidates seemed to have learned the correct studies. A few, however, are still writing about studies that are not on the specification (such as Loftus and Palmer rather than Loftus and Pickrell and different Maguire and Baron-Cohen studies than the one required). Encouragingly, the vast majority of candidates attempted both questions in **Section B** as required. However, especially in **Question 17**, many candidates focused on description of the study itself, which was not required, rather than focusing on the approach specified by the question.

Question 1

- (a) **Mann et al:** Some candidates identified the exact reason that Mann et al observed, and earned full marks. Others were less clear but nevertheless made many appropriate comments about pertinent issues that made such investigations hard. These could earn appropriate credit.
- (b) This part of the question was also well answered, with many candidates giving clear solutions to the problem.

Question 2

- (a) **Loftus and Pickrell:** Many candidates performed well on this question, with clear descriptions of appropriate details from the study. Poorer candidates simply suggested that they were told it was 'a study about past events'.
- (b) This was generally very well answered by candidates, there was a minority who gave circular answers, about giving participants information so they could consent. Such responses were not based on knowledge of the issues of research in psychology, so scored 0 marks.

Question 3

Baron-Cohen: Almost all candidates scored some marks here, with a range of total scores across the cohort. On rare occasions when candidates gave more than four responses, only the first four were marked. Apart from this, this question was moderately well answered.

Question 4

- (a) **Held and Hein:** This question was well answered – this is probably the best set of answers we have had on this new study so far. A very small minority of candidates describe the candidate constriction test, which is a physiological measure not a behavioural one, so they scored 0.
- (b) This question was also well answered, and many candidates were able to give general rather than specific answers, i.e. could decontextualise what they were saying. Others made good use of examples from the study.

Question 5

- (a) **Milgram:** This question was well answered, although some responses were too simplistic, only earning 1 mark, such as 'they thought the experimenter was responsible'. Candidates could have improved their responses by giving psychological answers and by referring in detail to only one explanation, as asked by the question, rather than covering two or more but not in depth.
- (b) Some answers here were also too simplistic, again earning only 1 mark, such as 'they were concerned that the learner was being harmed', although again the majority did well.

Question 6

- (a) **Haney, Banks and Zimbardo:** Some candidates gave more than one source of self-report data here. Although this is tempting if they know more than is required, they can only gain marks for one of the suggestions, so it is always better to give one in detail than two briefly when the question is asking for 'one of...', as giving two brief answers cannot, in this instance, earn two marks.
- (b) This part of the question was answered better than part (a), with candidates typically able to give detail about the advantage they had suggested.

Question 7

- (a) **Tajfel:** This question was generally well answered, with the majority of candidates being able to distinguish between prejudice (beliefs).
- (b) It was still possible for candidates to score here, even if they do not score in part (a). Very few candidates failed to score here. Some candidates effectively argued that Tajfel investigated prejudice indirectly, through the medium of discrimination because this is observable behaviour which is easier to study than attitudinal prejudice. Such answers could earn full marks.

Question 8

- (a) **Freud:** This question was answered very well, with the majority of candidates identifying and describing leading questions and their problems.
- (b) Most candidates scored full marks on this question, with accurate and appropriate descriptions of Freud's interpretation of Hans's fear.

Question 9

- (a) **Nelson:** Most candidates did well on this question, with correct answers given either in terms of age ranges or School stages.
- (b) This question was poorly answered. Few candidates appeared to know what an independent design involves, so those who gained marks did so serendipitously for referring to the need for more people (compared to a repeated measures design), which is a weak advantage.

Question 10

- (a) **Schachter and Singer:** This question was only moderately well answered, as many candidates seemed unaware of this key concept underpinning the study. Many incorrect answers offered the four conditions from the study.
- (b) Performance on this part of the question was much better than in part (a), because candidates were able to describe how either factor had been manipulated, so their lack of understanding in part (a) was not necessarily a disadvantage.

Question 11

- (a) **Dement and Kleitman:** Candidates typically gave good answers here, commonly identifying the controls in place prior to arriving at the lab, although others were given too. Candidates who did not score here generally offered examples of independent variables in place of stating controls. It is important that candidates can distinguish between the two. In addition, when talking about controls, it is important that the candidates made clear the idea that they were about consistency, e.g. 'all participants were...' or 'they were woken by the same doorbell'.
- (b) This question was generally well answered, even by candidates who had not managed to score full marks in part (a). However, a small number of candidates wrote about the role of a control condition (in comparison to an experimental condition) and scored 0 marks, rather than the controls implemented across conditions.

Question 12

- (a) This question was quite poorly answered. Many candidates simply offered one of the levels of one of the IVs (such as 'the routes task'). This was not sufficient for 1 mark as it neither identified the IV, for example in this case 'the topographical task', nor offered the alternative levels of the IV (e.g. 'routes and landmarks').
- (b) This part of the question was also quite poorly answered. It is important to note that although the participants did respond with descriptions of routes, recall of plot lines in movies etc, these behavioural data were merely a means to an end: they were part of the experimental task used to produce the different levels of the IV. They were not, in themselves, measures of the dependent variables.

Question 13

Rosenhan: Many candidates believed that the pseudo-patients were the participants in study 1 and that there were no participants in study 2. This is not the case, so scores in this question were low. It is important that candidates recognise that the pseudo-patients were stooges and that the real participants, the ones being tested, were the hospital staff.

Question 14

- (a) **Thigpen and Cleckley:** Although ζ , some candidates continue to suggest that a feature of a case study is that it is longitudinal/takes a long time. Whilst this may happen to be the case, it is not a defining feature of case studies so it could not earn a mark here. If candidates did write this, it was ignored.
- (b) The question was also well answered, although to earn full marks, more candidates needed to contextualise their answer to Thigpen and Cleckley's study.

Question 15

- (a) **Veale and Riley:** This question was very well answered. The majority of candidates scored full marks for stating the two groups, BDD and controls.
- (b) This part of the question produced much lower scores, with many candidates unable to offer any appropriate reason for conducting a pilot study. The answers given suggested that candidates were unaware of when or how a pilot study was done rather than having a confused understanding of its purpose.

Question 16

There were few very good answers to this question. Although many candidates were able to discuss one aspect of the nature-nurture debate, few were able to offer a balance between the two aspects of the debate. Some candidates, however, demonstrated an excellent understanding, for example:

Bandura et al: making 'paired' observations, such as the need to frustrate the children – which suggests nature, whilst comments such as it's not 'lady like' – which support nurture, or arguing the same point both ways e.g. girls may display more verbal aggression because they are born with brains wired up so they make better linguists (nature) or because they have imitated verbally competent female models (nurture).

Langlois et al: Similarly here candidates could argue the same point both ways e.g. because babies were tested at 6 months they could not have learned, so it must be nature, but even at 6 months babies are capable of learning some things, so it could be nurture, e.g. by copying (otherwise why would Langlois have worried about the babies seeing their mother's gaze).

Question 17

There were also few very good answers to this question. In this case, candidates seemed less certain about the requirement of the question, their understanding of the concept of 'generalisations' was typically quite poor. In this case, candidates tended to describe the study rather than considering whether its findings were generalisable, so scored few if any marks. A small number of candidates were able to make appropriate and relevant points about each of the studies, such as:

Milgram: precisely because his findings with Americans suggested Germans were not different, the results might generalise more widely – but he only tested a small number (40), so perhaps they would not.

Piliavin: it was a field experiment so the absence of demand characteristics as the participants were unaware of their participation should make the findings generalisable, but maybe they were not if the sorts of people who travel at the times of day they tested were not typical, e.g. because they did not use busy times so people who go to work – most people – would not have been in the sample.

Demattè: The test was really controlled, e.g. the smell intensities, so they ought to have been sure that the only factors affecting perceived attractiveness were smells so it ought to generalise, but in reality *lots* of other factors affect our decisions about attractiveness, not just a static face and its smell, like whether someone is funny or how they move, so perhaps the results are ungeneralisable due to individual differences in factors affecting what you find attractive.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/21
Core Studies 2

KEY MESSAGES

Section A –

Question 1 –

It is important that candidates are made aware of the issues in psychology as some were unable to define the laboratory experiment in **part a** and/or link the method to the Bandura study. Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in **part b**. Ethical alternatives should be described. Extended evaluative points that make direct reference to the alternative idea are necessary in **part c** to achieve full marks.

Question 2 –

It is important that candidates practice writing these types of questions. Many did not structure their responses appropriately and could not achieve full marks. For example, if the question asks for strengths and weaknesses then four points must be made (two strengths and two weaknesses). Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

Section B –

Candidates must write more extended responses in both **part b** and **part c** of the essay as many gave accurate responses that lacked depth. Centres need to ensure that the correct Maguire and Baron-Cohen et al. studies are taught to candidates. Evidence must be given in **part c** to achieve higher marks.

General comments

The marks achieved by candidates sitting this examination covered the whole spectrum of the mark scheme which was pleasing to see. Many did provide good answers which showed that they were very well prepared and did consistently refer to the evidence in order to achieve high marks.

Time management for this paper was good for most candidates.

Candidates need to be made aware that they need to answer one of the two questions for the **Section B** essay. When a candidate did answer both questions they were awarded the mark for the better of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually performed very poorly.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to the questions in **Section A** where there is no choice of question. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in the **part c** of their **Section B** essays to achieve higher marks. **Question 3** and **Question 4** were fairly equally chosen by candidates although **Question 3** was somewhat more popular.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1a

The vast majority of candidates were able to access some marks for this question. A few could give a definition of laboratory experiments and many mentioned a controlled environment and manipulation of

variables. Some described Bandura in some detail and could achieve a mark by mentioning the groups the participants were placed in by the researchers. No credit was given to strengths and weaknesses of the laboratory experimental method.

Question 1b

Most candidates correctly described a field experiment and understood this type of study takes place in the natural environment.

There were many variations on the original Bandura studies in a variety of settings which usually followed the original procedure. There were an alarming amount of studies that were unethical which could only gain partial credit. Candidates should describe ethical studies. Some mentioned having adults swearing at children and others discussed having abusive parents show children violence and then observe to see if this is later imitated.

Many described an alternative study taking place in a school and gave some details of how the study would take place and what data would be collected from participants. This was often brief or confused and meant these candidates achieved in the lower end of the mark range.

Some gave descriptions of the sample although required the number of participants and the sampling method to achieve higher marks.

Top marks were achieved by those who suggested straightforward ideas and were able to give clear details to ensure replicability.

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question and received no credit for this as this is the correct response to **Question 1 part c**.

Question 1c

The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points. Most were able to give both ethical and practical issues in their response.

Many focused on the ethical issues involved with working with children and also deceiving the children about the true nature of the study and getting informed consent. Many also looked at the ecological validity of the study and some evaluated the type of data collected.

Quite a few candidates only briefly identified issues and mentioned 3 or 4 points, but did not develop any of them. Some candidates forgot to refer their comments back to the context of their own studies. A few gave excellent and well developed points that achieved very high marks as they referred directly to their alternative idea.

Question 2a

This was a weak question in terms of the quality of answers given by candidates. Many would state what qualitative data is not rather than telling the Examiner what it is. A sizeable portion of candidates could note either the data being in depth or in the written form.

Question 2b

Some candidates gave excellent responses and clearly described a piece of qualitative data collected in the Rosenhan study. Popular responses included focusing on oral acquisitive syndrome and pacing in the corridors of the mental hospital. Some candidates misread this question and answered it as if it was asking 'how was the qualitative data recorded?' Many candidates simply wrote about how the journals/diaries were used without describing one piece of qualitative data.

Question 2c

There were some strong answers here and these were the ones which followed what the question was asking (e.g. they had a focus on generalisations). It was also pleasing to see most candidates referring directly to the Rosenhan study to back up their argument. Ecological validity and representativeness were the two main arguments used in stronger answers but many candidates were not attempting the 'plural

nature' of these types of questions to gain the seven plus marks available. Candidates need to describe two strengths and two weaknesses to achieve the higher marks.

Question 2d

In the main, this question was not answered well. Most candidates simply described, using examples from Rosenhan, what each type of data are without any explicit comparison taking place. There were some incredibly detailed descriptions of both types of data in relation to Rosenhan but written as two separate paragraphs.

A few did write answers that were clearly directed at the question and did make comparisons between the two types of data. These candidates did often then omit to mention the study so achieved fewer marks.

Section B

Question 3a

Many candidates gave good responses to this question and were able to clearly describe what is meant by the physiological approach. Some gave very brief responses and therefore just achieved one mark.

Question 3b

Many candidates struggled with this question as they had been taught the incorrect Maguire study. Centres must ensure the correct studies are taught as both Maguire has done a wide variety of research on topographical knowledge and the brain. Answers for both the Dement and Kleitman study and the Dematte study were often brief so achieved two out of the possible three marks per study.

Question 3c

Many candidates could identify at least two potential problems linked to the physiological approach and then either outline what the problem is or use a study to outline the point.

To achieve well on this section of the question candidates should identify and discuss three points with clear reference to the core studies.

A few candidates were able to do this and achieved very well. Most were able to identify problems but many did not refer to a core study so achieved fewer marks.

Question 4a

Some candidates clearly knew what a psychometric test was and also gave a clear example in their response. However, there were many candidates who attempted to answer this question but failed to score marks as they had no idea what a psychometric test was.

Question 4b

Some candidates did achieve well in their answers to this question. They were able to clearly describe the use of the psychometric tests in each of the studies. The majority of candidates achieved better with some of the named studies than others. For the Baron-Cohen study many did identify the IQ testing and how it was used. Many incorrectly named the eyes test as a psychometric test For Thigpen and Cleckley, the majority named the IQ test and many gave the correct results for Eve White and Eve Black. A few mentioned the memory test. Quite a few candidates believed some of the other tests in the study (e.g. Rorschach and the EEG) were psychometric. Finally, for the Billington study many could identify the empathising and systemising tests but could not give an indication of how the test was used.

Question 4c

For this question, candidates need to identify and discuss three advantages with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many chose to discuss the advantages of being able to produce numerical data as well as the results being useful for diagnosis. Candidates would omit to mention a study so achieved fewer marks in this section. In addition, many discussed the disadvantages of using psychometric tests which could not gain any credit.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22

Core Studies 2

KEY MESSAGES

Section A –

Question 1 –

It is important that candidates learn as many details of the study as possible as many were unable to describe all of the tasks completed by the participants in the Billington study which would have helped them to achieve full marks in the **part a**. Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in **part b**. Details of the what and how should be given as well as the time frame of the study as it was a longitudinal method. Extended evaluative points that make direct reference to the alternative idea are necessary in **part c** to achieve full marks.

Question 2 –

It is important that candidates practice writing these types of questions. Many did not structure their responses appropriately and could not achieve full marks. For example, if the question asks for strengths and weaknesses then four points must be made (two strengths and two weaknesses). Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

Section B –

Candidates must write more extended responses in both **part b** and **part c** of the essay as many gave accurate responses that lacked depth. Centres need to ensure that the correct Maguire study is taught to candidates. Evidence must be given in **part c** to achieve higher marks.

General comments

The marks achieved by candidates sitting this examination covered the whole spectrum of the mark scheme which was pleasing to see. Many did provide good answers which showed that they were very well prepared and did consistently refer to the evidence in order to achieve high marks.

Time management for this paper was good for most candidates and most attempted all questions that were required.

Compared to previous session very few candidates attempted both essays in **Section B** which was pleasing to see. A handful of Centres just need to ensure that candidates are aware that they need to answer one of the two questions for the **Section B** essay. When a candidate did answer both questions they were awarded the mark for the best of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually performed very poorly.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to the questions in **Section A** where there is no choice of question. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in the **part c** of their **Section B** essays to achieve higher marks. **Question 3** and **Question 4** were fairly equally chosen by candidates although **Question 4** was somewhat more popular.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1a

The vast majority of candidates were able to access some marks for this question. Almost all were able to describe what was meant by a snapshot method and many gave an example. Most could describe some of the tasks done in the Billington study. Some did describe all four tasks and achieved full marks. Candidates could have described how and/or why the tasks were brief for marks, but very few attempted to do this.

Question 1b

The vast majority of candidates did describe a longitudinal study and understood this type of study takes place over a long period of time.

The best answers were simple alternatives, using the Billington study's original aims and procedure but conducting it over a period of time. For example, using children in a school and conducting the SQ-R and EQ, EFT and eyes task and following up subject choice at university.

Many candidates achieved in the 6-7 mark band but failed to give details of the types of questions asked (if relevant) or the sampling method to achieve higher marks. A few gave very complicated procedures which made it difficult to achieve higher marks as these were usually not described in enough depth to make them replicable.

Top marks were achieved by those who suggested straightforward ideas and were able to give clear details to ensure replicability.

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question and received no credit for this as this is the correct response to **Question 1 part c**.

Question 1c

The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points. Most were able to give both ethical and practical issues in their response.

Many focused on the ethical issues involved with working with children and also deceiving the children about the true nature of the study and getting informed consent. Many also looked at the problems with longitudinal research and some evaluated the type of data collected.

Quite a few candidates only briefly identified issues and mentioned 3 or 4 points, but did not develop any of them. Some candidates forgot to refer their comments back to the context of their own studies. A few gave excellent and well developed points that achieved very high marks as they referred directly to their alternative idea.

Question 2a

This question was very well answered by the majority of candidates. Most were able to give a detailed definition of generalisability. A few achieved just one mark as their answer was either very brief or confused. For example, many struggled to refer to the parent population and sometimes described the 'other people' or 'whole world' and achieved lower marks.

Question 2b

There was a wide variety of responses to this question. Some candidates did understand what was meant by a control and were able to identify, describe and state why it is a control in the study. Many failed to identify why it was a control and achieved two marks. Many did seem unclear what was meant by control and just described aspects of the study which did often achieve one mark as it did mention one of the controls used. Some did believe there was a control group in this study which is incorrect.

Question 2c

There were some strong answers here and these were the ones who followed what the question was asking (e.g. they had a focus on generalisations). It was also pleasing to see most candidates referring directly to the Schachter and Singer study to back up their argument. Ecological validity and representativeness were the two main arguments used in stronger answers but many candidates would stop there and score six out of a possible ten. There are still many candidates not attempting the 'plural nature' of these types of questions to gain the 7+ marks available. Candidates need to describe two strengths and two weaknesses to achieve the higher marks.

Question 2d

There were a variety of responses given by candidates. Some had a clear understanding of reductionism and were able to apply it to the findings and conclusions of the Schachter and Singer study. Many did understand the issue but their responses were very brief. There were many candidates, however, that did not know what was meant by reductionism and gave very confused and muddled responses which achieved in the bottom band or no marks. Many did not attempt this question.

Section B

Question 3a

Many candidates gave good responses to this question and were able to clearly describe what is meant by both nature and nurture in psychology. There were some one mark answers as candidates did not identify which definition went with which term and there were a handful of very muddled responses.

Question 3b

Almost all candidates achieved some marks for this question. Bandura received the most marks as candidates could clearly describe results and link these to the nurture side of the debate. Candidates were able to give results from the Held and Hein study but these were often confused and did not refer to the nurturing and/or absence of nurturing of the kittens. For the Maguire study, many referred to the size of the hippocampus rather than the activity in the hippocampus. Most struggled to link this study to nurturing.

Question 3c

Many candidates could identify at least two potential problems linked to investigating and then either outline what the problem is or use a study to outline the point. Many discussed the problems with identifying the difference between nature and nurture

To achieve well on this section of the question candidates should identify and discuss three points with clear reference to the core studies.

A few candidates were able to do this and achieved very well. Most were able to identify problems but many did not refer to a core study so achieved fewer marks.

Question 4a

Some candidates knew what was meant by the individual differences approach and were able to give a clear and somewhat detailed definition of this in their response and achieved full marks. Many did have some understanding of this approach but either gave brief or very muddled responses which achieved just one mark.

Question 4b

Many candidates did achieve very well in their answers to this question. They were able to clearly describe how the data was collected in each of these studies. Many gave very detailed descriptions of the studies and this may have left less time for them to do the **part c** of this essay.

Question 4c

For this question, candidates need to identify and discuss three advantages with clear reference to a core study for each point. Some candidates did this very well and described advantages of the approach such as usefulness and detailed studies leading to more validity. There was a tendency for candidates to go through each study and give its strengths rather than adopt the point of view of the individual differences approach.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/23

Core Studies 2

KEY MESSAGES

Section A –

Question 1 –

It is important that candidates are made aware of the issues in psychology as some were unable to clearly define the field experiment method in **part a**. Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in **part b**. Ethical alternatives should be described. Extended evaluative points that make direct reference to the alternative idea are necessary in **part c** to achieve full marks.

Question 2 –

It is important that candidates practice writing these types of questions. Many did not structure their responses appropriately and could not achieve full marks. For example, if the question asks for strengths and weaknesses then four points must be made (two strengths and two weaknesses). In addition, candidates must give a clear comparison point when requested to do so rather than just descriptions. Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

Section B –

Candidates must write more extended responses in both **part b** and **part c** of the essay as many gave accurate responses that lacked depth. Evidence must be given in **part c** to achieve higher marks.

General comments

The marks achieved by candidates sitting this examination covered the whole spectrum of the mark scheme which was pleasing to see. Many did provide good answers which showed that they were very well prepared and did consistently refer to the evidence in order to achieve high marks. For this time zone, candidates were in the main taught the correct Maguire study which was very pleasing to see.

Time management for this paper was good for most candidates and almost all were able to finish the paper.

Only one or two candidates answered both questions in the **Section B** essay. When a candidate did this they were awarded the mark for the best of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually performed very poorly.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to the questions in **Section A** where there is no choice of question. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in the **part c** of their **Section B** essays to achieve higher marks. **Question 4** was the more popular choice of question although those that did **Question 3** often achieved very good marks on it

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1a

The vast majority of candidates were able to access some marks for this question. Most described that field experiments are done in the natural environment and have little control over extraneous variables. A few did

mention the IV and DV in this method. No credit was given to strengths and weaknesses of the field experimental method.

Question 1b

Most candidates correctly described a field experiment and understood this type of study takes place in the natural environment.

There were many interesting and creative alternative ideas given by candidates for the Dematte study. Many described research at some type of speed dating event or at a modelling show. Candidates achieved high marks by giving clear and often very detailed descriptions of the study making it replicable. Some described the sampling method but this was often forgotten. Most achieved at least six marks for their response.

Weaker candidates gave either very brief descriptions or very complicated studies that were not described clearly so achieved in the lower mark bands for their responses.

Top marks were achieved by those who suggested straightforward ideas and were able to give clear details to ensure replicability.

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question and received no credit for this as this is the correct response to **Question 1 part c**.

Question 1c

The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points. Most were able to give practical issues in their response. No candidate described any ethical issues which met the requirements of the question.

Many discussed the problems with controlling the smells used as well as possible problems with demand characteristics, sampling issues and problems with data collection. Many did give well developed points that achieved very high marks as they referred directly to their alternative idea. A few only briefly identified issues and did not refer back to the context of their own study.

Question 2a

The majority of candidates achieved at least one mark for their response to this question. They were able to link physiological processes as something to do with biology and/or the body. Many gave either quite a detailed definition and/or examples from the Maguire study and achieved full marks.

Question 2b

Most candidates achieved one or two marks for their responses. They were able to give details from the Maguire study that linked it to the physiological approach but failed to explain why this was an example of this approach in order to achieve full marks.

Question 2c

There were some strong answers here and these were the ones who followed what the question was asking (e.g. they had a focus on snapshot method). It was also pleasing to see most candidates referring directly to the Maguire study to back up their argument. The study being quick but lacking detail were the two main arguments used in stronger answers but many candidates would stop there and score six out of a possible ten marks. There are still many candidates not attempting the 'plural nature' of these types of questions to gain the seven plus marks available. Candidates need to describe two strengths and two weaknesses to achieve the higher marks.

Question 2d

In the main, this question was not answered well. Most candidates simply described physiological testing and some described other types of testing such as questionnaires and observations. A few did compare the two types of testing approaches but did not include any examples from either Maguire or any other study that uses the other ways of gathering data. Most candidates achieved in the lower mark band for this question and a few did not attempt it.

Section B

Question 3a

This question was attempted by a few candidates who were able to give a reasonable attempt at defining reductionism. Some did achieve full marks by giving a detailed definition.

Question 3b

All candidates achieved some marks for this question but often did not achieve full marks for each study due to the lack of detail. Bandura had the clearest description given of the data collection although candidates often omitted the type of aggression that was observed. For the Billington study, most candidates could describe some of the tasks done by the participants and most mentioned empathising and systemising but forgot about the eyes task and the embedded figures task. The weakest response was for Tajfel with many candidates just describing the study and/or giving a weak description of the matrices filled in by the participants in the study.

Question 3c

Many candidates could identify at least one advantage of reductionist explanations for psychologists. Most discussed how it provided a simple and easy to understand explanation. This was sometimes linked to a study and achieved two or three marks depending on the depth of the response. Many discussed the disadvantages of being reductionist which did not achieve any credit.

Question 4a

This question was well answered by the majority of candidates. Many gave a brief definition and then an example of some ethical issues and these types of responses did achieve full marks. Some did struggle to give a clear definition and found it a difficult term to describe.

Question 4b

Most candidates achieved well in their response and did as the question requested by focusing on one ethical issue throughout their response. A few changed issues and the best one was credited with one mark awarded for the other studies if appropriate. Most looked at informed consent and deception and did give very good responses for both the Milgram and Loftus and Pickrell study. Candidates often found it difficult to apply this issue to the Nelson study. It would have been acceptable to describe how Nelson met the issue of informed consent and/or deception in the study and a few candidates did this albeit briefly.

Question 4c

For this question, candidates need to identify and discuss three problems with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many were able to describe three problems and chose to look at issues such as ecological validity, demand characteristics and the lack of ability to study negative behaviour. Unfortunately, many did not link their responses to a study and achieved fewer marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/31
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 8 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should appreciate that this is a three hour examination and so it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (parts **(a)** and **(b)** should take approximately 45-50 minutes and be at least 4 sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between describe and suggest for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for papers 1 and 2 not only to studies learned for paper 3, but also to form the basis of their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

Section A (all options):

A number of modifications to examination technique could improve marks:

1. Writing an amount appropriate to the marks allocated. If a description of two studies is needed for 4 marks, the allocation of marks is 2 + 2, whereas if a description of one study is required for 4 marks, then the same amount in total should be written as for the 2 + 2 and not half the amount.
2. Writing an amount equivalent to 4 marks and not 8 or 12 marks. Although there were many answers that were far too short, there were also many answers that were just as long as **Section B** essays.

Section B (all options)

An important message, is that many answers would receive significantly higher marks if the difference between describe and evaluate is known by candidates. **Section B** question part **(a)** will always be 'describe' and question part **(b)** will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description, it is a different skill that can be defined as 'the ability to analyse and evaluate knowledge and processes and apply knowledge and processes to unfamiliar situations including those related to issues'. In other words, it is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about evidence that has been described in part **(a)**. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and not to just reproduce learning.

Evaluation by candidates can often be divided into three types:

- 1 those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- 2 those who focus exclusively on the named issue (and have marks restricted), and those who exclude it altogether (and also have marks restricted); and
- 3 those who do not evaluate at all (and score no marks) merely describing more information.

It is desirable to see all candidates achieve the first type of answer.

For this paper many more candidates showed signs of being 'type 1' by using the evaluation issues introduced when studying papers 1 and 2. However, sometimes issues were chosen that did not relate to the topic area in question. For example, a candidate might write "disruptive behaviour is reliable" and "disruptive behaviour is valid" both of which have very little meaning.

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. Many candidates appear not to know the difference between these two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. A suggestion is to go beyond description and to think about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. A suggestion is not something that can be learned beforehand. It is something that a candidate has to think about for themselves during the examination. Generally candidates will be required to suggest how they would investigate something, and this would need the application of methodological knowledge such as an experiment, observation, or self-report (questionnaire or interview). Application of methodological knowledge is what scores most marks in this Section.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a) This question part, like all other question part (a)'s, required the question set to be addressed specifically. In this instance any answer needed refer to the word 'strategies' which had to be related to 'special educational need'. 'Special educational need' meant that this question part could include either those with difficulties and disabilities or those who are gifted. Most candidates were able to address both these components and score full marks, but there were those who knew no strategies at all, often guessing at what might be possible.
- (b) This question part was specifically aimed at those with learning difficulties and disabilities, and so any answer mentioning gifted children scored no marks. Some candidates took a more general approach and contrasted integration with segregation (strategies often included in the answer to part (a)), whilst others focused on specific difficulties such as dyslexia. Those candidates adopting the latter approach often knew some basics about dyslexia and suggested using larger print, colour or group work.

Question 2

- (a) This essay question asked about disruptive behaviour in schools. A wide range of answers were written with marks covering the entire mark range. Better answers looked at the different types of disruptive behaviour, such as attention-seeking, being out-of-seat, bullying, and generally disrupting both the teacher and other candidates, before moving on to consider various reasons for such behaviours. Finally candidates considered both corrective and preventive strategies for controlling inappropriate behaviour. Many answers were clearly based on psychological knowledge, evident by the names (and dates) quoted, whereas others were more anecdotal, but did mention the main sub-topics. Some answers were lacking in detail and so did not score marks in the top bands (see key messages).
- (b) The named evaluation issue here was 'reductionism' and candidates should have included this as one of their range of evaluation issues. To exclude this issue, like any other part (b) answer, restricted marks to a maximum of 6. It was expected that reductionism be considered in relation to corrective strategies, for example, which are behaviourist and are reductionist in making the assumption that every child behaves and responds to reinforcement and punishment in the same way. Other issues should also have been considered such as different perspectives, different methodologies, or determinism, for example.

Question 3

- (a) This question asked candidates to use the experimental method to investigate the effectiveness of teaching styles. Many candidates appeared not to know what the basics of an experiment involved, instead suggesting many varied and creative (but incorrect) possibilities. A simple experiment should have an independent variable of two different teaching styles and using an independent groups design, the success in examination results at the end of a year could be measured, which would be the dependent variable. Some candidates did write superb answers that were full of appropriate methodological knowledge.
- (b) This question part asked for a description of two different teaching styles, and some candidates wrote excellent answers, often using Fontana's high-initiative and low-initiative and Bennett's formal and informal distinction. Other equally good answers contrasted a humanistic style (e.g. learning circles) with a cognitive style (e.g. discovery learning). Such answers often failed to achieve top marks because answers were very brief, often shorter than a 2 mark **Section A** 'short answer question'. Some candidates misread the question and wrote about learning styles (e.g. Curry and Grasha) and these answers scored no marks at all.

Question 4

- (a) In order to answer this question, candidates needed to know about Vygotsky's theory and be able to apply it to the teaching of science to young children. A small number of candidates clearly knew nothing about the work of Vygotsky, or assumed guessed wrongly, and scored no marks. There is a choice of **Section C** questions, and so if one question can not be answered then the other should be attempted. Some answers not only used Vygotsky's ideas very well, they also showed good understanding of what is possible with young children.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe the psychology on which their part (a) answer was based, and many candidates described the work of Vygotsky clearly, in detail and showed good understanding of it. A few candidates (incorrectly) used the work of Piaget in part (a) and then described Piaget's theories in part (b). Although doing this answered part (b), it scored no marks because part (b) must be considered in relation to part (a) and the beginning or introduction to the question where Vygotsky was specifically mentioned.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

Most candidates scored no marks at all for either part (a) or part (b) for this question part, despite it being on the syllabus. For information it appears in the 'Management of Stress' sub-section which states: 'Psychological techniques: biofeedback (Budzynski et al. 1973)'. It is advised that all parts of the syllabus are taught because here many candidates lost a potentially valuable 6 marks. Candidates often assumed that 'biofeedback' referred to a medical practitioner feeding back information to a patient about the state of their health. A few candidates did correctly describe biofeedback for part (a) and also for part (b) correctly described the biofeedback study on tension headache control by Budzynski et al., scoring full marks in doing so.

Question 6

- (a) The requirement here was to describe the doctor-patient relationship. Quite a number of answers did not score in the top band of the mark range because they were restricted both in the coverage of the topic area and in detail. Some candidates for example wrote about verbal and non-verbal communication and nothing else. Others wrote about doctor-centred and patient-centred relationships and nothing else. For a top band mark an answer should cover at least two of the syllabus bullet-points. Some answers were also lacking in detail and some answers were quite general where a candidate knew a few terms, but nothing about the research or psychological study underlying the terms. At the top end of the mark range there were some superb answers. These candidates covered a range, had detail (although sometimes too much detail) quoted relevant research and it was often a pleasure to award the full 8 marks available.
- (b) The requirement here was to evaluate the doctor-patient relationship. The named issue was the usefulness of self-reports. One of the major problems with answers to this question is that many candidates wrote about issues that were not really appropriate to the question. Candidates must

write about a range of issues (including the named issue), but these issues must be relevant. For example, in this instance a candidate might write “the doctor-patient relationship is valid”. Yes it is, but how could it not be valid? Similarly a candidate might write “the doctor-patient relationship applies to real life”. Yes it does! These might be extreme examples, but illustrate the way evaluation issues can only be debated, and credited, if they are applicable to the specific topic area in question.

Question 7

- (a) Question part (a) asked candidates for three things (2 marks for each) a medical practitioner could do to improve adherence. Some candidates merely identified, suggesting no more than “simplify instructions” whereas others referred to the work of Ley, for example, briefly describing research and, in showing this appropriate psychological knowledge, scored both marks. Also creditworthy were suggestions such as repeating important information, stating the most important things first, providing information about the treatment programme, changing practitioner style, or applying a behavioural technique.
- (b) When asked anything about adherence, as was the case in the June examinations, candidates appear to want to write a pre-prepared answer, whatever the specific question is. In doing this, candidates often scored no marks by failing to answer the question set. In response to this question, candidates often gave a long list of ways in which adherence could be measured (pre-prepared), but crucially most answers failed to address the requirement to assess the long-term effectiveness of a change a practitioner might make. The most effective way to achieve this would be to conduct a longitudinal study where the same people are studied over a period of time.

Question 8

- (a) This question part invited candidates to suggest how they would conduct a community health programme to encourage healthy eating. A number of candidates *described* the Tapper et al. study and scored no marks. Others suggested conducting a study themselves, which begins to answer the question, but then suggested the study be done in a School and so had marks restricted because a School is different from a community (the question specified community). The best answers conducted a community study and used appropriate techniques such as fear arousal and providing information to get the message across. Some candidates referred to the Yale model of communication, but sometimes described it rather than applied it to this specific question.
- (b) This question part wanted description of a successful community study and the syllabus identifies the one by Farquhar et al., the ‘three community study’, although any published community study was creditworthy. A number of candidates provided excellent answers and scored full marks. Others did not, either because they failed to read the question or because they did not know the difference between a School-based, a worksite and a community programme.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

- (a) This question asked for an explanation of social density and, except for a few who confused it with spatial density, most candidates scored full marks. Social density is the number of people in a given space and studies of social density vary the number of people in the same size space.
- (b) This question wanted a description of a laboratory study of crowding and density, and again, except for the few who incorrectly chose to describe a *non-laboratory* study such as that by Christian et al., most candidates scored very high and more often maximum marks. Descriptions of the laboratory study conducted by Calhoun were often detailed, accurate and showed good understanding. It is important for candidates to know the method used in studies like this because without it a candidate may guess incorrectly and so waste valuable marks.

Question 10

- (a) There were some excellent answers on personal space and territory and many answers easily achieved the 8 marks allocated to this question. These answers included a range of information from different bullet-points of the syllabus, had depth, detail and showed organisation in their answers. Some candidates only considered personal space invasions, and whilst focusing on just

one 'bullet-point sub-topic' will score marks, this strategy will not score marks for range. It is advised that information from at least two 'bullet-point sub-topics' is included.

- (b) The named issue here was 'different methods' and some candidates only considered this issue. Answers showed ability and understanding when comparing and contrasting stop-distance, simulation and field experiments involving invasions. These answers also considered other issues dealing with them in an equally effective and efficient way. Some answers followed the usual pattern of not evaluating in the most effective way, such as evaluating study-by-study or by only evaluating the named issue. As with other options, the most effective strategy to maximise marks is to organise an answer by evaluation issues using studies as examples (see general comments).

Question 11

- (a) This question was rarely attempted which suggests that it might not be taught in as much detail as is needed or perhaps not taught at all. Research shows that in emergency situations people behave in three ways: doing nothing, seemingly unable to understand what is happening; behaving according to their normal way of behaving i.e. following the script; and thirdly (and who survive most often) there are those who can make a quick decision and behave in a 'creative' but rational way. To answer the question candidates could have interviewed survivors, asking questions about their behaviour, or looked at any CCTV records of an emergency situation which could be analysed for their content. Instead of using psychological methods, many candidates often made inappropriate suggestions some even misunderstanding the term 'psychological script' preferring instead to suggest acting out the scripts of a play in a theatre!
- (b) The term 'scripts' appears on the syllabus: 'behaviours during events, and methodology: Contagion (LeBon, 1895); scripts (Shank and Abelson, 1977). Laboratory experiments (e.g. Mintz, 1951), simulations and real life examples. This means that candidates should have been able to answer this question part with little difficulty. As with other parts of the syllabus, this appears not to have been studied by many Centres. What a psychological script is was outlined in the introduction to the question itself (and the basic idea is immediately above).

Question 12

- (a) This question wanted candidates to suggest how they would determine whether a housing design was successful or not. There were many very good and appropriate answers, for example interviewing the residents or giving them a 'satisfaction' questionnaire. Such answers impressed with their knowledge of the type of questionnaire and how it would be scored. Other less psychological methods were suggested, such as looking at crime levels in the area, and according to one candidate "seeing if it was demolished like the Pruitt-Igoe".
- (b) Two features of successful housing designs were required here, and most candidates were able to score marks, often only being restricted through lack of detail. Newman outlined a 'zone of territorial influence', an area which appears to belong to someone and secondly 'opportunities for surveillance' suggesting that if a building or area can be seen by occupants, then there would be fewer anti-social problems.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) To score full marks here candidates had to include a basic comment about both the words 'psychoanalytic' and 'phobias'. Many candidates addressed only one of these two components, some merely describing a phobia (such as agoraphobia). Full marks were achieved by other candidates who outlined the psychoanalytic explanation and who could provide an example of a phobia to support the answer. The psychoanalytic explanation believes that phobias are the product of unresolved conflicts between the id and the superego.
- (b) This question part required a fuller description (rather than a basic explanation) of the psychoanalytic approach and many candidates expanded the basic explanation in (a) to provide appropriately detailed answers which scored full marks. These candidates also gave a relevant example, most using the case study of Little Hans and his phobia of horses to support the explanation.

Question 14

- (a) As usual, answers to this question covered the entire mark range. There are those who score a few marks by making a some relevant points but cover a limited range of information, add little detail to generalised and anecdotal points and don't show enough organisation or understanding. There are also those who achieve full marks because they have been extremely well prepared and include a wide range of detail in their answers. Occasionally it is a pleasure to read answers with relevant information that extends beyond that included on the syllabus.
- (b) A number of candidates only considered the named issue of 'psychometric tests' and so were restricted to a maximum of 4 marks. Other candidates mentioned a number of issues but often kept repeating the same points because they took a 'study-by-study' approach. The best answers included the issue of 'psychometric tests' using the Maudsley OCD inventory (and often others) to address aspects such as reliability, validity and the usefulness of such tests. Other issues included in top answers were a comparison and contrast about different explanations and treatments, and some used the case study of Charles to assess the individual nature of those with OCD.

Question 15

- (a) Candidates had to suggest a drug-testing procedure. Many candidates began with the selection of a sample of ill volunteers and then divided them into two groups: those given the drug and a control group (interestingly a few candidates suggested using a placebo group). In doing this, candidates were outlining the basics of an experiment (even though some did not realise it). The outcome suggested by most candidates was not only whether the patients recovered from the illness more quickly with the drug than without it, but also whether there were any side effects that may result in the drug being unsafe for the general public. Some excellent answers often scored full marks.
- (b) A description of 'the neurochemical explanation of depression' was straightforward for many candidates who often scored the full 6 marks out of 6. Those not scoring high marks were restricted mainly because their answers were too brief and lacking detail. As has been mentioned elsewhere in this report, a few sentences is insufficient for a question of this type and worth six marks.

Question 16

- (a) This question asked candidates to use observation to obtain data on a pyromaniac. The most logical way to gather data would be to conduct a participant observation or to use cctv to analyse the behaviour of a person setting and watching a fire. Although not easy to do, either possibility would give insight into the behaviours of the pyromaniac. Rather than base answers on observations, candidates suggested conducting interviews, designing laboratory experiments and advertising for pyromaniacs to participate and other non-observational methods. Candidates are advised to be clear about the basics involved in each method, as has been studied in the AS component of the course.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe the characteristics of a pyromaniac, and to assist with the answer the question even stated that pyromania is an impulse control disorder. Indeed pyromania shares the same features as other impulse control disorders such as kleptomania and compulsive gambling. Many candidates described the relevant features and scored high marks, but many candidates often could do no better than guess, often writing answers based on statements like 'pyromaniacs like lighting fires'.

Psychology and Organisations

Question 17

- (a) Nearly all candidates scored 1 mark because they gave a common-sense explanation of the term 'personnel selection decisions', which was acceptable in this instance. To earn the second mark the term had to have some elaboration, such as reference to decision-making, and not every candidate was able to do this.
- (b) Candidates were invited to describe two multiple decision-making models. Nearly all candidates scored full marks here; those who did not identified the models rather than describe them. The three models are: (i) the multiple regression model which combines each 'job' factor statistically; (ii)

the multiple cut-off model where applicants must obtain a minimum score on each factor to be successful; and (iii) the multiple hurdle model where decisions about success or failure are made at various stages such as at end of day one if an interview is two-day.

Question 18

- (a) There is no doubt that a question on 'motivation to work' is a favourite for which many candidates have been well prepared. The best answers began with a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, before moving on to consider a wide range of theories, often distinguishing between need theories, goal-setting theories and cognitive or rational theories. Candidates need to be aware that for just describing the needs hierarchy proposed by Maslow will not be enough to score full marks. Such candidates should ideally go beyond his five initial needs, and consider the update that has three more. Candidates are always advised to consider a range of information from at least two syllabus bullet-points.
- (b) As with all essay part (b) questions candidates are advised to consider a range of evaluation issues (in addition to the named issue) as this is the most effective way to score top marks. The issue named for this question was 'individual differences'. This could have provided some good debate because some people are extrinsically motivated whereas others are intrinsically motivated. Other issues were considered by top mark answers but not by those wallowing in the lower and bottom bands of the mark scheme. The message is simple: consider a range of evaluation issues, including the named issue, and marks will improve significantly.

Question 19

- (a) The view that 'leaders are born and not made' is fundamental to studies of leadership. However, it is theory and evidence is needed to support or reject it. This question therefore invited candidates to suggest ways in which the theory could be tested. A few candidates applied the logic of assuming that if a mother or father is a 'great leader' then it could be determined whether a son or daughter is also a great leader. Others suggested conducting twin studies. All these answers received credit because candidates were showing an ability to think, to make suggestions and apply their psychological knowledge. On the other hand one candidate wrote "I can't answer this question because we haven't studied it" showing no ability to think and apply at all.
- (b) The majority of candidates scored maximum marks here when they wrote in detail about universalist theories of leadership such as the 'great man/woman' theory, and charismatic (or transformational) leaders. A number of candidates scored no marks at all because they wrote about behavioural theories which are different from, and are not therefore, universalist theories.

Question 20

- (a) To conduct a study in a more holistic way, rather than an assessment by numbers, candidates should logically have suggested conducting an interview. If this was unstructured, or if it was structured with an open-ended question, then the worker would have the opportunity to express his or her feeling on whatever he or she wished and in as much depth and detail as he or she wished. The data would be qualitative rather than quantitative and it would be more holistic. A number of candidates chose this approach and scored high marks, but many candidates either knew nothing about interviews, other than 'I would do an interview', or they could not work out what 'a more holistic way' actually meant.
- (b) To score marks here, candidates had to describe a reductionist measure of job satisfaction. A number of candidates did not know what reductionist meant and scored no marks at all. As reductionism is an important issue for both papers 1 and 2, and as there was a basic explanation of it in the question, it was hard to see why answers the term was misinterpreted. In contrast there were very good answers with candidates describing the job description index for example, which measures five different aspects of job satisfaction.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/32
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 8 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should appreciate that this is a three hour examination and so it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (parts **(a)** and **(b)** should take approximately 45-50 minutes and be at least 4 sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between describe and suggest for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for papers 1 and 2 not only to studies learned for paper 3, but also to form the basis of their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

Section A (all options):

A number of modifications to examination technique could improve marks:

1. Writing an amount appropriate to the marks allocated. If a description of two studies is needed for 4 marks, the allocation of marks is 2 + 2, whereas if a description of one study is required for 4 marks, then the same amount in total should be written as for the 2 + 2 and not half the amount.
2. Writing an amount equivalent to 4 marks and not 8 or 12 marks. Although there were many answers that were far too short, there were also many answers that were just as long as **Section B** essays.

Section B (all options)

An important message, is that many answers would receive significantly higher marks if the difference between describe and evaluate is known by candidates. **Section B** question part **(a)** will always be 'describe' and question part **(b)** will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description, it is a different skill that can be defined as 'the ability to analyse and evaluate knowledge and processes and apply knowledge and processes to unfamiliar situations including those related to issues'. In other words, it is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about evidence that has been described in part **(a)**. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and not to just reproduce learning.

Evaluation by candidates can often be divided into three types:

- 1 those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- 2 those who focus exclusively on the named issue (and have marks restricted), and those who exclude it altogether (and also have marks restricted); and
- 3 those who do not evaluate at all (and score no marks) merely describing more information.

It is desirable to see all candidates achieve the first type of answer.

For this paper many more candidates showed signs of being 'type 1' by using the evaluation issues introduced when studying papers 1 and 2. However, sometimes issues were chosen that did not relate to the topic area in question. For example, a candidate might write "disruptive behaviour is reliable" and "disruptive behaviour is valid" both of which have very little meaning.

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. Many candidates appear not to know the difference between these two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. A suggestion is to go beyond description and to think about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. A suggestion is not something that can be learned beforehand. It is something that a candidate has to think about for themselves during the examination. Generally candidates will be required to suggest how they would investigate something, and this would need the application of methodological knowledge such as an experiment, observation, or self-report (questionnaire or interview). Application of methodological knowledge is what scores most marks in this Section.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a) This question part, like all other question part (a)'s, required the question set to be addressed specifically. In this instance any answer needed refer to the word 'strategies' which had to be related to 'special educational need'. 'Special educational need' meant that this question part could include either those with difficulties and disabilities or those who are gifted. Most candidates were able to address both these components and score full marks, but there were those who knew no strategies at all, often guessing at what might be possible.
- (b) This question part was specifically aimed at those with learning difficulties and disabilities, and so any answer mentioning gifted children scored no marks. Some candidates took a more general approach and contrasted integration with segregation (strategies often included in the answer to part (a)), whilst others focused on specific difficulties such as dyslexia. Those candidates adopting the latter approach often knew some basics about dyslexia and suggested using larger print, colour or group work.

Question 2

- (a) This essay question asked about disruptive behaviour in schools. A wide range of answers were written with marks covering the entire mark range. Better answers looked at the different types of disruptive behaviour, such as attention-seeking, being out-of-seat, bullying, and generally disrupting both the teacher and other candidates, before moving on to consider various reasons for such behaviours. Finally candidates considered both corrective and preventive strategies for controlling inappropriate behaviour. Many answers were clearly based on psychological knowledge, evident by the names (and dates) quoted, whereas others were more anecdotal, but did mention the main sub-topics. Some answers were lacking in detail and so did not score marks in the top bands (see key messages).
- (b) The named evaluation issue here was 'reductionism' and candidates should have included this as one of their range of evaluation issues. To exclude this issue, like any other part (b) answer, restricted marks to a maximum of 6. It was expected that reductionism be considered in relation to corrective strategies, for example, which are behaviourist and are reductionist in making the assumption that every child behaves and responds to reinforcement and punishment in the same way. Other issues should also have been considered such as different perspectives, different methodologies, or determinism, for example.

Question 3

- (a) This question asked candidates to use the experimental method to investigate the effectiveness of teaching styles. Many candidates appeared not to know what the basics of an experiment involved, instead suggesting many varied and creative (but incorrect) possibilities. A simple experiment should have an independent variable of two different teaching styles and using an independent groups design, the success in examination results at the end of a year could be measured, which would be the dependent variable. Some candidates did write superb answers that were full of appropriate methodological knowledge.
- (b) This question part asked for a description of two different teaching styles, and some candidates wrote excellent answers, often using Fontana's high-initiative and low-initiative and Bennett's formal and informal distinction. Other equally good answers contrasted a humanistic style (e.g. learning circles) with a cognitive style (e.g. discovery learning). Such answers often failed to achieve top marks because answers were very brief, often shorter than a 2 mark **Section A** 'short answer question'. Some candidates misread the question and wrote about learning styles (e.g. Curry and Grasha) and these answers scored no marks at all.

Question 4

- (a) In order to answer this question, candidates needed to know about Vygotsky's theory and be able to apply it to the teaching of science to young children. A small number of candidates clearly knew nothing about the work of Vygotsky, or assumed guessed wrongly, and scored no marks. There is a choice of **Section C** questions, and so if one question can not be answered then the other should be attempted. Some answers not only used Vygotsky's ideas very well, they also showed good understanding of what is possible with young children.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe the psychology on which their part (a) answer was based, and many candidates described the work of Vygotsky clearly, in detail and showed good understanding of it. A few candidates (incorrectly) used the work of Piaget in part (a) and then described Piaget's theories in part (b). Although doing this answered part (b), it scored no marks because part (b) must be considered in relation to part (a) and the beginning or introduction to the question where Vygotsky was specifically mentioned.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

Most candidates scored no marks at all for either part (a) or part (b) for this question part, despite it being on the syllabus. For information it appears in the 'Management of Stress' sub-section which states: 'Psychological techniques: biofeedback (Budzynski et al. 1973)'. It is advised that all parts of the syllabus are taught because here many candidates lost a potentially valuable 6 marks. Candidates often assumed that 'biofeedback' referred to a medical practitioner feeding back information to a patient about the state of their health. A few candidates did correctly describe biofeedback for part (a) and also for part (b) correctly described the biofeedback study on tension headache control by Budzynski et al., scoring full marks in doing so.

Question 6

- (a) The requirement here was to describe the doctor-patient relationship. Quite a number of answers did not score in the top band of the mark range because they were restricted both in the coverage of the topic area and in detail. Some candidates for example wrote about verbal and non-verbal communication and nothing else. Others wrote about doctor-centred and patient-centred relationships and nothing else. For a top band mark an answer should cover at least two of the syllabus bullet-points. Some answers were also lacking in detail and some answers were quite general where a candidate knew a few terms, but nothing about the research or psychological study underlying the terms. At the top end of the mark range there were some superb answers. These candidates covered a range, had detail (although sometimes too much detail) quoted relevant research and it was often a pleasure to award the full 8 marks available.
- (b) The requirement here was to evaluate the doctor-patient relationship. The named issue was the usefulness of self-reports. One of the major problems with answers to this question is that many candidates wrote about issues that were not really appropriate to the question. Candidates must

write about a range of issues (including the named issue), but these issues must be relevant. For example, in this instance a candidate might write “the doctor-patient relationship is valid”. Yes it is, but how could it not be valid? Similarly a candidate might write “the doctor-patient relationship applies to real life”. Yes it does! These might be extreme examples, but illustrate the way evaluation issues can only be debated, and credited, if they are applicable to the specific topic area in question.

Question 7

- (a) Question part (a) asked candidates for three things (2 marks for each) a medical practitioner could do to improve adherence. Some candidates merely identified, suggesting no more than “simplify instructions” whereas others referred to the work of Ley, for example, briefly describing research and, in showing this appropriate psychological knowledge, scored both marks. Also creditworthy were suggestions such as repeating important information, stating the most important things first, providing information about the treatment programme, changing practitioner style, or applying a behavioural technique.
- (b) When asked anything about adherence, as was the case in the June examinations, candidates appear to want to write a pre-prepared answer, whatever the specific question is. In doing this, candidates often scored no marks by failing to answer the question set. In response to this question, candidates often gave a long list of ways in which adherence could be measured (pre-prepared), but crucially most answers failed to address the requirement to assess the long-term effectiveness of a change a practitioner might make. The most effective way to achieve this would be to conduct a longitudinal study where the same people are studied over a period of time.

Question 8

- (a) This question part invited candidates to suggest how they would conduct a community health programme to encourage healthy eating. A number of candidates *described* the Tapper et al. study and scored no marks. Others suggested conducting a study themselves, which begins to answer the question, but then suggested the study be done in a School and so had marks restricted because a School is different from a community (the question specified community). The best answers conducted a community study and used appropriate techniques such as fear arousal and providing information to get the message across. Some candidates referred to the Yale model of communication, but sometimes described it rather than applied it to this specific question.
- (b) This question part wanted description of a successful community study and the syllabus identifies the one by Farquhar et al., the ‘three community study’, although any published community study was creditworthy. A number of candidates provided excellent answers and scored full marks. Others did not, either because they failed to read the question or because they did not know the difference between a School-based, a worksite and a community programme.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

- (a) This question asked for an explanation of social density and, except for a few who confused it with spatial density, most candidates scored full marks. Social density is the number of people in a given space and studies of social density vary the number of people in the same size space.
- (b) This question wanted a description of a laboratory study of crowding and density, and again, except for the few who incorrectly chose to describe a *non-laboratory* study such as that by Christian et al., most candidates scored very high and more often maximum marks. Descriptions of the laboratory study conducted by Calhoun were often detailed, accurate and showed good understanding. It is important for candidates to know the method used in studies like this because without it a candidate may guess incorrectly and so waste valuable marks.

Question 10

- (a) There were some excellent answers on personal space and territory and many answers easily achieved the 8 marks allocated to this question. These answers included a range of information from different bullet-points of the syllabus, had depth, detail and showed organisation in their answers. Some candidates only considered personal space invasions, and whilst focusing on just

one 'bullet-point sub-topic' will score marks, this strategy will not score marks for range. It is advised that information from at least two 'bullet-point sub-topics' is included.

- (b) The named issue here was 'different methods' and some candidates only considered this issue. Answers showed ability and understanding when comparing and contrasting stop-distance, simulation and field experiments involving invasions. These answers also considered other issues dealing with them in an equally effective and efficient way. Some answers followed the usual pattern of not evaluating in the most effective way, such as evaluating study-by-study or by only evaluating the named issue. As with other options, the most effective strategy to maximise marks is to organise an answer by evaluation issues using studies as examples (see general comments).

Question 11

- (a) This question was rarely attempted which suggests that it might not be taught in as much detail as is needed or perhaps not taught at all. Research shows that in emergency situations people behave in three ways: doing nothing, seemingly unable to understand what is happening; behaving according to their normal way of behaving i.e. following the script; and thirdly (and who survive most often) there are those who can make a quick decision and behave in a 'creative' but rational way. To answer the question candidates could have interviewed survivors, asking questions about their behaviour, or looked at any CCTV records of an emergency situation which could be analysed for their content. Instead of using psychological methods, many candidates often made inappropriate suggestions some even misunderstanding the term 'psychological script' preferring instead to suggest acting out the scripts of a play in a theatre!
- (b) The term 'scripts' appears on the syllabus: 'behaviours during events, and methodology: Contagion (LeBon, 1895); scripts (Shank and Abelson, 1977). Laboratory experiments (e.g. Mintz, 1951), simulations and real life examples. This means that candidates should have been able to answer this question part with little difficulty. As with other parts of the syllabus, this appears not to have been studied by many Centres. What a psychological script is was outlined in the introduction to the question itself (and the basic idea is immediately above).

Question 12

- (a) This question wanted candidates to suggest how they would determine whether a housing design was successful or not. There were many very good and appropriate answers, for example interviewing the residents or giving them a 'satisfaction' questionnaire. Such answers impressed with their knowledge of the type of questionnaire and how it would be scored. Other less psychological methods were suggested, such as looking at crime levels in the area, and according to one candidate "seeing if it was demolished like the Pruitt-Igoe".
- (b) Two features of successful housing designs were required here, and most candidates were able to score marks, often only being restricted through lack of detail. Newman outlined a 'zone of territorial influence', an area which appears to belong to someone and secondly 'opportunities for surveillance' suggesting that if a building or area can be seen by occupants, then there would be fewer anti-social problems.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) To score full marks here candidates had to include a basic comment about both the words 'psychoanalytic' and 'phobias'. Many candidates addressed only one of these two components, some merely describing a phobia (such as agoraphobia). Full marks were achieved by other candidates who outlined the psychoanalytic explanation and who could provide an example of a phobia to support the answer. The psychoanalytic explanation believes that phobias are the product of unresolved conflicts between the id and the superego.
- (b) This question part required a fuller description (rather than a basic explanation) of the psychoanalytic approach and many candidates expanded the basic explanation in (a) to provide appropriately detailed answers which scored full marks. These candidates also gave a relevant example, most using the case study of Little Hans and his phobia of horses to support the explanation.

Question 14

- (a) As usual, answers to this question covered the entire mark range. There are those who score a few marks by making a some relevant points but cover a limited range of information, add little detail to generalised and anecdotal points and don't show enough organisation or understanding. There are also those who achieve full marks because they have been extremely well prepared and include a wide range of detail in their answers. Occasionally it is a pleasure to read answers with relevant information that extends beyond that included on the syllabus.
- (b) A number of candidates only considered the named issue of 'psychometric tests' and so were restricted to a maximum of 4 marks. Other candidates mentioned a number of issues but often kept repeating the same points because they took a 'study-by-study' approach. The best answers included the issue of 'psychometric tests' using the Maudsley OCD inventory (and often others) to address aspects such as reliability, validity and the usefulness of such tests. Other issues included in top answers were a comparison and contrast about different explanations and treatments, and some used the case study of Charles to assess the individual nature of those with OCD.

Question 15

- (a) Candidates had to suggest a drug-testing procedure. Many candidates began with the selection of a sample of ill volunteers and then divided them into two groups: those given the drug and a control group (interestingly a few candidates suggested using a placebo group). In doing this, candidates were outlining the basics of an experiment (even though some did not realise it). The outcome suggested by most candidates was not only whether the patients recovered from the illness more quickly with the drug than without it, but also whether there were any side effects that may result in the drug being unsafe for the general public. Some excellent answers often scored full marks.
- (b) A description of 'the neurochemical explanation of depression' was straightforward for many candidates who often scored the full 6 marks out of 6. Those not scoring high marks were restricted mainly because their answers were too brief and lacking detail. As has been mentioned elsewhere in this report, a few sentences is insufficient for a question of this type and worth six marks.

Question 16

- (a) This question asked candidates to use observation to obtain data on a pyromaniac. The most logical way to gather data would be to conduct a participant observation or to use cctv to analyse the behaviour of a person setting and watching a fire. Although not easy to do, either possibility would give insight into the behaviours of the pyromaniac. Rather than base answers on observations, candidates suggested conducting interviews, designing laboratory experiments and advertising for pyromaniacs to participate and other non-observational methods. Candidates are advised to be clear about the basics involved in each method, as has been studied in the AS component of the course.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe the characteristics of a pyromaniac, and to assist with the answer the question even stated that pyromania is an impulse control disorder. Indeed pyromania shares the same features as other impulse control disorders such as kleptomania and compulsive gambling. Many candidates described the relevant features and scored high marks, but many candidates often could do no better than guess, often writing answers based on statements like 'pyromaniacs like lighting fires'.

Psychology and Organisations

Question 17

- (a) Nearly all candidates scored 1 mark because they gave a common-sense explanation of the term 'personnel selection decisions', which was acceptable in this instance. To earn the second mark the term had to have some elaboration, such as reference to decision-making, and not every candidate was able to do this.
- (b) Candidates were invited to describe two multiple decision-making models. Nearly all candidates scored full marks here; those who did not identified the models rather than describe them. The three models are: (i) the multiple regression model which combines each 'job' factor statistically; (ii)

the multiple cut-off model where applicants must obtain a minimum score on each factor to be successful; and (iii) the multiple hurdle model where decisions about success or failure are made at various stages such as at end of day one if an interview is two-day.

Question 18

- (a) There is no doubt that a question on 'motivation to work' is a favourite for which many candidates have been well prepared. The best answers began with a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, before moving on to consider a wide range of theories, often distinguishing between need theories, goal-setting theories and cognitive or rational theories. Candidates need to be aware that for just describing the needs hierarchy proposed by Maslow will not be enough to score full marks. Such candidates should ideally go beyond his five initial needs, and consider the update that has three more. Candidates are always advised to consider a range of information from at least two syllabus bullet-points.
- (b) As with all essay part (b) questions candidates are advised to consider a range of evaluation issues (in addition to the named issue) as this is the most effective way to score top marks. The issue named for this question was 'individual differences'. This could have provided some good debate because some people are extrinsically motivated whereas others are intrinsically motivated. Other issues were considered by top mark answers but not by those wallowing in the lower and bottom bands of the mark scheme. The message is simple: consider a range of evaluation issues, including the named issue, and marks will improve significantly.

Question 19

- (a) The view that 'leaders are born and not made' is fundamental to studies of leadership. However, it is theory and evidence is needed to support or reject it. This question therefore invited candidates to suggest ways in which the theory could be tested. A few candidates applied the logic of assuming that if a mother or father is a 'great leader' then it could be determined whether a son or daughter is also a great leader. Others suggested conducting twin studies. All these answers received credit because candidates were showing an ability to think, to make suggestions and apply their psychological knowledge. On the other hand one candidate wrote "I can't answer this question because we haven't studied it" showing no ability to think and apply at all.
- (b) The majority of candidates scored maximum marks here when they wrote in detail about universalist theories of leadership such as the 'great man/woman' theory, and charismatic (or transformational) leaders. A number of candidates scored no marks at all because they wrote about behavioural theories which are different from, and are not therefore, universalist theories.

Question 20

- (a) To conduct a study in a more holistic way, rather than an assessment by numbers, candidates should logically have suggested conducting an interview. If this was unstructured, or if it was structured with an open-ended question, then the worker would have the opportunity to express his or her feeling on whatever he or she wished and in as much depth and detail as he or she wished. The data would be qualitative rather than quantitative and it would be more holistic. A number of candidates chose this approach and scored high marks, but many candidates either knew nothing about interviews, other than 'I would do an interview', or they could not work out what 'a more holistic way' actually meant.
- (b) To score marks here, candidates had to describe a reductionist measure of job satisfaction. A number of candidates did not know what reductionist meant and scored no marks at all. As reductionism is an important issue for both papers 1 and 2, and as there was a basic explanation of it in the question, it was hard to see why answers the term was misinterpreted. In contrast there were very good answers with candidates describing the job description index for example, which measures five different aspects of job satisfaction.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/33
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 8 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should appreciate that this is a three hour examination and so it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (parts **(a)** and **(b)** should take approximately 45-50 minutes and be at least 4 sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between describe and suggest for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for papers 1 and 2 not only to studies learned for paper 3, but also to form the basis of their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

Section A (all options):

A number of modifications to examination technique could improve marks:

1. Writing an amount appropriate to the marks allocated. If a description of two studies is needed for 4 marks, the allocation of marks is 2 + 2, whereas if a description of one study is required for 4 marks, then the same amount in total should be written as for the 2 + 2 and not half the amount.
2. Writing an amount equivalent to 4 marks and not 8 or 12 marks. Although there were many answers that were far too short, there were also many answers that were just as long as **Section B** essays.

Section B (all options)

An important message, is that many answers would receive significantly higher marks if the difference between describe and evaluate is known by candidates. **Section B** question part **(a)** will always be 'describe' and question part **(b)** will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description, it is a different skill that can be defined as 'the ability to analyse and evaluate knowledge and processes and apply knowledge and processes to unfamiliar situations including those related to issues'. In other words, it is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about evidence that has been described in part **(a)**. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and not to just reproduce learning.

Evaluation by candidates can often be divided into three types:

- 1 those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- 2 those who focus exclusively on the named issue (and have marks restricted), and those who exclude it altogether (and also have marks restricted); and
- 3 those who do not evaluate at all (and score no marks) merely describing more information.

It is desirable to see all candidates achieve the first type of answer.

For this paper many more candidates showed signs of being 'type 1' by using the evaluation issues introduced when studying papers 1 and 2. However, sometimes issues were chosen that did not relate to the topic area in question. For example, a candidate might write "disruptive behaviour is reliable" and "disruptive behaviour is valid" both of which have very little meaning.

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. Many candidates appear not to know the difference between these two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. A suggestion is to go beyond description and to think about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. A suggestion is not something that can be learned beforehand. It is something that a candidate has to think about for themselves during the examination. Generally candidates will be required to suggest how they would investigate something, and this would need the application of methodological knowledge such as an experiment, observation, or self-report (questionnaire or interview). Application of methodological knowledge is what scores most marks in this Section.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a) This question part, like all other question part (a)'s, required the question set to be addressed specifically. In this instance any answer needed refer to the word 'strategies' which had to be related to 'special educational need'. 'Special educational need' meant that this question part could include either those with difficulties and disabilities or those who are gifted. Most candidates were able to address both these components and score full marks, but there were those who knew no strategies at all, often guessing at what might be possible.
- (b) This question part was specifically aimed at those with learning difficulties and disabilities, and so any answer mentioning gifted children scored no marks. Some candidates took a more general approach and contrasted integration with segregation (strategies often included in the answer to part (a)), whilst others focused on specific difficulties such as dyslexia. Those candidates adopting the latter approach often knew some basics about dyslexia and suggested using larger print, colour or group work.

Question 2

- (a) This essay question asked about disruptive behaviour in schools. A wide range of answers were written with marks covering the entire mark range. Better answers looked at the different types of disruptive behaviour, such as attention-seeking, being out-of-seat, bullying, and generally disrupting both the teacher and other candidates, before moving on to consider various reasons for such behaviours. Finally candidates considered both corrective and preventive strategies for controlling inappropriate behaviour. Many answers were clearly based on psychological knowledge, evident by the names (and dates) quoted, whereas others were more anecdotal, but did mention the main sub-topics. Some answers were lacking in detail and so did not score marks in the top bands (see key messages).
- (b) The named evaluation issue here was 'reductionism' and candidates should have included this as one of their range of evaluation issues. To exclude this issue, like any other part (b) answer, restricted marks to a maximum of 6. It was expected that reductionism be considered in relation to corrective strategies, for example, which are behaviourist and are reductionist in making the assumption that every child behaves and responds to reinforcement and punishment in the same way. Other issues should also have been considered such as different perspectives, different methodologies, or determinism, for example.

Question 3

- (a) This question asked candidates to use the experimental method to investigate the effectiveness of teaching styles. Many candidates appeared not to know what the basics of an experiment involved, instead suggesting many varied and creative (but incorrect) possibilities. A simple experiment should have an independent variable of two different teaching styles and using an independent groups design, the success in examination results at the end of a year could be measured, which would be the dependent variable. Some candidates did write superb answers that were full of appropriate methodological knowledge.
- (b) This question part asked for a description of two different teaching styles, and some candidates wrote excellent answers, often using Fontana's high-initiative and low-initiative and Bennett's formal and informal distinction. Other equally good answers contrasted a humanistic style (e.g. learning circles) with a cognitive style (e.g. discovery learning). Such answers often failed to achieve top marks because answers were very brief, often shorter than a 2 mark **Section A** 'short answer question'. Some candidates misread the question and wrote about learning styles (e.g. Curry and Grasha) and these answers scored no marks at all.

Question 4

- (a) In order to answer this question, candidates needed to know about Vygotsky's theory and be able to apply it to the teaching of science to young children. A small number of candidates clearly knew nothing about the work of Vygotsky, or assumed guessed wrongly, and scored no marks. There is a choice of **Section C** questions, and so if one question can not be answered then the other should be attempted. Some answers not only used Vygotsky's ideas very well, they also showed good understanding of what is possible with young children.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe the psychology on which their part (a) answer was based, and many candidates described the work of Vygotsky clearly, in detail and showed good understanding of it. A few candidates (incorrectly) used the work of Piaget in part (a) and then described Piaget's theories in part (b). Although doing this answered part (b), it scored no marks because part (b) must be considered in relation to part (a) and the beginning or introduction to the question where Vygotsky was specifically mentioned.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

Most candidates scored no marks at all for either part (a) or part (b) for this question part, despite it being on the syllabus. For information it appears in the 'Management of Stress' sub-section which states: 'Psychological techniques: biofeedback (Budzynski et al. 1973)'. It is advised that all parts of the syllabus are taught because here many candidates lost a potentially valuable 6 marks. Candidates often assumed that 'biofeedback' referred to a medical practitioner feeding back information to a patient about the state of their health. A few candidates did correctly describe biofeedback for part (a) and also for part (b) correctly described the biofeedback study on tension headache control by Budzynski et al., scoring full marks in doing so.

Question 6

- (a) The requirement here was to describe the doctor-patient relationship. Quite a number of answers did not score in the top band of the mark range because they were restricted both in the coverage of the topic area and in detail. Some candidates for example wrote about verbal and non-verbal communication and nothing else. Others wrote about doctor-centred and patient-centred relationships and nothing else. For a top band mark an answer should cover at least two of the syllabus bullet-points. Some answers were also lacking in detail and some answers were quite general where a candidate knew a few terms, but nothing about the research or psychological study underlying the terms. At the top end of the mark range there were some superb answers. These candidates covered a range, had detail (although sometimes too much detail) quoted relevant research and it was often a pleasure to award the full 8 marks available.
- (b) The requirement here was to evaluate the doctor-patient relationship. The named issue was the usefulness of self-reports. One of the major problems with answers to this question is that many candidates wrote about issues that were not really appropriate to the question. Candidates must

write about a range of issues (including the named issue), but these issues must be relevant. For example, in this instance a candidate might write “the doctor-patient relationship is valid”. Yes it is, but how could it not be valid? Similarly a candidate might write “the doctor-patient relationship applies to real life”. Yes it does! These might be extreme examples, but illustrate the way evaluation issues can only be debated, and credited, if they are applicable to the specific topic area in question.

Question 7

- (a) Question part (a) asked candidates for three things (2 marks for each) a medical practitioner could do to improve adherence. Some candidates merely identified, suggesting no more than “simplify instructions” whereas others referred to the work of Ley, for example, briefly describing research and, in showing this appropriate psychological knowledge, scored both marks. Also creditworthy were suggestions such as repeating important information, stating the most important things first, providing information about the treatment programme, changing practitioner style, or applying a behavioural technique.
- (b) When asked anything about adherence, as was the case in the June examinations, candidates appear to want to write a pre-prepared answer, whatever the specific question is. In doing this, candidates often scored no marks by failing to answer the question set. In response to this question, candidates often gave a long list of ways in which adherence could be measured (pre-prepared), but crucially most answers failed to address the requirement to assess the long-term effectiveness of a change a practitioner might make. The most effective way to achieve this would be to conduct a longitudinal study where the same people are studied over a period of time.

Question 8

- (a) This question part invited candidates to suggest how they would conduct a community health programme to encourage healthy eating. A number of candidates *described* the Tapper et al. study and scored no marks. Others suggested conducting a study themselves, which begins to answer the question, but then suggested the study be done in a School and so had marks restricted because a School is different from a community (the question specified community). The best answers conducted a community study and used appropriate techniques such as fear arousal and providing information to get the message across. Some candidates referred to the Yale model of communication, but sometimes described it rather than applied it to this specific question.
- (b) This question part wanted description of a successful community study and the syllabus identifies the one by Farquhar et al., the ‘three community study’, although any published community study was creditworthy. A number of candidates provided excellent answers and scored full marks. Others did not, either because they failed to read the question or because they did not know the difference between a School-based, a worksite and a community programme.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

- (a) This question asked for an explanation of social density and, except for a few who confused it with spatial density, most candidates scored full marks. Social density is the number of people in a given space and studies of social density vary the number of people in the same size space.
- (b) This question wanted a description of a laboratory study of crowding and density, and again, except for the few who incorrectly chose to describe a *non-laboratory* study such as that by Christian et al., most candidates scored very high and more often maximum marks. Descriptions of the laboratory study conducted by Calhoun were often detailed, accurate and showed good understanding. It is important for candidates to know the method used in studies like this because without it a candidate may guess incorrectly and so waste valuable marks.

Question 10

- (a) There were some excellent answers on personal space and territory and many answers easily achieved the 8 marks allocated to this question. These answers included a range of information from different bullet-points of the syllabus, had depth, detail and showed organisation in their answers. Some candidates only considered personal space invasions, and whilst focusing on just

one 'bullet-point sub-topic' will score marks, this strategy will not score marks for range. It is advised that information from at least two 'bullet-point sub-topics' is included.

- (b) The named issue here was 'different methods' and some candidates only considered this issue. Answers showed ability and understanding when comparing and contrasting stop-distance, simulation and field experiments involving invasions. These answers also considered other issues dealing with them in an equally effective and efficient way. Some answers followed the usual pattern of not evaluating in the most effective way, such as evaluating study-by-study or by only evaluating the named issue. As with other options, the most effective strategy to maximise marks is to organise an answer by evaluation issues using studies as examples (see general comments).

Question 11

- (a) This question was rarely attempted which suggests that it might not be taught in as much detail as is needed or perhaps not taught at all. Research shows that in emergency situations people behave in three ways: doing nothing, seemingly unable to understand what is happening; behaving according to their normal way of behaving i.e. following the script; and thirdly (and who survive most often) there are those who can make a quick decision and behave in a 'creative' but rational way. To answer the question candidates could have interviewed survivors, asking questions about their behaviour, or looked at any CCTV records of an emergency situation which could be analysed for their content. Instead of using psychological methods, many candidates often made inappropriate suggestions some even misunderstanding the term 'psychological script' preferring instead to suggest acting out the scripts of a play in a theatre!
- (b) The term 'scripts' appears on the syllabus: 'behaviours during events, and methodology: Contagion (LeBon, 1895); scripts (Shank and Abelson, 1977). Laboratory experiments (e.g. Mintz, 1951), simulations and real life examples. This means that candidates should have been able to answer this question part with little difficulty. As with other parts of the syllabus, this appears not to have been studied by many Centres. What a psychological script is was outlined in the introduction to the question itself (and the basic idea is immediately above).

Question 12

- (a) This question wanted candidates to suggest how they would determine whether a housing design was successful or not. There were many very good and appropriate answers, for example interviewing the residents or giving them a 'satisfaction' questionnaire. Such answers impressed with their knowledge of the type of questionnaire and how it would be scored. Other less psychological methods were suggested, such as looking at crime levels in the area, and according to one candidate "seeing if it was demolished like the Pruitt-Igoe".
- (b) Two features of successful housing designs were required here, and most candidates were able to score marks, often only being restricted through lack of detail. Newman outlined a 'zone of territorial influence', an area which appears to belong to someone and secondly 'opportunities for surveillance' suggesting that if a building or area can be seen by occupants, then there would be fewer anti-social problems.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) To score full marks here candidates had to include a basic comment about both the words 'psychoanalytic' and 'phobias'. Many candidates addressed only one of these two components, some merely describing a phobia (such as agoraphobia). Full marks were achieved by other candidates who outlined the psychoanalytic explanation and who could provide an example of a phobia to support the answer. The psychoanalytic explanation believes that phobias are the product of unresolved conflicts between the id and the superego.
- (b) This question part required a fuller description (rather than a basic explanation) of the psychoanalytic approach and many candidates expanded the basic explanation in (a) to provide appropriately detailed answers which scored full marks. These candidates also gave a relevant example, most using the case study of Little Hans and his phobia of horses to support the explanation.

Question 14

- (a) As usual, answers to this question covered the entire mark range. There are those who score a few marks by making a few relevant points but cover a limited range of information, add little detail to generalised and anecdotal points and don't show enough organisation or understanding. There are also those who achieve full marks because they have been extremely well prepared and include a wide range of detail in their answers. Occasionally it is a pleasure to read answers with relevant information that extends beyond that included on the syllabus.
- (b) A number of candidates only considered the named issue of 'psychometric tests' and so were restricted to a maximum of 4 marks. Other candidates mentioned a number of issues but often kept repeating the same points because they took a 'study-by-study' approach. The best answers included the issue of 'psychometric tests' using the Maudsley OCD inventory (and often others) to address aspects such as reliability, validity and the usefulness of such tests. Other issues included in top answers were a comparison and contrast about different explanations and treatments, and some used the case study of Charles to assess the individual nature of those with OCD.

Question 15

- (a) Candidates had to suggest a drug-testing procedure. Many candidates began with the selection of a sample of ill volunteers and then divided them into two groups: those given the drug and a control group (interestingly a few candidates suggested using a placebo group). In doing this, candidates were outlining the basics of an experiment (even though some did not realise it). The outcome suggested by most candidates was not only whether the patients recovered from the illness more quickly with the drug than without it, but also whether there were any side effects that may result in the drug being unsafe for the general public. Some excellent answers often scored full marks.
- (b) A description of 'the neurochemical explanation of depression' was straightforward for many candidates who often scored the full 6 marks out of 6. Those not scoring high marks were restricted mainly because their answers were too brief and lacking detail. As has been mentioned elsewhere in this report, a few sentences is insufficient for a question of this type and worth six marks.

Question 16

- (a) This question asked candidates to use observation to obtain data on a pyromaniac. The most logical way to gather data would be to conduct a participant observation or to use CCTV to analyse the behaviour of a person setting and watching a fire. Although not easy to do, either possibility would give insight into the behaviours of the pyromaniac. Rather than base answers on observations, candidates suggested conducting interviews, designing laboratory experiments and advertising for pyromaniacs to participate and other non-observational methods. Candidates are advised to be clear about the basics involved in each method, as has been studied in the AS component of the course.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe the characteristics of a pyromaniac, and to assist with the answer the question even stated that pyromania is an impulse control disorder. Indeed pyromania shares the same features as other impulse control disorders such as kleptomania and compulsive gambling. Many candidates described the relevant features and scored high marks, but many candidates often could do no better than guess, often writing answers based on statements like 'pyromaniacs like lighting fires'.

Psychology and Organisations

Question 17

- (a) Nearly all candidates scored 1 mark because they gave a common-sense explanation of the term 'personnel selection decisions', which was acceptable in this instance. To earn the second mark the term had to have some elaboration, such as reference to decision-making, and not every candidate was able to do this.
- (b) Candidates were invited to describe two multiple decision-making models. Nearly all candidates scored full marks here; those who did not identified the models rather than describe them. The three models are: (i) the multiple regression model which combines each 'job' factor statistically; (ii)

the multiple cut-off model where applicants must obtain a minimum score on each factor to be successful; and (iii) the multiple hurdle model where decisions about success or failure are made at various stages such as at end of day one if an interview is two-day.

Question 18

- (a) There is no doubt that a question on 'motivation to work' is a favourite for which many candidates have been well prepared. The best answers began with a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, before moving on to consider a wide range of theories, often distinguishing between need theories, goal-setting theories and cognitive or rational theories. Candidates need to be aware that for just describing the needs hierarchy proposed by Maslow will not be enough to score full marks. Such candidates should ideally go beyond his five initial needs, and consider the update that has three more. Candidates are always advised to consider a range of information from at least two syllabus bullet-points.
- (b) As with all essay part (b) questions candidates are advised to consider a range of evaluation issues (in addition to the named issue) as this is the most effective way to score top marks. The issue named for this question was 'individual differences'. This could have provided some good debate because some people are extrinsically motivated whereas others are intrinsically motivated. Other issues were considered by top mark answers but not by those wallowing in the lower and bottom bands of the mark scheme. The message is simple: consider a range of evaluation issues, including the named issue, and marks will improve significantly.

Question 19

- (a) The view that 'leaders are born and not made' is fundamental to studies of leadership. However, it is theory and evidence is needed to support or reject it. This question therefore invited candidates to suggest ways in which the theory could be tested. A few candidates applied the logic of assuming that if a mother or father is a 'great leader' then it could be determined whether a son or daughter is also a great leader. Others suggested conducting twin studies. All these answers received credit because candidates were showing an ability to think, to make suggestions and apply their psychological knowledge. On the other hand one candidate wrote "I can't answer this question because we haven't studied it" showing no ability to think and apply at all.
- (b) The majority of candidates scored maximum marks here when they wrote in detail about universalist theories of leadership such as the 'great man/woman' theory, and charismatic (or transformational) leaders. A number of candidates scored no marks at all because they wrote about behavioural theories which are different from, and are not therefore, universalist theories.

Question 20

- (a) To conduct a study in a more holistic way, rather than an assessment by numbers, candidates should logically have suggested conducting an interview. If this was unstructured, or if it was structured with an open-ended question, then the worker would have the opportunity to express his or her feeling on whatever he or she wished and in as much depth and detail as he or she wished. The data would be qualitative rather than quantitative and it would be more holistic. A number of candidates chose this approach and scored high marks, but many candidates either knew nothing about interviews, other than 'I would do an interview', or they could not work out what 'a more holistic way' actually meant.
- (b) To score marks here, candidates had to describe a reductionist measure of job satisfaction. A number of candidates did not know what reductionist meant and scored no marks at all. As reductionism is an important issue for both papers 1 and 2, and as there was a basic explanation of it in the question, it was hard to see why answers the term was misinterpreted. In contrast there were very good answers with candidates describing the job description index for example, which measures five different aspects of job satisfaction.