PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/11

Core Studies 1

General comments

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as aims, samples, 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 some candidates, notably on questions **8**, **9**, **14** and **15**. In **Section A**, the candidates' knowledge of the procedure and results of some, but not all, studies was good but many candidates could have improved their performance by learning specific details of the procedure, such as the variables that were manipulated and the controls that were imposed. Where appropriate, candidates should know about both quantitative and qualitative results of each study. Although some candidates were aware of the aims and contexts of the studies, this is also an area in which many could improve. The reasons for each study being done are described in the introduction to each paper and are important for understanding why each piece of research was conducted.

The majority of candidates seemed to have learned the correct studies. A few, however, are still writing about studies that are not on the syllabus (such as Loftus and Palmer rather than Loftus and Pickrell, and Maguire studies different to the one required). Almost without exception, candidates are answering two questions in **Section B** as required and the essays written by many candidates attempt to focus on evaluation rather than description. Candidates who use the new studies in this section often do so successfully but there is still a tendency to choose those that were also on the old syllabus.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Mann et al: Part **(a)** of this question, asking why the study was an experiment, elicited a range of answers from candidates. Many offered relevant material, typically with reference to controls or IVs and DVs, although some candidates gained limited marks per answer. Some candidates did not recognise that any experiment must have an IV and a DV (even if it cannot be 'manipulated' in a strict sense) and some offered irrelevant material relating to aims or hypotheses.

Part **(b)**, about an advantage of laboratory experiments, was typically well answered with an advantage in terms of 'more control' being offered by most candidates. However, this explanation was sometimes limited to the idea that video recordings were used, which in itself does not explain why it is well controlled.

Question 2

Loftus and Pickrell: Part **(a)**, asking for the aim, was generally well answered with most candidates gaining full marks.

Part **(b)** was not so well answered as many candidates could not describe a piece of evidence that supported the aim, such as some numerical data or the descriptions participants gave that they believed they could remember from the false event. This evidence is central to the findings of the study. To improve their answers here, candidates needed to focus on the word 'evidence' in the question.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 3

Baron-Cohen et al: Part **(a)**: Many candidates did not score well on this question. The key phrase is 'participants were selected' but this was not seen by candidates as requiring a psychological answer, merely an anecdotal one, and some suggested that they were selected by an IQ test. Although many candidates guessed that the researchers may have used 'an advertisement', they could not say where this appeared, and this was important to the selection of this particular sample.

Part **(b)** was not well answered, with many candidates suggesting that the control group was a random sample, and again many suggesting that they were selected by an IQ test.

To improve their answers to this kind of question, candidates need to be aware of both sampling techniques and specific knowledge about the different types (for example that a 'random sample' is not merely the 'chance collection of people') and to know the source of the sample, i.e. the population from which it was taken.

Question 4

Held and Hein: Part **(a)** of this question asked for the results of the visual cliff test and many candidates were able to describe the results for both the active and passive kittens. Some candidates wrote about 'failing the test' or 'falling off the cliff' and some gave irrelevant answers which appeared to be based on a different study altogether, such answers involving balls of yarn. As the visual cliff results were the main finding of the study, and the difference in response of the kittens is a simple one, this minority of candidates needed to ensure that they were learning the basic elements of the correct study.

Part **(b)** of this question required candidates to explain the conclusion from these results and candidates typically performed less well here although good candidates gave accurate, succinct answers. Poor answers tended to describe kittens being kept in the dark and not developing senses.

Question 5

Haney, Banks and Zimbardo: This question, about features of the induction procedure, was well answered, with most candidates gaining full marks. Those who did not, tended to lose marks through carelessness, putting in several things without elaborating any, so not providing two features in enough detail. A small number of candidates described the 'role instruction' of the guards, rather than the 'induction procedure' of the prisoners.

Question 6

Piliavin et al: This question, about controls, was often answered very well, with candidates giving detailed information about the train route, time of day etc. Where candidates did not perform well this was generally because they described levels of the independent variables, such as the victim's race (black or white), the time of the model's entry (early or late) or the type of victim (drunk or ill) rather than the controls, i.e. the candidates did not appear to understand the idea of what was held constant. To help candidates with this it is useful to distinguish between the IV, which is *manipulated* (rather than 'controlled') and the controls, which are *held constant* across each level of the IV.

Question 7

Tajfel: Part **(a)** of this question about how participants were, and believed they were, allocated to groups was generally answered very well. The majority of candidates clearly understood that the participants were told one thing (that they were doing a 'dots test' and being divided into groups according to their results) but were actually divided into groups randomly. Most candidates knew which was the first study and were clearly described the over/underestimator idea.

In part **(b)**, asking why the participants needed to be deceived, candidates produced good answers although fewer were as clear as in part **(a)**. Although many candidates seemed to understand that it was to produce a situation in which the participants would identify with an (artificial) in-group and therefore potentially demonstrate prejudice, few candidates were able to clearly express this idea that it was necessary to support the 'minimal groups' paradigm in any effective way.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 8

Bandura et al: Part **(a)** of this question related to the difference between the immediate effects of a model (social facilitation) versus imitative learning, which Bandura et al discuss in the introduction to their paper and which is important to understanding the effect of social learning. Those candidates who made better attempts at answering this part of the question successfully focused on imitative behaviour being produced in the *absence* of a model (as cued by the question asking about how it differs from the *presence* of a model).

In part **(b)** about how imitation was demonstrated, candidates typically gave partial answers, mentioning that Bandura et al showed that children (from the aggressive model condition) were aggressive (i.e. were displaying imitative behaviour) when there was no longer a model present (in the observation room). Where candidates did not score full marks their answers lacked clarity, typically merely stating 'the children imitated in the absence of the model'.

Question 9

Schachter and Singer: Few candidates were able to answer this question. Most seemed to be unaware of how the researchers had measured the effect of the conditions on the participants, although a few were able to give more than enough accurate examples of the six categories of possible responses to the stooge. To improve their answers to this question, candidates need to be aware of the difference between the categories of behaviour recorded (the answer to the question) and the four experimental conditions (the response given by the majority of candidates).

Question 10

Dement and Kleitman: Responses about the sample here were generally good, typically answering with the number of males and females in part **(a)**, which earned credit. Some candidates were able to elaborate this by identifying that they were adults, or were volunteers. However, a surprising number either believed that all the participants were male, did not appear to understand what 'features of the sample' meant and instead described features of the procedure (such as that they were not allowed to drink alcohol) or guessed other characteristics such as that they were all white, which we know from the article.

There were many good answers to part **(b)**, with candidates typically correctly identifying the small size of the sample or its gender bias and elaborating this disadvantage for full marks.

Question 11

Maguire et al: In this question, asking the candidates to identify two ethical guidelines and say how they were followed, produced many good answers. Where candidates did not gain full marks, they could have improved their responses by clearly giving the name of the guideline and by ensuring that they were aware of those guidelines which were actually followed by Maguire et al. For example, there was no mention of debriefing in the article and, since the participants knew exactly what was happening in the study, this would not have been a very important ethical issue (and candidates cannot assume that it was done).

Question 12

Demattè et al: In part **(a)**, candidates needed to describe the way that the smells were delivered to the participants. Many candidates were able to name the olfactometer or describe the machine used but their descriptions of what it did were brief or non-existent. Some candidates strayed into describing the procedure and others were perhaps referring to different studies with 'odours in the room' and on items of clothing.

In part **(b)**, they were able to give more accurate answers about the importance of this mechanism of delivery and typically suggested 'control' as an important advantage. However, few candidates were able to earn full marks. They needed to explain how the machine helped with standardisation of the procedure, for example by regulating flow/administering clean air so it reduced the likelihood of differences being due to the mixing of smells.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 13

Thigpen and Cleckley: Those candidates who understood what the Rorschach test was gave good answers to this question. In part **(a)** successful candidates described a wide range of the findings from the Rorschach test. Those candidates who did not know what the Rorschach test was, responded with incorrect answers including numerical 'results' and references to IQ or memory test results. Such candidates would have benefited from having seen ink blot tests and to recognise that they produce qualitative data.

Part **(b)** was correspondingly well answered by those who understood the Rorschach test, who could readily suggest flaws such as subjectivity. Some candidates, however, misunderstood the relevance of subjectivity, suggesting that participants would interpret the images differently (the point of the test) rather than that their responses could be interpreted in different ways by the researcher.

Question 14

Billington et al: Few candidates scored well, lacking details such as that there were 60 items in the original and 75 in the SQ-R. Many candidates appeared to misunderstand that the SQ tests only the drive to systemise and many appeared to be referring to the Eyes Test. In part **(a)**, some candidates said it was 'shorter' than the revised version, which is a comparison not a description.

In part **(b)** many candidates offered changes that suggested they were thinking about the revised Eyes Test, rather than reporting differences between the SQ and SQ-R. Most were unaware that both the SQ and SQ-R were 4-item, forced choice tests.

To improve their performance on such questions, candidates should have a clear understanding of how data was collected.

Question 15

Veale and Riley: Part **(a)**, was very poorly answered with very few candidates being able to give any qualitative data and most overlooking the key word 'behaviours' from the question. Instead they tended to quote quantitative data or refer in very general terms to the patients 'spending hours in front of the mirror'. To improve their answers to part **(a)**, candidates needed to be able to distinguish between qualitative and quantitative data and to accurately recall specific examples of behaviours that were described by the participants, rather than quoting the wording of questions (used to collect quantitative data) or writing at length and including material that was irrelevant and therefore not creditworthy.

In part **(b)**, candidates could have given a good answer even if they had been unable to answer part **(a)** but here the answers achieved limited credit. To improve their answers to part **(b)** candidates needed to be able to give an advantage of collecting qualitative data, however brief, and contextualise this to the study, such as by referring to collecting in-depth data (the advantage) and that this helped to understand the reasons behind the behaviour of the BDD patients (the contextualisation).

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Section B

In this section it is important that candidates recognise that the questions are asking for discussion, evaluation or application and, as such, that pure description of a study does not earn credit. To further improve their performance on these questions, candidates should remember that description of their chosen study should be limited to the use of it to illustrate points in their discussion and they need to try to focus their evaluation on the key commands in the question. Although there may be direct questions asking for strengths and or weaknesses of the study itself, many ask the candidate to discuss a particular aspect of the study, such as its sample or procedure, to write about possible applications of the work in the study or to consider the study in a particular way, such as from an ethical viewpoint or the extent to which it supports a debate such as the nature-nurture argument (or, in the case of question 16, a situational explanation). Differences between success on questions 16 and 17 were quite centre-specific suggesting that candidates benefit from having issues such as debates and ethical and practical matters made explicit for every study.

Question 16

Milgram/Haney, Banks and Zimbardo/Rosenhan: In this question, candidates needed to explain the *extent to which* their study provided evidence for a situational explanation. Candidates who chose Milgram or Haney, Banks and Zimbardo were typically able to offer some evidence from their chosen study to support a situational explanation but often struggled to move beyond the middle band. Better answers gave more detail, typically adding either detail about aspects of the situation that were critical in this respect or quoting data and explaining how it supported the situational argument. It was important that this essay also contained a response to 'the extent to which' i.e. that the candidate presented some evidence to suggest that a situational explanation might not have been supported (such as individual differences in the voltage reached by Milgram's participants, the distress of the prisoners and aggression of the guards in Haney, Banks and Zimbardo's study and variations in the length of time that pseudo-patients were detained in Rosenhan's study). The best answers attempted a balance between these two positions and supported both with effective discussion based on details from their chosen study.

Question 17

Freud/Langlois et al/Nelson: This question asked candidates to use their chosen study to discuss the use of children in psychological research. Responses included the full range of available studies. Candidates typically attempted to identify relevant advantages and disadvantages of using children but some simply described the study. This was particularly so of candidates who chose Freud. Better answers use the context of their study to illustrate both advantages and disadvantages of both a practical and ethical nature.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

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 a Section A, 2-mark answer that has the command 'describe', candidates should ensure they provide enough detail to score both marks, rather than a partial, very brief or vague answer. See **Questions 3(b)**, and **9** for example. Detail is not required for questions with the command to 'identify' such as **Question 5(a)**.
- 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. See **Question 13(a)** and **13(b)** for example.
- Candidates should answer *both* parts within the same question and where there are two parts they should ensure both parts are answered. See **Questions 8(a)** and **8(b)**, and **12(a)** for example.
- 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

Hopefully the detail included in this report will help candidates improve even further as it covers information on how to improve examination technique as well as giving comments on specific questions.

Centres need to ensure that they are teaching the correct core studies to ensure that candidates are able to score marks in these areas. Reference to the syllabus will reveal the correct studies, but to draw attention to the two most often confused: The correct study is by Baron-Cohen et al (2001) and not the 1997 study. Similarly for Maguire et al, the correct study is the 1997 paper and not the 2000 study. This confusion caused problems for candidates with **Questions 3(a)**, **3(b)** and **11**.

A minor concern is that candidates still confuse basic command terms such as identify, outline, explain and describe. To identify is simply to name something (worth 1 mark). To outline is to give a brief description (worth 1 mark). To describe or to explain is to give more detail than an outline so the reader has some understanding of what is being described. To identify would provide a term but give no information on what that term means. Explanation and description questions are worth 2 marks as more detail is required.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) There were a number of aims in the study by Mann et al. Following the general mark scheme, one mark was given for a partial answer, such as 'to investigate systematic differences in telling lies' whereas two marks were given for a more full answer such as 'to investigate whether there are systematic differences in behaviour (such as a decrease in gaze aversion) between lying and truth telling'. Full marks could also be obtained for any direct quote from the study, such as 'to examine the behaviour of liars who have lied spontaneously of their own volition, in very high-stake situations: suspects in police custody'. Most candidates scored two marks, often for two partial answers, but a number of candidates did score full marks showing good knowledge and understanding.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 2

(a) In the Loftus and Pickrell study, the sample was an opportunity sample which was obtained by candidates from the University of Washington who were asked to provide a pair of individuals which included both a subject and the subject's relative. Whilst a number of candidates provided this correct description, many candidates incorrectly assumed that the sample was collected by using a newspaper sample and so scored no marks.

(b) This question part asked for one disadvantage of sampling in this way. There were many candidates who followed through from part **(a)** and gave a disadvantage of newspaper sampling. Other candidates wrote about sample bias, where the pair selected may not have been representative. Others wrote about demand characteristics; as the pair would have known the psychology student, this might have made them suspicious about the study.

Question 3

(a) This question asked candidates to describe the shape of the graph for the eyes test scores for the control groups. Most candidates were unable to answer this question even though the graph appears as Fig. 3 on page 245 of the original paper. Many candidates described a graph for the AS/HFA, even though this did not exist, or they mentioned an inverse correlation for the AS/HFA, ignoring the control group (and the question) altogether. A partial mark could be obtained for stating that the shape of the graph followed a normal distribution curve, and full marks for elaboration of some relevant aspect of it.

(b) As always candidates should ensure they provide an answer that will ensure they achieve full marks. For this question many candidates scored 1 mark when giving answers such as 'AS/HFA scored lower on the test'. Many candidates scored full marks for a more detailed answer such as 'AS/HFA scored lower on the eyes test (21.9) compared with the IQ matched controls of Group 4 (30.9)'. Some candidates scored no marks at all when comparing the results for males and females, rather than AS/HFA and controls, and some candidates scored no marks when they referred to participants with Tourette's syndrome (participants in the 1997 study and not the 2001 study used by Cambridge).

Question 4

(a) Like **Question 3(a)** many candidates answered this question incorrectly despite the answer to the question appearing on the original paper (see note 4, page 377). Some candidates simply described the results of the original study. Other candidates suggested that there was less obedience because of the lack of payment. The correct answer is that when Milgram ran the experiment with undergraduates *without payment* he found levels of obedience to be similar to those of the paid participants.

(b) Those candidates who did not know the answer to question part **(a)** often guessed at the answer to this question part too, and most often such candidates guessed incorrectly. As the result of the experiment with unpaid participants was similar to that of those paid, it tells us that the sense of obligation in the original study did not depend on payment and so must have been caused by other factors.

Question 5

(a) Candidates had to identify two items of uniform of the guards, and correct answers included khaki shirt, khaki trousers, whistle, wooden baton/nightstick, and reflecting sunglasses. The majority of candidates were able to do this successfully, scoring full marks. A few candidates described the uniform of the prisoners and scored no marks.

(b) This question part invited candidates to describe the effect the uniform had on the guards. A few candidates interpreted this incorrectly and wrote about the effect of the uniform on the prisoners, but most candidates provided correct answers. Some mentioned that the uniform created a military attitude, sense of authority and power; others looked at how it helped the guards to adopt their role and enjoy it by asking for extra duty. Other candidates, also correctly, mentioned the pathology of power that the uniform helped to create.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 6

(a) A number of candidates misunderstood the wording of this question. The question specifically asked for weaknesses with the way in which observational data *was* collected, and did not ask for alternative ways in which data *could* be gathered.

Those candidates answering correctly mentioned that the view of the observers may have been obscured, or because each observer collected different data there was no inter-rater reliability.

(b) This question part again revealed a difference in marks between those who made a correct suggestion but without elaboration, such as 'record it on CCTV' and those who gave that little more detail such as 'record it on CCTV and then it can be replayed later to check the accuracy of observations'. The former answer scored 1 mark whereas the latter scored the full 2 marks.

Question 7

Candidates were asked for four features of the sample in study 1, and any feature scored 1 mark from a long list of possibilities including: 64, boys, aged 14–15, went to the same school, from Bristol (UK), knew each other well, were in same form/house.

Question 8

(a) Weaker answers were written by candidates who launched directly into giving an example from the study of Little Hans, but better answers were written by those candidates who answered both components of the question by giving an advantage of a case study followed by an example from the study to illustrate that advantage. Candidates providing only an advantage scored just 1 mark.

(b) Answers to this question followed the same pattern as those to part **(a)**. Before answering, candidates should read the question fully and ensure they address both components. For 2 marks the question wanted a disadvantage and an example to support it from this study. Providing only a disadvantage, or only an example, would score just 1 mark.

Question 9

This question wanted an *explanation* of the two levels of the 'motive' variable and was allocated four marks. Two crucial components **in the question** told candidates that some detail **was needed** in the answer: it asked candidates to 'explain', so an explanation was required **in addition to** identification for the allocation of 4 marks rather than **just** 2 marks. This meant that those candidates writing nothing more than 'good and bad motive' scored 2 marks. On the one hand this appears to be generous, but these are the two correct answers and it means that such candidates were better than those incorrectly identifying 'motive implicit/motive explicit. For the full two marks **per motive,** candidates needed to go on to write what both the good motive and bad motive actually involved. It was pleasing to see many candidates do exactly this, but frustrating that so many others lost out on valuable marks.

Question 10

(a) In the Dement and Kleitman study, eye movements were recorded by placing two or more electrodes near the eyes which were attached to an EEG with wires to record the corneo-retinal potential (electrical activity as the eyes move). Candidates including any two components from the above sentence scored 2 marks, and any one feature just 1 mark. Eye movement was not recorded by an observer sitting next to the participant as some candidates believed.

(b) In the Dement and Kleitman study, brain waves were recorded in exactly the same way as for eye movements except that electrodes were placed on the scalp and the EEG recorded the electrical activity of the brain. As for part **(a)**, any two features scored 2 marks and any one feature 1 mark unless the features were the same as those in part **(a)**. This means that a full 4 marks could not be awarded for 'electrodes connected with wires to an EEG machine' stated twice.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 11

This question wanted any four controls from the 1997 study by Maguire et al. Some candidates incorrectly wrote about controls from the 2001 study by Maguire and some candidates appeared not to know what a control actually is. Encouragingly, most candidates did score 4 marks out of 4 for including controls such as: the following of the same procedure, that they were all male, all from London, all were licensed, all had at least three years' experience, and were all blindfolded. Any other appropriate control also scored a mark.

Question 12

(a) This question asked for two things: firstly to identify the experimental design that was used (1 mark) and then to outline (or briefly describe) that design (also 1 mark).

Many candidates correctly identified that a repeated measures design was used, which is where all the participants do all conditions. Some candidates went on to give an example from the study. Many candidates suggested it was an independent design and some candidates did not know the concept of experimental design. All experiments have a design and this is an important concept to know and understand.

(b) If candidates did not know the experimental design then they could not give an advantage of it in this question part. Those candidates knowing this design wrote that an advantage is that it helps to control participant variables, reducing individual differences and meaning that the dependent variable is more likely to be due to the independent variable.

Question 13

(a) Although many candidates scored full marks on this question, some scored no marks because they described what the pseudo-patients *did* and this meant they repeated the same answer in question part **(b)**. Candidates are always advised to read both part **(a)** and part **(b)** before beginning to answer any Section A question. Correct answers, scoring 1 mark each, mentioned that: all the pseudo-patients were sane; there were 8 of them; that there were three women and five men; and that they had a range of different occupations.

(b) Most candidates also scored maximum marks here, most including the crucial aspects of telephoning the hospital for an appointment and claiming they were hearing voices.

Question 14

(a) Most candidates were able to provide an explanation of the term 'self report', which is where a participant provides data about themselves to the researcher, and in this study this was done in the form of a questionnaire about systemising and empathising.

(b) Candidates were asked to give the results of the SQ-R for males and females. There is no direct male/female comparison for SQ-R, so giving candidates more flexibility in their answer. One answer could be '66% of males were categorised as either Type S or Extreme Type S compared to 28.8% of females' or similarly '36.8% of females were categorized as Type E or Extreme Type E compared to males at 10.3%'. Another possible answer was 'female physical SQ-R mean of 61.23 compared with male physical SQ-R mean of 65.46'; or similarly 'female humanities SQ-R mean of 51.54 compared with male humanities SQ-R mean of 58.65'.

Question 15

There were many conclusions that could have been drawn from the study by Veale and Riley, and many candidates did this with little difficulty and so scored all four marks. There were two main mistakes made by candidates that scored no marks. The first was to write about the list of 9 points that the BDD patients were encouraged to develop. There were recommendations for the future and not conclusions from the study itself. The second was the giving of a *result* rather than a conclusion. For example the writing of '84.6% of BDD patients compared with 29.6% of controls reported a long mirror session each day' is what was found; it is not a conclusion.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 16

This question part wanted two strengths of one of the named studies. There were four types of answer: **(i)** Some candidates did not answer the question about strengths, instead describing the study in its entirety. If the Examiner could not identify any strength then no mark could be awarded. **(ii)** Some candidates wrote about significantly more than two strengths, and often there were seven or eight present. As marks could only be awarded for two, then two in detail was a much better strategy than a large number each in a few sentences. **(iii)** Some candidates gave both strengths and weaknesses. Credit was given for the strengths, but not for the weaknesses. **(iv)** Some candidates answered the question set and the strengths chosen varied according to the chosen study. For the study by Thigpen and Cleckley strengths were often the qualitative data that could be gathered and the longitudinal nature of the study; for the Maguire et al and Schachter and Singer studies, the main strengths related to the experimental method and the types of data that were gathered. For the candidates choosing two strengths there were some superb answers which described the strength and then gave one or more examples from the study in support.

Question 17

This question invited candidates to discuss the strengths of using animals compared to humans using a named study (Held and Hein, Bandura et al or Langlois et al) as an example. As was common with **Question 16** there were candidates who did not answer the question correctly. The worst answers were by those candidates who merely described the study. Those who chose the Langlois et al or Bandura et al study scored no marks for any mention of animals. Those choosing to describe the Held and Hein kitten carousel mentioned animals but failed to refer to humans. At the top end of the range some answers were a pleasure to read with many candidates showing their ability by discussing animals versus humans using a wide range of different points (e.g. ethics, developmental differences, communication similarities and differences) and using relevant examples to support the points being made.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/13

Core Studies 1

General comments

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as aims, samples, procedures, results, conclusions and various aspects of evaluation such as criticism and applications.

The majority of candidates 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 studies than the one required). It is pleasing to see that, almost without exception, candidates are answering two questions in ***Section B*** as required and that the essays written by many candidates focus on evaluation rather than description.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Mann et al: This question required a description of two differences between truth-telling and lying behaviours. Although many candidates gained credit for stating relative levels of blinking and pausing when lying and truth-telling, very few were able to go beyond this in terms of description. The easiest way to improve their answers would have been for candidates to state quantitative results – and these are central findings to the study. Many also ignored the clear statement in Mann et al's paper that there were no (significant) differences in some behaviours, and reported 'differences' in these - such as gaze aversion.

Question 2

Baron-Cohen et al: Part **(a)** of this question asked candidates to identify two tests from the WAIS-R used with the AS/HFA group. Although this required a simple answer, the name of any two of the four tests used, candidates were unable to give correct responses. They mainly offered tests from the Billington et al study.

Part **(b)** was answered a little better by candidates, with a few knowing that the average IQ of the AS/HFA group was 115 but fewer knowing that this was the same as the controls and was within the normal range, which was sufficient to gain full marks.

Question 3

Held and Hein: Part **(a)** of this question asked candidates what was already known about human visual adaptation before Held and Hein's study. This information is in the introduction to the paper and explains why it was necessary to conduct the study, so is important context for the aims. Few candidates were able to say either that adaptation requires movement-produced sensory feedback although some gave an alternative answer, that perception reverts to normal after adaptation, which was creditworthy.

Part **(b)** of this question required candidates to explain whether the results for baby animals were the same or different and candidates were typically able to say 'the same' (or 'similar') but were unable to expand on this response. Occasional candidates gave accurate, succinct answers, suggesting that the kittens respond just like people in visual rearrangement studies, because they both need visual stimulation which is linked to natural movement.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 4

Milgram: Part **(a)** of this question was well answered, with candidates typically choosing to describe the apparatus of the shock generator and detailing aspects such as the switches labelled in 15V steps or the written labels associated with some shock levels. Alternative answers included the wires attached to the learner and the tape recording of the noises from the learner. A small number of candidates described the *procedure* instead of the *apparatus*: it is important that candidates understand the difference between these basic terms.

Part **(b)**: asked why the apparatus the candidate had described was necessary. Again, many candidates scored well on this question, mainly by suggesting that the shock generator was needed to measure the DV of obedience. Some were able to expand on this to explain that the situation needed to be valid and therefore the machine needed to look real. Some candidates expressed this idea in terms of ecological validity, although some were unable to explain the term in a way that was relevant to the study. Those who did so typically referred to the situation replicating (in a controlled way) killing of people in order to test Milgram's 'Germans are different' hypothesis.

Question 5

Haney, Banks and Zimbardo: This question was well answered. In part **(a)** candidates were required to describe how the participants were informed and misinformed. Candidates were able to give a range of appropriate responses, such as information about having to be at home on a given Sunday, that they would be assigned to prisoner or guard roles or that the guards would maintain control and misinformation such as about the aim or the nature of the arrest of 'prisoners'. Weak answers simply repeated from the question that it was a prison simulation or described aspects of the results, such as the effects the study had on the participants.

Part **(b)** of this question required candidates to explain an advantage of deceiving participants and again candidates offered good answers. Partial responses simply suggested that it reduced demand characteristics. Those who gained full marks offered detail about why naivety is important, for example, (although not necessarily) by relating their answer to this study.

Question 6

Tajfel: Part **(a)** of this question asked for two controls, and was generally answered well. The majority of candidates were able to offer an example from the study, such as the groups being divided into groups randomly or the boys working separately, although some were only able to offer one control.

Part **(b)** asked for a problem with controls, and also produced good answers, typically stating that this could reduce ecological validity. Again, the best answers were able to expand on this, for example, by explaining that behaviour might be less natural if the situation is obviously artificial.

Question 7

Bandura et al: Part **(a)** of this question asked for the meaning of a 'matched pairs design'. Very few candidates were able to answer this question, although some were able to describe that the children were assessed for their pre-existing aggression levels (i.e. matched on a criterion that was important to the study) and that this measure was used to divide them between groups (i.e. for allocation to groups).

In part **(b)**, which asked for an advantage of matched pairs designs, candidates typically gave good answers, suggesting that they were aware of the idea of a matched pairs design, but were unable to define it. Indeed, this was evident in some cases as candidates occasionally gave a correct answer to part **(a)** in their response to part **(b)**. Where candidates did not score full marks they could have improved their answers by indicating that it was important to know that the differences in the children's aggression were the consequence of the IV (the model type or gender) rather than simply because they had been different from the beginning. To expand this, candidates could have illustrated how this is better than an independent groups design (where this could be due to individual differences) or that it is better than a repeated measures design (because the children would not be exposed to two different conditions – or models – and risk order effects).

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 8

Freud:

In this question candidates had to describe two pieces of evidence that supported Freud's view that Hans was a 'little Oedipus'. Candidates typically gave suitably detailed accounts of evidence such as the giraffe episode, his fear of horses and Freud's explanation, and Hans wanting to be touched by his mother. Those candidates who did not gain marks tended to offer only interpretation, rather than the evidence on which it was based, for example, saying that Hans was 'in love' with his mother, without illustrating the evidence on which Freud based this conclusion as required by the question.

Question 9

Langlois et al: Candidates gave some excellent, detailed descriptions of the stimuli including that there were men and women in the photographs, that their clothing was masked and that the men were clean shaven. Those candidates who did not earn full marks often made the mistake of referring to the IVs rather than the features of the stimuli, or described the participants themselves instead of the faces in the photographs. In addition, some candidates appeared to be confusing the study with Dematte et al.

Question 10

Nelson: Part **(a)** of this question asked candidates how 'goodness' was judged in the study and many were able to describe the 'smiley faces' scale often including good detail such as the sizes and labels. Some candidates provide appropriate drawings, which were creditworthy.

In part **(b)** candidates were asked for an advantage of this type of scale and typically gave good answers, suggesting a range of possibilities such as that they were easy to understand (so more valid than word-based tests for children) or that they provided quantitative data (which would be more objective or easier to analyse).

Question 11

Dement and Kleitman: Answers here were generally poor. In part **(a)**, asking candidates to use quantitative data to explain the results, many did not know the numerical results – which are just four numbers and are central to the study. Furthermore, some candidates offered qualitative results as justification, suggesting that these individuals did not know the differences between qualitative and quantitative data – an important distinction. To improve their answers here candidates need to learn the results of the study, and to be aware that, even if they cannot remember the exact numbers they should describe the relative scores in each case, for example that more participants estimated both 5 and 15 minutes correctly, than estimated them incorrectly.

There were some good answers to part **(b)**, with candidates typically saying that an advantage is the objectivity of the EEG as a measure of REM sleep making it valid, for 2 marks. Some candidates were able to gain credit here simply because they knew what an EEG was and could say that it enabled accurate comparisons to be made between dream durations.

Question 12

Maguire et al: In part **(a)**, candidates were typically able to identify what the PET scan did, or was used for, at a basic level. To improve their answers here, candidates could have gone on to say that measuring areas of brain activity/where energy is being used, enables the researchers to localise functions to specific parts of the brain.

Candidates typically did not score full marks on part **(b)** of this question, which asked about the other brain scan used in the study. Although many were able to state that an MRI was also used, few candidates knew that this was used to map the PET scans onto images of brain structure. This is perhaps because they were unaware of the fundamental difference in nature of the two types of scan. They needed to know that PET scans are good at detecting *activity* but that the exact *location* of that activity on the scan is not clear whereas a standard MRI produces a very high resolution *image* of the structures of the brain *without* any information about activity. The two therefore complement each other.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 13

Demattè et al: this was a simple question requiring four individual pieces of information about the sample and candidates demonstrated that they knew the study in a good level of detail, with many providing sufficient detail for full marks.

Question 14

Rosenhan: This question triggered a wide range of responses from candidates explaining the possible reasons for the pseudo-patients' admissions. The weakest simply stated that the pseudo-patients had pretended to hear voices, and better answers extended this to explain that in cases of doubt it was safer to risk a false diagnosis than to leave a sick person undiagnosed. Alternative explanations suggested that such behaviour would not be expected, i.e. that sane people do not normally arrange appointments and present with a symptom or, with reference to Rosenhan's conclusion, that in the context of a mental health institution clinicians could not tell the sane from the insane.

Question 15

Thigpen and Cleckley: In part **(a)** successful candidates were able to describe evidence such as Eve's shopping trip or the letter. Other suitable data included that from interviews and from hypnosis although less successful candidates simply named or described these methods without reporting any evidence. Those candidates who did not gain full marks needed to be aware that *any* non-test data is anecdotal, so they may have known some relevant material but did not offer it in answer to the question.

Section B

In this section it is important that candidates recognise that the questions are asking for discussion, evaluation or application and that pure description of a study does not earn credit. To further improve their performance on these questions, candidates should remember that description of their chosen study should be limited to the use of it to illustrate points in their discussion and they need to try to focus their evaluation on the key commands in the question. Although there may be direct questions asking for strengths and/or weaknesses of the study itself, many ask the candidate to discuss a particular aspect of the study, such as its sample, procedure, results or conclusion (as in the case of **Question 17**) or to consider the study in a particular way, such as from an ethical viewpoint, the extent to which it supports a debate such as the nature-nurture argument or, as in the case of **Question 16**, to write about possible applications of the work in the study.

Question 16

Loftus and Pickrell/Schacter and Singer/Billington et al: In this question, candidates needed to evaluate their chosen study in terms of its *usefulness/applications*. The most popular choices were Lofus and Pickrell and Billington et al and many candidates tackling these were able to offer some examples from their chosen study to support their comments about usefulness. Many, however, found it difficult to move beyond the middle band. Better answers gave more detail of the suggested applications as well as offering more relevant details from the study. The best answers did this *and* offered suggestions both supporting and contradicting the usefulness of the study. Good essays often contained imaginative ideas for how the knowledge gained from the study might be used, such as using evidence from Billington et al to enable boys and girls to do better in school (with suitable explanations of how this might be achieved) and to check that university candidates are suited to their choice of course.

Question 17

Piliavin et al/Freud/Veale and Riley: This question asked candidates to discuss the use of qualitative data using their chosen study. Most responses used Freud, probably because this study collected the most qualitative data. However, since the question was asking candidates to *discuss*, it was important that they considered both the advantages and disadvantages of qualitative data, so any of the studies could have been used successfully. Candidates typically attempted to identify relevant advantages and disadvantages from the study, but some merely described the data collected, which did not earn marks. Better answers used the context of their study effectively to illustrate both advantages and disadvantages, for example referring to detail, validity and usefulness as advantages and subjectivity, a lack of reliability, potential sources of bias and the lack of statistical analysis as disadvantages.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/21

Core Studies

Key Messages

Section A

Question 1

Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in **part b**. 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 are made aware of all of the issues and debates in psychology as well as appropriate strengths and weaknesses. Candidates seemed very uncertain about what was meant by individual differences and the strengths and weaknesses of this approach. 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 entire range of the mark spectrum. Some candidates provided excellent answers which showed that they were very well prepared and a few 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 best of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually achieved 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.

Individual Questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) Candidates were able to describe different types of experiments. Most named both laboratory and field experiments and could give some accurate descriptions of what they involved. A few named quasi/natural experiments and some were aware that this involved no manipulation of the IV. Many wrote very long responses outlining both strengths and weaknesses of these methods which achieved no marks. A number of candidates also described other methods such as self-report and case study which also received no credit.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

(b) Most candidates correctly described a study in the natural environment and were able to give details of how obedience would be tested and measured. There was a variety of different ideas given by Centres ranging from going into Schools, hospitals and in traffic. Most focused on measuring some type of obedience and often collected data via observation.

However, many candidates designed very inappropriate and unethical studies that were at times disturbing to read. Examples ranged from replicating the Holocaust, killing kittens, shooting suspected criminals, locking children in a dark room and not letting them out, abusing terrorists, shocking people as in the original Milgram study and sacking employees from their place of work.

Some candidates achieved lower marks due to insufficient detail for replication too. It would appear that candidates understood the question but had not had enough experience in the use of practical and ethical research methodologies in psychology to apply them appropriately to answering this question.

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**.

(c) The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points. Most were able to give both ethical and methodological issues in their response. Those achieving higher marks often referred to validity, reliability, types of data and the potential for different forms of bias.

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 2

(a) Candidates did understand what is meant by application to everyday life. They were either able to identify that it referred to usefulness or the ecological validity of the research. Many gave brief responses which were just partial answers and received one mark.

(b) This question seemed to challenge many candidates, with some being able to identify how BDD patients were different to normal participants but often failed to write sufficient detail about the mirror gazing behaviour and emotions to gain more than one mark. Where some of the candidates achieved higher marks it was for mentioning how different the BDD participants were within themselves and within the group. Details of the study were often missing.

(c) Candidates also found this question quite challenging and most just evaluated the Veale and Riley study. As a result of this there were many points that are not relevant to individual differences so these were not given credit. This meant very few candidates were able to identify at least two strengths and two weaknesses to achieve over 6 marks.

Some gave very good examples to back up their points but found it difficult to give examples for every point and therefore sometimes had no examples for the weaknesses. This led to achieving no more than 4 out of the available 10 marks.

(d) Candidates found it difficult to focus on the question. Most described the many uses of the Veale and Riley study and did not discuss the usefulness of the study. Some just described what the study found and therefore implied this might be useful to society.

In order to achieve above 4 marks, candidates must discuss the impact of the issues surrounding application of research. Some candidates were able to do this and mainly focused on the generalisability of the sample and also the subjective nature of the data collected.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Section B

Question 3

(a) Most candidates did achieve well with this question using terms such as thought processes and thinking skills. Some elaborated further by referring to perception or providing a study to demonstrate the cognitive process under study. Candidates often referred to Mann et al or sometimes Loftus and Palmer.

(b) Candidates were able to access some marks on this question but often struggled to focus on cognitive processes studied. Many gave details of the procedures of the studies rather than cognitive processes and received no credit for this type of response. Most had a basic understanding of what was investigated by psychologists in the three named studied but failed to give any depth to their answer and achieved fewer marks overall.

(c) Candidates were able to discuss advantages in this section of their essay but did not refer back to any core study so could not achieve full marks.

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.

Question 4

(a) Many candidates could achieve at least one mark for this question by mentioning that qualitative data is detailed and/or in-depth. Unfortunately many also stated what was *not* meant by qualitative data such as it being non numerical or not being counted. Many examples were given but candidates need to be aware that all methods used to collect data in psychology, other than open ended questions, can collect both qualitative and quantitative data. In addition to this, opinions and feelings can also be collected from both qualitative and quantitative data.

(b) Many candidates did very well in their response to this question. The vast majority focused on how the data was collected and some could give examples of this data.

However, many spent too much time describing the details of the procedure of the studies and this was not creditworthy. Many also described general features of the data collected rather than the data itself. For example, in the Haney, Banks and Zimbardo study many referred to collecting data about pathology of power rather than giving a detailed example of this (e.g. how the guards woke the prisoners in the middle of the night and made them do the 'count' which could last for hours). A few did give good examples, but found it difficult to do this consistently for all three named studies.

(c) For this question, candidates need to identify and discuss three points with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many chose to discuss the problems with being unable to do statistical analysis on the data and/or compare groups of participants, bias in interpretation of data and demand characteristics. More able candidates did focus on issues such as validity and reliability. Some just focused on one issue and were only able to achieve a maximum mark of 3 out of the available 9 marks for this question. Several gave brief descriptions of each problem with no mention of a core study and therefore only achieved one mark per point up to a maximum of three points.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22

Core Studies 2

KEY MESSAGES

Section A

Question 1

Candidates need to know each research method in depth (five points) to enable them to tackle questions in this section. They need to suggest simple alternatives to the original study in **part (b)** covering what, how, who, where and when. Extended evaluative points linked to their own study from **part (b)** are necessary in **part (c)** to gain full marks. There were a number of unethical studies for **1(b)**.

Question 2

It is important for candidates to know how each study is linked to the methodology and data presentation, so for this examination, the qualitative element of Haney, Banks and Zimbardo. For **part (b)**, candidates need to present actual findings rather than conclusions from the study. For **part (c)**, candidates need to evaluate the use of qualitative data with Haney, Banks and Zimbardo as an example throughout. Also, to gain 7+ marks candidates need to write about two strengths and two weaknesses as a minimum. For **part (d)**, candidates need to discuss how far the findings of Haney, Banks and Zimbardo are useful in everyday life.

Section B

Candidates must focus their answers in **part (b)** to what feature(s) the question is asking (in this examination, data collection) rather than just writing in general about the study. Candidates need to make three separate points in **part (c)** *and* have evidence from studies for each to gain full marks.

General Comments

The marks achieved by the candidates sitting this examination covered the entire range of possible scores but with only a few gaining top-end marks. Some candidates provided a range of excellent answers to many of the questions and could explain psychological terminology well showing they had prepared themselves well for this paper.

Time management looked good for the majority of candidates. There was some evidence that candidates who over-answered **Question 3(b)** or **4(b)** wrote much shorter answers for **3(c)** or **4(c)** as a result. This could also have been true for **Question 1(b)**. Candidates need to ensure they have enough time to answer all questions to the best of their ability.

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

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to both ***Section A*** *and* ***Section B*** as there is no choice with these questions. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in **part (c)** of their ***Section B*** essays to achieve the higher marks available. **Question 3** and **Question 4** were chosen in roughly equal amounts with neither proving to be better answered in the main.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) The vast majority of candidates could access as least two marks for this question usually by stating sample size and the longitudinal nature of case studies. Some could access more marks by writing about additional features of a case study such as in-depth/rich and giving an example of a real case study. However, a large majority of candidates wrote evaluation points here that could not gain credit.

(b) There was a wide variety of ideas given by candidates on how to examine false memories using a case study. Many candidates could appropriately state the sample size of one participant or a family unit but many simply created a different experiment with a large sample size which could only gain partial credit. Candidates usually did well outlining the 'who' (when the correct sample size of one was used), the 'what' (a specific false memory) and the 'how' (e.g. interviewing). Many candidates did not tackle the 'when' (the length of the study) or the 'where' elements of the overall study so could not gain the top band. There were a minority of highly unethical studies presented in this answer – this is a psychology examination and the candidates must think like a professional psychologist when designing these studies.

(c) Many candidates could highlight one or two evaluative points about their own study designed in **Question 1(b)**. Common points made were about the sample used, the unethical nature of a study about false memories and how the data were collected. A large number of candidates evaluated their study on ethical grounds at the expense of practical issues which meant they only got partial credit for their answers. A sizeable portion of candidates made a series of brief points linked to their own design to gain more marks. Some candidates evaluated aspects generically to gain just minimal credit as they had not linked them specifically to their own study.

Question 2

(a) Some candidates clearly knew what qualitative data was and gained full marks. However, there were a number of candidates who did not answer the question set, instead to choosing to say what qualitative is *not* rather than what it *is.*

(b) Many candidates could not provide a qualitative finding from the Haney, Banks and Zimbardo study. Instead, they wrote about *how* qualitative data were collected or gave a conclusion, for example, pathological prisoner syndrome. A finding is a result that the research team provided *before* they analysed it to see what it could mean. Some candidates could provide a finding but even some of these answers provided more than one qualitative finding.

(c) Many candidates attempted this question and gained some credit. There was evidence of a small minority of candidates evaluating Haney, Banks and Zimbardo in general and these could only gain credit if the answer was linked to qualitative data. Many candidates could give some strengths and weaknesses of qualitative data but then failed to use the Haney et al study as examples of these strengths and weaknesses so gained partial credit. Therefore, it would appear that some candidates did not understand '...using Haney, Banks and Zimbardo's study as an example'.

(d) A minority of candidates appeared to understand the '...extent to which...' portion of this question and gave some excellent answers as to how Haney, Banks and Zimbardo's findings could be used in everyday life. Candidates appeared prepared to discuss the study and its limitations but then did not discuss the extent these limitations affect everyday life applications. Many candidates used it as a way of simply evaluating the study again. Candidates need to discuss *how* the findings *could* be used in everyday life.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 3

(a) Many candidates could make reference to something from the social approach (e.g. groups) to score one mark. There were candidates who appeared to confuse social and behavioural approaches to psychology or claimed it is about 'social behaviour' which could not gain credit.

(b) There were many very good answers to this question, as candidates could pick out the necessary aspects of each study that showed how data were collected. Specific details about each study in terms of the actual data were crucial to gain the 3 marks per study. Milgram tended to be well answered with candidates knowing both qualitative and quantitative data collected. This was also true for Piliavin et al with many showing very good knowledge of the study. However, as with previous examinations, there were candidates who gave very long answers here that covered all of the study rather than focusing on what the question was asking – in this case, data collection – and this wasted time. The weakest answers related to the Tajfel study, where candidates tended to focus on other methodological aspects rather than the data collection specifically.

(c) Some candidates could only manage brief answers here which could indicate they were not well prepared, or that they had run out of time to write a more detailed response. Many candidates could at least outline some disadvantages like ethics and sampling and some then used a study to elaborate on the disadvantage. However, only a few candidates then went on to relate studies to all disadvantages so 3+3+3 was quite rare. Some candidates are making the same points repeatedly and gaining only 3 marks in total – this is the maximum you can score per advantage written about. This is especially true with ethical issues.

Question 4

(a) Candidates appeared to know what quantitative data was and were able to give an example to gain the second mark, or elaborate on the idea that it is numerical. There were very few answers that did not to appear to understand quantitative data.

(b) Candidates appeared to know the three studies well with only Langlois proving troublesome for some. A good proportion of candidates could easily pick out at least one aspect of each study that was quantitative data. For Dement and Kleitman, candidates appeared to know how data was collected throughout the study but some did write about all data instead of having a focus on quantitative as the question asked. Candidates, in the main, appeared well prepared for the Mann et al study too and knew what aspects the observers were looking for in the participants. Langlois was the weakest for this question with many candidates simply writing out the whole procedure without a focus on what the quantitative data were. If a candidate did not cover all three studies this was the one that tended to be omitted which could indicate it had not been studied by some candidates. However, as with previous examinations, there are candidates who give very long answers here that cover all of the study rather than having a focus on what the question is asking – in this case, quantitative data collection – and this wastes time.

(c) A significant proportion of candidates could only manage brief answers here which could indicate they were not well prepared *or* that they had run out of time to write a more detailed response. Many candidates could outline at least one problem related to collecting quantitative data, with lack of detail and reductionist being popular choices. Only a minority of candidates could make three separate points and fewer could relate all to a study in order to gain the maximum of 3 marks per point made. As with **3(c)**, some candidates made the same point several times using different studies (especially about validity) but this could still only score the maximum of 3 marks for one well-made point with evidence.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/23

Core Studies

Key Messages

Section A

Question 1

It is important that candidates are made aware of the issues in psychology as many were unable to define a laboratory experiment in **part a**. Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in **part b**. 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 are made aware of all of the issues and debates in psychology as sometimes all candidates from a Centre did not know what was meant by reliability and validity. 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 lower end of the mark spectrum. A few candidates provided good answers which showed that they were very well prepared and a few 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 best of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually achieved 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 equally chosen by candidates.

Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) 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. Most described Nelson in some detail and could achieve a mark by

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

mentioning the groups the participants were placed in by the researchers. No credit was given to strengths and weaknesses of the laboratory experimental method.

(b) Most candidates correctly described a field experiment and understood this type of study takes place in the natural environment. Many described an alternative study taking place in a playground 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**.

(c) The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points. Most were able to give both ethical and methodological 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 2

(a) Candidates generally did very well in this question and were able to clearly explain what is meant by ethical issues. A few gave brief responses which were just partial answers and received one mark.

(b) Most candidates were able to access some marks here by showing an awareness that the kittens were not harmed in the long term by participating in this study.

Some did discuss how ethical issues were broken in the study and achieved one mark as this showed an understanding of the issue but not how it was addressed by Held and Hein.

(c) The vast majority of candidates did receive some marks on this question by discussing general points with the study and some of these were relevant to the issues of reliability and validity.

A few gave more advanced responses and did understand the terminology and could apply these issues to the study.

Many confused the two terms and gave muddled responses.

(d) There were many good answers given in response to this question and some interesting points raised about the application of ethical issues to animals. Candidates all understood the differences between applying these issues to humans compared to animals. Many discussed harming participants and there was a variety of responses in terms of whether this was acceptable. Some also discussed other issues such as consent and debrief that are not possible with animals.

The main area of weakness in candidates responses was not giving developed responses and referring back specifically to the Held and Hein study throughout their response. A few were able to do this and did achieve higher marks for their answers.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Section B

Question 3

(a) Most candidates were able to achieve at least one mark as they were aware that 'generalisations' refers to applying results to a wider population. Some did give more detailed responses and referred to sample.

(b) Many candidates struggled with this question as they had been taught the incorrect Baron-Cohen study and Maguire study. Centres must ensure the correct studies are taught as both sets of researchers have done a wide variety of research on autism and topographical knowledge and the brain. Some were able to access marks by giving a brief description of the study that did happen to mention a generalisation. Answers were often very brief.

(c) Candidates were able to discuss problems in this section of their essay but did not refer back to any core study so could not achieve full marks.

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 4

(a) Candidates did show a good understanding of this term and many achieved full marks.

(b) Some candidates did achieve well in their answers to this question. They were aware of how data was collected in the studies and could describe these in their responses. Often the answers were somewhat brief and did not give full details of data collection. These responses often achieved 2 marks out of the possible 3.

(c) For this question, candidates need to identify and discuss three points with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many chose to discuss the problems with accessing a good and varied sample, time and cost implications and practical issues in dealing with a different culture. Some just focused on one issue and were only able to achieve a maximum mark of 3 out of the available 9 marks for this question. Several gave brief descriptions of each problem with no mention of a core study and therefore only achieved one mark per point up to a maximum of three points.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

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 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 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 candidates correctly used string to tie together their answer pages. However, pages should be tied loosely so an Examiner could turn and read each page.

A number of candidates answer questions out of order. This is not a problem within an option, but mixing questions from different options (**Question 1**, **Question 5**, **Question 2**, **Question 7**, etc.) makes marking and administration more complex. Candidates should leave a space or complete each option on a different answer booklet.

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)

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 and confusing the two will score no marks. Evaluation 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 can often be divided into three types:
- those who evaluate using a number of issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- those who focus exclusively on the named issue or exclude it altogether (and have marks restricted);
- those who do not evaluate at all (and score no marks).

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

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. There is a fundamental difference between these two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. To suggest is to go beyond description and to think about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. If these two requirements are adhered to then many more candidates will score more marks. A second important point to make is that marks for description are allocated as either 6 marks for one piece of evidence, or 3 marks each for two pieces of evidence. The amount of detail written should reflect this mark allocation.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

(a) This question part asked candidates about types of intelligence. A few candidates were unaware that there are different types of intelligence and some just referred to what was often labelled 'IQ intelligence'. For full marks, candidates needed to show awareness of different types, and one of the simplest ways to do this is to give examples. In some answers 'type' was defined, and combining this with examples resulted in very good answers like 'types of intelligence can be classified according to characteristics for example Gardner's musical intelligence and linguistic intelligence'.

(b) Following on from part **(a)**, a few candidates wrote only about 'IQ intelligence' and often scored 2 marks out of the available 4. Other candidates knew about different types in detail and used either Goleman's emotional intelligence and one of Gardner's types, or used two of Gardner's nine different types. A question asking for two types when there are at least eleven different types made this a question that was accessible for every candidate.

Question 2

(a) There were three types of answer written in response to this question. There were those candidates who knew nothing about perspectives on learning, writing anecdotally about the children in classrooms. Secondly there were those who knew about perspectives and wrote very good answers, but failed to extend the basics to education. For example a candidate would write about the work of Pavlov (on dogs) and Skinner (on pigeons) but failed to write about how these applied to humans or how it is applied in a classroom. Finally there were those candidates who scored the highest marks, who considered a number of different perspectives, included the basics, and considered how the perspective applied in a classroom. Most impressive was the range of different aspects referred to, such as disruptive behaviour in addition to learning itself.

(b) Candidates had to evaluate different perspectives on learning and specifically to contrast two perspectives. Some candidates described more of what they had included in question part **(a)** and were not able to score any marks for such descriptions. Other candidates evaluated each approach and as is mentioned for other options, this is not the most effective strategy (see **Question 14 (b)** for example). A contrast (or comparison) is a high level skill but one which any psychology candidate should possess. A contrast is to look at two (or more) things and say how they are different. A comparison is to look at two (or more) things and say how they are similar. For this question, describing one perspective followed by a description of another is merely two descriptions and not a comparison or contrast.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 3

(a) Questions like this allow the candidate the freedom to suggest investigating the given problem posed in the question with a method of their choice. Logically candidates suggest a method that is appropriate, but this is not always the case. For example, it was suggested that a questionnaire be used and the children asked 'which teaching approach would you prefer'. Whilst this suggestion did show some methodological knowledge it is not as effective as those suggesting an experiment with children being taught using a cognitive approach for a few months and then by a humanistic approach for a few months (the independent variable). At the end of the experiment a test could then be given (the dependent variable) to determine which of the two approaches was better.

(b) Most candidates had little difficulty in scoring top marks in response to this question. Many described the basic principles of the humanistic approach including the work of Maslow and Rogers and most applied this to education. A small number of candidates appeared to be taking the Organisations option and described Maslow's theory in relation to motivation at work.

Question 4

(a) Answers in response to this question were split between those candidates who could not answer the question or did not read the whole of the question fully before starting to write, and those candidates who wrote superb answers full of appropriate methodology and a good understanding of teaching styles and disruptive behaviour. For the former types of candidate answers often described a cause of disruptive behaviour, or a poor teaching style, with no attempt to address the requirements of the question. The better answers used a field experiment where 'good' and 'poor' styles could be tested with a covert observation to assess which of the two resulted in more or less disruptive behaviour.

(b) As mentioned, there were candidates who described a teaching style in part **(a)** and then found that this question part also asked for a description of a teaching style. A few candidates described a poor style in part **(a)** and a good style in part **(b)** and often made the assumption that a formal style is poor and an informal style is good. A few candidates incorrectly wrote about learning styles and were not able to score any marks for these answers. Better answers specified a teaching style, such as formal or informal, and then not only described it, but also explained why the style was good or less good. For example, Bennett suggests that a formal style is better for younger candidates when learning to read and write.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

(a) Many candidates scored maximum marks when answering this question because they provided good explanations of non-verbal communication (e.g. communicating through wordless messages) and linking this to the patient-practitioner relationship. Some candidates listed the features of NVC provided by Argyle, which was impressive, but sometimes failed to score full marks because there was no mention of the doctor-patient relationship.

(b) Most candidates chose to describe the study by McKinstry and Wang because that is the study identified in the syllabus and one that is most concerned with non-verbal communication and the patient-practitioner relationship. Answers covered the whole mark range with some candidates unable to write more than a sentence or two through to those who wrote more than two sides of A4 examination paper. Such answers often received full marks, but so did the answers that were approx. 3/4 of a page. It is always recommended that candidates write an amount appropriate to the mark allocation for the particular question. Answers scoring top marks often summarised the whole study and, as this was a field experiment using a questionnaire, emphasised the relevant methodological aspects.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 6

(a) There were a large number of answers written were full of psychological knowledge and which showed good understanding of the topic area, scoring maximum marks. Following the syllabus candidates frequently organised their answers into causes/sources, measures and the management of stress. However, many candidates wrote about everything included on the syllabus and produced answers that were far too long, causing them time problems later on. Candidates should be selective in what they include; they do not need everything to achieve a maximum mark. At the bottom end of the mark range were anecdotal answers showing little knowledge of psychology.

(b) Candidates needed to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about stress and include a discussion of the use of scientific equipment to measure stress. A few candidates did not evaluate at all, simply choosing to describe more information about stress. Answers like this were not able to score any marks. Some candidates did not write anything about scientific equipment whilst many others did, using various examples to write about the objectivity and reliability along with the quantitative data such scientific measures produce.

Question 7

(a) Most candidates answering this question were able to describe the specificity theory of pain accurately. Although answers were not detailed, this did not detract from marks simply because it is not possible to give extensive detail about this theory. Marks were allocated for accuracy and clarity of the description. A small number of candidates chose to describe the gate control theory and such answers were not able to score any marks.

(b) The requirement here was to gather evidence to test the specificity theory that was based on 'real-life' pain rather than 'artificially-induced laboratory pain'. There were some superb answers where candidates turned around the evidence used in support of the gate control theory because this evidence is the reason why the specificity theory is no longer considered to be appropriate. For example, some candidates wrote about phantom limb pain that could not exist if the specificity theory were true.

Question 8

(a) This question required candidates to design a laboratory experiment to test cognitive overload. A number of candidates suggested a modification of a computer game with too many inputs to deal with at once but sometimes such answers focused on procedure rather than the 'hard' methodology of IV, DV, controls and other important features of an experiment. A few candidates did not appear to know what an experiment involves, suggesting the use of an interview or questionnaire. As with all ***Section C*** questions a little knowledge of a syllabus topic combined with good methodological knowledge means that a thinking candidate can write a top mark answer.

(b) The sub-topic of cognitive overload appears on the syllabus and the suggested example is that by Barber (1988). This is the case of the mid-air aeroplane crash near Zagreb in 1977 where 176 people were killed. The cause was said to be due to an air traffic controller who, because of cognitive overload, could not cope with the number of aircraft in his sector. Many candidates correctly described the full story in detail. It is worth noting that any published research or example of cognitive overload could be used to answer the question as the Barber (1988) reference appears as an example rather than being compulsory.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

(a) Most candidates scored full marks for this question because they mentioned both the required components of the negative effects of noise and anti-social (rather than pro-social) behaviour. Some candidates identified a relevant study, whilst others gave a brief anecdotal example to clarify their explanation.

(b) There are two studies given on the syllabus, those of Geen and O'Neal (1969) and Donnerstein and Wilson (1970) although these are indicative examples and any relevant study could have been used to answer the question. Most candidates chose one of these studies and described it with sufficient accuracy and detail to score full marks. A small number of candidates described both studies and the best description of the two was credited.

Question 10

(a) There were some excellent answers on personal space and territory and many answers deserved more than the 8 marks allocated to this question due to the range, depth, detail and organisation of answers. Many candidates organised their answers around measures of personal space and included invasions as a method. This was a good strategy and indeed, any organisation of information will receive credit because it shows understanding. Some candidates appear to think that this topic area is nothing more than personal space invasions, and whilst focusing on just one 'bullet-point sub-topic' will score marks, this approach will not score marks for range. It is advised that information from at least two 'bullet-point sub-topics' is included.

(b) Many answers here followed the usual pattern of not evaluating in the most effective way, such as evaluating study-by-study or by only evaluating the named issues. As with other options, the most effective strategy is to organise an answer by evaluation issues using studies as examples. The named issue here was ethics and some candidates only considered this issue. Interestingly many of these candidates did not apply the ethical issues (consent, right to withdraw, psychological harm, etc.) that they had learned when doing core studies, instead often writing about human rights and more generalised points when a focus on 'psychological ethics' would have been much more effective.

Question 11

(a) Some candidates were not able to score any marks because they did not know the difference between quantitative and qualitative data, or they misread quantitative for qualitative despite this being in bold on the paper and the stem also suggesting what the answer should focus on. Answers at the top end of the mark range devised studies which did gather data in the form of words, done through the use of either questionnaire or interview, and particularly the use of open-ended questionnaires asking people about what they thought or how they felt. Some candidates assumed that a closed questionnaire gathers qualitative data. It does not, as answers are predetermined with a tick box so frequencies can be determined.

(b) Candidates had to describe one study looking at crowding and pro-social behaviour. A number of candidates incorrectly described studies on anti-social behaviour and a number of candidates described two studies despite the question asking for one study. Most candidates chose to describe either the Bickman et al (1973) 'post a letter' study or the Dukes and Jorgenson (1976) 'return dirty dishes' study. Credit was given for the detail, accuracy and understanding of answers.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 12

(a) There were some very inventive ideas written in response to this question. Although any method could have been chosen, most answers sensibly suggested using a field experiment. What distinguished the good from the best answers was a focus almost exclusively on procedure compared to an emphasis on the methodology of a field experiment with IV, DV and controls and with procedure playing a small part of the wider experimental design.

(b) This question wanted a description of just one study, which meant giving enough detail for 6 marks, and those candidates who described three (simply because three appear on the syllabus) had just one credited. It meant in most cases that brief answers only scored 2 or 3 marks. One candidate did write about three studies in detail and scored maximum marks for just one, but wasted a significant amount of time describing two studies that did not receive any credit. Candidates are always advised to do exactly what the question requires to maximise their overall performance in the examination. Relevant studies included those by Jacobs and Linman (1991) on squirrels, Capaldi (2000) on bees, and Walcott (1979) on pigeons.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

(a) Part **(a)** wanted candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'biological/medical treatment of abnormality'. The majority of candidates scored both available marks and had little problem in identifying relevant examples. Most candidates correctly identified biochemical examples, although a few candidates described non-biological/medical and were not able to gain any marks for this.

(b) Part **(b)** wanted a description of two medical/biological treatments. Most candidates scored full marks by including two different drug (biochemical) treatments or by writing about electro-convulsive therapy. Some candidates did not score any marks because they included treatments such as rational emotive therapy or cognitive behaviour therapy which are incorrect because they are not biological.

Question 14

(a) A significant majority of candidates had prepared the topic of schizophrenia extremely well; there were some very good and detailed answers that scored maximum marks. Knowledge included often covered types, explanations and treatments. The only weakness with many of these answers were that they were too long and time could have been better spent elsewhere, such as on question part **(b)**. One noteworthy point is that DSM-V, published in 2013, no longer categorises types of schizophrenia. Future syllabuses have been modified to account for this, but if candidates continue to write about types they will not be penalised.

(b) A number of candidates only considered the named issue of reductionism and so were restricted to a maximum of 4 marks. Other candidates mentioned a number of issues but failed to say what the issues were or debate them. For example, a candidate would write 'the biochemical model is reductionist' without any mention of what reductionism is, or without a mention of why reductionism is an advantage or disadvantage. Many candidates took an 'evaluation-by-explanation' approach to this question. Whilst this approach will score good marks it will never score top marks. For example, candidates would write about the genetic explanation in relation to reductionism. They would then repeat the same points for the biochemical explanation and repeat the same points for the cognitive explanation, etc. A much better approach is to organise the answer by issue. This would be to consider the reductionism debate and use the explanations as examples, followed by a consideration of another issue, such as nature-nurture, defining it, giving advantages and disadvantages of it and then using the explanations as examples.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 15

(a) The performance of candidates in response to this question was no different from any other ***Section C*** question in that either candidates made a reasonable suggestion based on psychological and methodological knowledge or they described some knowledge appropriate to the topic area, but not directed toward the specific question. The best answers suggested using a self-report questionnaire, as the question asked, and there was good understanding of the type of questionnaire, examples of questions and a scoring system to analyse the responses.

(b) This question produced a variety of answers covering the entire mark range. Some candidates decided that a type A personality was relevant (i.e. those taking the health option) and others brought in the Eysenck introvert/extrovert personality dimension. Other candidates looked more widely at impulse control disorders. Each answer was credited according to its accuracy and extent to which it focused on cognitive and/or personality explanations of addictive behaviour.

Question 16

(a) Answers in response to this question covered the whole mark range. There were those who merely wrote an essay on phobias without addressing the question at all. Slightly better were those who stated nothing more than 'I would give them a test to see what they would do'. Best of all were those candidates who were inventive and suggested taking a baseline measure of physiology before a test and then again during a test. What added quality to the answer were comments like 'this objective and quantitative data is reliable and valid'. Some even suggested taking self-report data by asking for a level of anxiety out of ten before the test and then again at the start of and during the test.

(b) This question part asked candidates to describe a case study of a person with a phobia. Most candidates chose to describe the phobia of little Hans (Freud) or little Albert (Watson), both of which were appropriate because even though they are studied as part of the core studies they are still examples of phobias. There were some candidates who could not answer the question, presumably because they had not made the link between this topic area and the core studies.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

(a) Nearly all candidates scored one mark because they gave a common-sense explanation of the term 'rapid rotation'. To earn the second mark this term had to be related to shiftwork and organisations and not every candidate was able to do this.

(b) Some candidates could not answer this question at all. The syllabus states 'Temporal conditions of work environments: Shiftwork: rapid rotation theory (e.g. metropolitan rota and continental rota); slow rotation theory', so this question should not have caused any problems for candidates at all. Those knowing this syllabus sub-section described both the metropolitan rota and the continental rota in detail, often giving advantages and disadvantages of each.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 18

(a) There were three types of answer written in response to this question. There were those candidates who knew very little about leadership, writing anecdotally about the processes that they thought could be involved in leadership. Secondly there were those who knew the relevant aspects to include and wrote very good answers, but failed to use relevant jargon terms or quote relevant psychological research. Finally there were those candidates, who scored the highest marks, who made a distinction between theories and research and also considered leaders and followers (i.e. a whole range of relevant aspects) and who used terminology, quoted research, and showed understanding in their answer.

(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 the usefulness of theories. This could have provided some good debate because there is often a difference between an academic exercise (a theory) and what happens in real life, on the workshop floor for example. A few candidates to their credit debated the leader-manager distinction with some suggesting that these are one and the same rather than two different roles and styles.

Question 19

(a) In this question candidates had to suggest how they would investigate how many people have achieved Maslow's highest level of need. Answers covered the whole mark range with basic answers having nothing more than 'I would interview them to see if they were self-actualised' to those candidates who suggested devising questionnaires or using existing questionnaires. One candidate, who achieved a maximum mark, suggested constructing their own 'life happiness questionnaire' and gave details of the type of questionnaire; examples of questions, the number of questions, what a score out of 20 meant, and even mentioned using test-retest reliability. This candidate also showed good knowledge of what self-actualisation involves, evident from the examples of questions being included on her questionnaire.

(b) The majority of candidates scored maximum marks here when they provided full details of Maslow's need theory of motivation. Most started with physiological needs and progressed through the hierarchy. Very few candidates mentioned Maslow's additional three needs even though the 1970 reference to Maslow is on the syllabus rather than the 1954 original theory.

Question 20

(a) The request to suggest conducting a participant observation study appeared to confuse many candidates who did not know what the term meant. Candidates should appreciate that methodology and issues/debates apply to the whole course (AS and A2) and so the method of participant observation, used by Rosenhan (sane in insane places) for example, applies to any appropriate subject matter. Many candidates on the other hand knew this method and wrote interesting and varied ways in which the person sabotaging the machine could be identified.

(b) The concept of sabotage, outlined by Taylor and Walton (1971) for example, is an interesting aspect of job dissatisfaction. They suggest sabotage can be a reflection of frustration; it can be an attempt to ease the work process, and more extremely it could be part of an attempt to assert control over the work process. For example, if a person struggles to keep up with the pace of the machine, in their frustration they may do something to damage the machine that might give them a short break whilst the machine is repaired.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

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 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 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 candidates correctly used string to tie together their answer pages. However, pages should be tied loosely so an Examiner could turn and read each page.

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)

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 and confusing the two will score no marks. Evaluation 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 can often be divided into three types:
- those who evaluate using a number of issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- those who focus exclusively on the named issue or exclude it altogether (and have marks restricted);
- those who do not evaluate at all (and score no marks).

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

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. There is a fundamental difference between these two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. To suggest is to go beyond description and to think about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. If these two requirements are adhered to then many more candidates will score more marks. A second important point to make is that marks for description are allocated as either 6 marks for one piece of evidence, or 3 marks each for two pieces of evidence. The amount of detail written should reflect this mark allocation.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

(a) This question part asked candidates about the humanistic application to learning. Except for the few candidates who wrote about nothing other than Maslow's hierarchy of needs, it was a straightforward question to answer for the majority of candidates and it was good to see that answers often focused on application aspect rather than just the basics of the humanistic approach.

(b) Following on from part **(a)**, a few candidates again wrote about Maslow, this time in more detail, and nearly always forgetting that this is the 'applications to education' sub-topic. These answers scored no marks. Better answers considered one application in detail with learning circles, co-operative learning and the open classroom being featuring most often. It was good to see that the underlying basis of each of these was briefly included along with the Summerhill School example.

Question 2

(a) Maslow appeared here again, in terms of his theory of motivation. Whereas no marks were allocated for Maslow in **Question 1**, Maslow's theory was more relevant here, but again it must be applied to education to be effective and score marks. Some candidates considered a vast range of different theories, often including cognitive and behaviourist in addition to the humanist. Such candidates also considered attribution theory and learned helplessness. In doing this answers were often far too long, and sometimes a maximum mark could be awarded for an answer of much less detail. Whilst a range of different aspects should be considered, candidates can (and should) be selective.

(b) Candidates had to evaluate what psychologists have found out about motivation and to specifically include a debate about different perspectives. Answers to this question followed the pattern observed in all other options. Candidates should evaluate a range of issues, including the named issue to access the full range of marks. If the named issue is not included, or indeed only the named issue is included, then the mark will be significantly restricted. Some candidates opted to comment on each perspective individually and whilst this is good, the skill should be extended to become a direct comparison or contrast of different perspectives, the sign of a most able candidate.

Question 3

(a) This question part was misinterpreted by many candidates who merely *described* different strategies, failing to address the question to *suggest* how different strategies to best educate a gifted child could be investigated. Answers achieving full marks often suggested that a field experiment be conducted with the independent variable consisting of three different strategies each applied for two weeks, with the dependent variable being the progress of the gifted child. Such answers showed understanding when linking good methodological knowledge with knowledge from the topic area in question.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

(b) This question part required a description of different educational strategies for educating a gifted child, different from an investigation to see which is best, as was asked in part **(a)**. Those candidates who described these strategies in part **(a)** either described them again, described them in more detail or wrote nothing at all. It is important to read both parts of a question before beginning to answer. The same question will never be asked twice. For the more able candidates descriptions of acceleration, segregation and enrichment were often very good and frequently supported with relevant research.

Question 4

(a) The marks for this question were split in half with four marks being allocated to the testing of reliability and four marks to validity. A number of candidates knew what these terms were, but could only define them rather than apply them to an intelligence test. For example, some candidates described four, five and sometimes six different types of validity but could not say how any of them could be used to test a newly devised intelligence test. That said there were candidates who wrote excellent answers, showing sound knowledge of reliability, validity and intelligence testing.

(b) All candidates should know the terms reliability and validity as applied to psychology as they are fundamental to an understanding of the subject and can appear on any of the three examination papers. Some candidates do not know the terms at all; others know them but muddle them up; while others know them and their different types. There is a further confusion as mentioned above with regard to reliability because for an intelligence test split-half and test-retest can be used, but not inter-rater reliability as this applies to observations.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

(a) This question caused problems for many candidates because they did not know the term 'alternative techniques' to measure pain even though it is on the syllabus. Other candidates wrote about what the alternative techniques were not, and scored a mark, but then failed to say anything about what the alternatives actually were. Top answers outlined the 'alternatives' and mentioned the examples given on the syllabus.

(b) Each technique was worth a maximum of three marks. Identification of a technique scored a single mark, so writing 'TENS' and 'acupuncture' scored 2 marks. Further marks were than awarded for the detail and accuracy given in the description of a technique. Marks were also awarded for any technique which was not on the syllabus but which could be a way of reducing pain. Such techniques included hypnosis, massage, and percutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (PENS) which blocks signals making nerve cells less sensitive to pain.

Question 6

(a) There were a large number of answers which were well organised, were full of psychological knowledge and which showed good understanding of the topic area, scoring maximum marks. Many candidates made the distinction between the techniques of fear arousal and providing information and most candidates included at least one piece of research from studies conducted in schools, work-sites and communities. Two weaknesses were observed: firstly, many candidates wrote about everything included on the syllabus for this topic area and in doing this wrote answers which were far too long and causing them time problems later on. Candidates can be selective in what they include, and they do not need everything to achieve a maximum mark. Secondly, many candidates assumed that Zimbardo (1977) devised the Yale model of communication. He did not. The Yale model resulted from research conducted in the 1950s by Hovland et al.

(b) Candidates had to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about pain and include a discussion of the usefulness of self-reports. A few candidates did not evaluate at all, simply choosing to describe the usefulness of self-reports and indeed these candidates often excluded this aspect from their part **(a)** answer to address self-reports in this evaluative section. Answers like this scored no marks. Part **(a)** is for description and part **(b)** evaluation and candidates should know this fundamental distinction. At the top end of the mark range there were answers which evaluated using a number of different issues including that of the usefulness of self-reports.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 7

(a) The crucial component of this question was for candidates to gather data looking at **both** what people say **and** what people do and so two methods needed to be used. Many candidates did exactly this, suggesting the use of a questionnaire and then the use of an observation. A few candidates showed impressive methodological knowledge of both questionnaires and observations, but some answers were limited in this respect. Some candidates took the wrong approach by *describing* two studies on this topic area conducted by other psychologists, and some candidates merely wrote an essay on 'Describe measures of adherence'. Other candidates would write 'Cluss and Epstein suggested several methods' and then proceed to describe each measure on the list of ways in which adherence has been measured by other people. There is nothing wrong in suggesting two items from this list because at least there needs to be some thought in choosing two appropriate measures. Merely describing all seven listed simply shows a lack of understanding. This question part has the command 'suggest' and so it requires candidates to think of something of their own, or to *use* existing information to write about. This question part will never score top marks for mere description of knowledge. The 'describe' command is assessed in other question parts.

(b) Those candidates who chose to describe in part **(a)** often wrote 'I chose to describe the Sherman study (for example) because it is an appropriate study to include and it is a measure of adherence'. Such answers scored no marks. Top-end answers wrote 'I chose to use a questionnaire because...' and wrote about this self-report method along with advantages and disadvantages of it; other candidates wrote 'Like Sherman et al I chose to use repeat prescriptions because it has the advantage of...'. Answers like these show that candidates understand what they are doing when they *use* psychological and methodological knowledge to answer a question; this is very different from the candidate who merely describes a study.

Question 8

(a) This question allowed candidates to choose a method of their own to answer the question. Some candidates described the questionnaire used by Friedman and Rosenman, which was appropriate, but others wrote a whole essay on different measures/causes of stress including life events and daily hassles, which was not appropriate. One superb answer, which scored full marks, suggested that the Type A personality questionnaire could be used to categorise people into Type A and Type B and then, as done in the study by Wang et al, placed in an MRI scanner and subjected to a stress task. In this way, it could be determined whether the Type As experienced more stress than Type Bs with MRI scanner evidence to support. Although there were some flaws in this answer, credit was given for a very original suggestion based on appropriate methodological and psychological knowledge.

(b) The personality explanation of stress by Friedman and Rosenman (1974) was described in good detail by many candidates, with detail such as time consciousness, assertiveness and competitiveness included. Often details of the questionnaire they devised to test their explanation were provided. Some candidates wrote a mini essay on stress, including the work of Selye, showing that some candidates are pre-programmed to respond to trigger words rather than using knowledge selectively to answer questions set.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

(a) This question meant that most candidates scored at least 1 partial mark because they understood the term contagion. What many could not do was to apply the term in psychological terms, often writing that it is where there is a spread during an emergency event.

(b) This question wanted a description of Le Bon's contagion explanation of behaviour during emergency events. Although there was some confusion in answers when work other than that by Le Bon was described, many candidates answered correctly and fully. Le Bon (1895) suggests that otherwise normally civilised people behave like wild animals and become irrational, giving vent to primitive urges and stampede. The aim of the individual person is to survive at all costs to others and so he (or she) must be first to reach the exit. Anyone getting in the way is walked over, or trampled, with no concern for others, whether friends or family.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 10

(a) There were some excellent answers on noise. Whilst such answers impressed with the range, depth, detail and organisation, many candidates wrote far too much seemingly including everything that is included in the syllabus rather than choosing particular studies to illustrate a particular sub-section. For example the syllabus has 'the effects of noise on pro-social behaviour' and two studies appear as examples. Both these studies do not need to be included and one can be chosen as an example of the sub-topic area.

(b) Many answers here followed the usual pattern of not evaluating on the most effective way, such as evaluating study-by-study or by only evaluating the named issues. As with other options, the most effective strategy is to organise an answer by evaluation issues using studies as examples. A range of issues should always be considered as ***Section B*** questions always ask for 'Evaluation to include' rather than just 'Evaluate this one issue". See general comments for more details.

Question 11

(a) Some candidates wrote superb answers here because they based their answers on a known method to measure personal space and then added their own methodological variation to address the question. For example, it was suggested that the stop-distance method could be used, and then the person asked a question about how they felt about the distance between them and the other person. Other candidates suggested using Halls' zones, with an experimenter standing in the intimate zone and then asking the person how they felt about this. Both these suggestions, and indeed many other suggestions, scored good marks because they showed psychological and methodological knowledge. On the other extreme of the mark range there were candidates who appeared not to know anything about personal space; there were those who merely described a study already conducted; and those who ignored the 'gather data on how people *feel*' when their space is invaded.

(b) The main problem with many answers was that candidates appeared to have forgotten the 'standard' ethical issues, often writing a few words of anecdotal common-sense rather than an answer based on psychological knowledge. Some candidates described studies where space had been invaded, but this is not what the question asked. Answers at the top end of the range mentioned that invading personal space is unethical because the person being invaded has not given informed consent, or that the person may also feel uncomfortable, which can be said to be psychological harm. Such answers often referred to studies to illustrate the point they were making, this being very different usage from the mere description of a study.

Question 12

(a) There were very few candidates answering this question and these answers were all basic and lacking both psychological and methodological knowledge. If a candidate knows what social overload is, then any method can be used investigate social overload, such as a questionnaire, or interview for example. Indeed, a little knowledge of any syllabus topic combined with good methodological knowledge means that a thinking candidate can write a top mark answer.

(b) Some candidates did not know what social overload was, and given that there was a choice of question in this section, candidates are advised to read both ***Section C*** questions carefully before beginning an answer. Social overload is most often attributed to Milgram, who did more work than just his obedience studies. Milgram compared people living in urban and rural environments, providing an explanation for a variety of different social behaviour. Social overload is simply when there are too many social inputs to process at any one time.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

(a) Part **(a)** wanted candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'biochemical treatments for schizophrenia'. The majority of candidates scored both available marks and had little problem in identifying relevant examples. Some candidates did not address all parts of the question. To achieve full marks there must have been inclusion of the terms 'biochemical' and 'treatments' and these must have been related to schizophrenia.

(b) Part **(b)** wanted a description of two biochemical treatments. Here too most candidates scored full marks by including two different drug, i.e. biochemical, treatments. Typically candidates wrote about typical and atypical antipsychotics, most often using chlorpromazine and clozapine as examples. A number of candidates wrote about electro-convulsive therapy. In order for ECT to be credited candidates needed to mention how it is biochemical rather than nothing more than how it is administered. ECT is said to stimulate dopamine production for example.

Question 14

(a) Some candidates confused *models* of abnormality with different *types* of abnormality and such answers scored very few marks. At the other end of the mark range there were some superb answers that included definitions of abnormality (such as failure to function), a range of different models (medical/biological, psychodynamic, behavioural, and cognitive) and even included treatments associated with these models. A few candidates failed to score top marks because they spent too long describing the basics of models rather than considering how the model explained abnormality. For example, such answers included details of Freud's psychosexual stages or how Pavlov conditioned dogs.

(b) A number of candidates only considered the named issue and so were restricted to a maximum of 4 marks. Other candidates mentioned a number of issues but failed to say what the issues were or debate them. For example a candidate would write 'the behavioural model is nurture, and it is reductionist' without any mention of what reductionism is, or without a mention of why reductionism is an advantage or disadvantage. Many candidates took an 'evaluation by model' approach to this question. Whilst this approach will score good marks it will never score top marks. For example, candidates would write about the biological model in relation to nature-nurture and reductionism. They would then repeat the same points for the behavioural model and repeat the same points for the psychodynamic model, etc. A much better approach is to organise the answer by issue. This would be to consider the nature-nurture debate and use the models as examples, followed by a consideration of reductionism, defining it, giving advantages and disadvantages of it and then using the models as examples.

Question 15

(a) For many candidates, describing the main features of electro-convulsive therapy (ECT) was straightforward with details about its invention, how it is administered and its effects being included. Sometimes candidates wrote about what ECT is used to treat, and over time it has been used to treat schizophrenia and depression along with a range of other mental problems. A few candidates debated the ethics surrounding the use of ECT and some about the negative effects such as memory loss. Both of these were credited as features of ECT.

(b) This question produced a variety of answers covering the entire mark range. Some candidates decided to conduct an experiment comparing electro-convulsive therapy (ECT) with an alternative treatment, but these answers did not address the long-term effectiveness aspect of the question. Better answers designed a longitudinal study and looked at the same person over a period of time. The main weakness with these answers is that a long list of suggestions was made (a questionnaire, interview, observation, test, and any other thing that could be thought of) without going into any detail of what any of them would actually involve. Better answers suggested, for example, gathering baseline data such as conducting a range of psychometric and cognitive tests, giving a course of ECT, and then after six months giving the same tests again to see if there had been any deterioration in cognitive functioning.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 16

(a) This question part asked candidates to 'Suggest how you would decide whether a patient had obsessions, compulsions, or both. Many candidates read the question incorrectly and simply wrote all they knew about obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD). Others wrote very good answers, suggesting that an observation could be done to investigate behaviour (and often made the point that it is better to *see* rather than merely *ask*) and then linked this with the use of a questionnaire (and sometimes interview) to determine the patient's thoughts. Suggesting two different methods like this gave the more able candidates the opportunity to show their knowledge about how different methods can be applied to the same thing, in this case, OCD.

(b) This question part asked about the use of drug therapy for the treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder. Some candidates wrote nothing more than a few vague words such as 'give them anti-depressants', whilst others provided very thorough and detailed descriptions based on the underlying theory. For example, the drugs clomipramine and fluoxetine are both commonly used to treat OCD. A few candidates evaluated the use of such drugs, although this was not required by the question, and often credit was given for the understanding shown in such answers.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

(a) For many candidates explaining the term 'groupthink' first outlined by Janis (1965) was an easy two marks. For other candidates, guesses which scored no marks at all varied from 'a group getting together to think' to 'group brainstorming exercises', both of which scored no marks at all.

(b) There are many different ways in which groupthink can be avoided, and a brief explanation was all that was needed, in addition to identifying the term, to score both available marks. Three possible strategies include: encouraging evaluation (rewarding those who evaluate a proposal to make it stronger/better); using sub-groups (where group members may be more likely to be evaluative compared to when in a large group); and holding 'second-chance' meetings (where there is a final opportunity to review proposals before they are implemented).

Question 18

(a) There were three types of answer written in response to this question. There were those candidates who knew very little psychology, writing anecdotally about the processes that could be involved in the selection of people for work. Secondly there were those who knew the relevant aspects to include and wrote very good answers, but failed to use relevant jargon terms or quote relevant psychological research. Finally, there were those candidates who scored the highest marks, who considered job analysis, job advertising, screening processes, use of tests, types of interview and even decision-making models (i.e. a whole range of relevant aspects) and who used terminology, quoted research and showed understanding. One general weakness was that candidates referred to 'using structured or unstructured interviews' without a mention at all about what these involved or the type of data that they produce.

(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 issues listed in the syllabus are the most logical ones to use, but anything can be used as an issue if it has advantages and disadvantages and it has supporting examples from the topic area in question. For example, structured and unstructured interviews can be used. There are advantages and disadvantages with each of these: structured having pre-prepared questions and asked in the same order to each candidate, reducing bias and allowing the interviewer to compare the answers of each person being interviewed. Unstructured interviews could be contrasted with this.

Question 19

(a) The request to 'Suggest a strategy' allowed candidates to choose a method of investigation of their own. Some candidates chose to conduct an observation whilst others decided to give the workers a questionnaire. Some answers were basic because they went little further than 'I would do a questionnaire'. Better answers showed good methodological knowledge when describing the type

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

of questionnaire (such as open or closed) they would use, the nature of questions that could be asked, or how the answers would be scored. Candidates should always take the opportunity to show their methodological knowledge using appropriate jargon terms.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

(b) This question part invited candidates to look at the Vroom and Yetton normative decision theory. Many candidates did just that, and they often did it accurately, in good detail and often scored full marks. However, there were quite a few candidates who did not know the theory at all, despite it being on the syllabus, and there were a number of candidates who saw the word 'leadership' in part **(a)** and so assumed they could write all about leadership in part **(b)**. This strategy scored no marks and as always, candidates should not write general pre-prepared answers on a topic in the hope that it will be sufficient.

Question 20

(a) In this question candidates had to suggest how they would conduct a field experiment to investigate different colours of light. This meant that no other method would score marks. Most candidates knew what a field experiment was and most could describe the basics, such as details of a procedure. The better answers referred to an independent and dependent variable and included details of controls, sampling and similar appropriate methodological detail. Weaker answers did not refer to the colour of lighting at all, instead opting to write about dull compared with bright lights or natural lighting compared with artificial. A few candidates chose to *describe* the 'Hawthorne experiments' rather than make a suggestion of their own. As mentioned, describing scores no marks in this section.

(b) The majority of candidates scored some basic marks here when identifying two physical conditions such as noise and temperature. Some candidates went on to score further marks by describing some detail about the particular physical condition they had chosen. A number made the point that if the temperature is too hot or too cold then it is not comfortable for workers. A few candidates went beyond common-sense answers like 'too hot too cold' and scored top marks when they included some explicit psychological knowledge, such as reference to a piece of psychological research. A small number of candidates mentioned *psychological* work conditions but these answers scored no marks.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

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 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 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 candidates correctly used string to tie together their answer pages. However, pages should be tied loosely so an Examiner could turn and read each page.

A number of candidates answer questions out of order. This is not a problem within an option, but mixing questions from different options (**Question 1**, **Question 5**, **Question 2**, **Question 7**, etc.) makes marking and administration more complex. Candidates should leave a space or complete each option on a different answer booklet.

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)

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 and confusing the two will score no marks. Evaluation 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 can often be divided into three types:

- those who evaluate using a number of issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- those who focus exclusively on the named issue or exclude it altogether (and have marks restricted);
- those who do not evaluate at all (and score no marks).

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

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. There is a fundamental difference between these two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. To suggest is to go beyond description and to think about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. If these two requirements are adhered to then many more candidates will score more marks. A second important point to make is that marks for description are allocated as either 6 marks for one piece of evidence, or 3 marks each for two pieces of evidence. The amount of detail written should reflect this mark allocation.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

(a) This question part asked candidates about the approaches to study inventory (ASI). Except for the few candidates who did not know anything about the ASI, most candidates were able to describe the basics of it in sufficient detail.

(b) Following on from part **(a)** a few candidates could not answer the question, despite the ASI being on the syllabus under the 'measuring learning styles and teaching styles' sub-section. Many others described the basics: 64 items with 16 subscales divided into four categories of meaning orientation, reproducing orientation, achieving orientation, and styles and pathologies. Answers scoring full marks even mentioned 'ASSIST', a study skills inventory specifically for students, an extension of the ASI.

Question 2

(a) The answers provided by most candidates were very good. Some candidates described every detail included on the syllabus even though this is not required. For example, one sub-topic is 'causes and effects of one specific learning difficulty or disability' and some candidates wrote about dyslexia, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and autism, when only one needs to be covered. Although knowledge from a range of different sub-topics is highly desirable, candidates should choose examples from that range to illustrate rather than describing everything. This meant that answers were often far too long, and often a maximum mark could be awarded for an answer with much less detail. Another consequence is that a candidate might run out of time. An answer equivalent to 8 marks, approximately 1.5 sides of A4 paper, is a good target amount of writing.

(b) Candidates had to evaluate what psychologists have found out about special educational needs and to specifically include a discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of different strategies used to educate children. Answers to this question followed the pattern observed in all other options. Candidates should evaluate a range of issues, including the named issue, to access the full range of marks. If the named issue is not included, or indeed only the named issue is included, then the mark will be significantly restricted. Many candidates only wrote about different strategies (e.g. enrichment, acceleration, segregation) and did not consider other issues at all.

Question 3

There were too few responses to provide comments on these questions.

Question 4

(a) Answers in response to this question could be split into two types. Some candidates wrote anecdotally about what they would do to manage classroom behavior without any reference to theories or strategies, or the use of appropriate terminology. Answers of this type scored low marks. The second type of candidate went beyond anecdote, making suggestions that were based on theory, evidence and even perspective. For example the best answers suggested using positive reinforcement and negative punishment based on prevention (rather than correction).

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

(b) As mentioned for part **(a)** there were those candidates who wrote anecdotally and struggled because they did not know any underlying theory. There were also those who, despite writing anecdotally in part **(a)**, wrote about the underlying perspective in part **(b)**. Finally there were those candidates who, having suggested forms of reinforcement and punishment in part **(a)**, described in detail the behaviourist perspective and its principles in part **(b)**.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

(a) This question part (and part **(b)**) caused problems for many candidates because they did not know the term 'objective measure' of adherence and so provided a guess which was sometimes correct but was often incorrect. There were those who wrote very good answers and were awarded full marks with some candidates gaining credit for including a relevant example of an objective measure such as pill counting or biochemical test.

(b) A number of candidates did not know what was meant by an objective measure and so could not answer this question part. Other candidates wrote more general adherence answers including any adherence study that came to mind, whether objective or not. To clarify, subjective measures include any self-report by the patient, the patient's family or by the practitioner. Objective measures (which cannot be falsified by the patient) include pill counts, biochemical tests, and repeat prescription records. Some candidates did write very good answers, with the studies by Chung and Naya (2000) and Sherman (2000) for example being clearly and accurately described.

Question 6

(a) Many candidates wrote excellent answers and scored full marks because they included most (and often all) of the indicative content listed in the syllabus for this topic area. Such answers impressed with accuracy and understanding and also because of the way in which answers were organised, often following the structure of the syllabus sub-topics. However, quite a number of candidates did not, making the incorrect assumption that writing a generalised and anecdotal answer about health and safety would be credited. Whatever the topic area in question, candidates should always write answers based on psychological knowledge, showing what has been learned and understood. The most effective way to do this is to write accurately about the studies (theory and research) appearing on the syllabus.

(b) As with other options, many answers were descriptive rather than evaluative. Part **(a)** is for description and part **(b)** evaluation and candidates should know this fundamental distinction. Any description in question part **(b)** will score no marks at all. That said, some answers for this question part were evaluative and scored very high marks. Some of these candidates only looked at the issue of individual and situational explanations, the named evaluative issue. This issue is central to this topic area because it highlights the Theory A and Theory B explanations for example. Other issues were sometimes included, but there were often brief, without debate and sometimes lacked supporting examples.

Question 7

(a) The crucial component of this question was for candidates to address both reliability and validity as each of these was allocated 4 marks and if only one was considered then no more than half marks could be awarded. Some candidates addressed both, some just one, and a few candidates did not write about reliability or validity. Another crucial element to any ***Section C*** question is the command *suggest*, meaning that if a candidate only *described* reliability and validity they were not credited because that is not what the question asked. Better answers often suggested using test-retest for reliability and by controlling variables other than the independent variable to be closer to cause and effect to increase validity.

(b) Most candidates scored high marks for this question because most could describe a study gathering data physiologically to measure stress. The Geer and Maisel (1972) study was most commonly quoted which is appropriate because they used a GSR (galvanic skin response) as their measure of physiological arousal. Some answers were very detailed and showed a very thorough knowledge of this study. High marks were also shown by those choosing to write about the studies by Lundberg (1976) and by Johansson (1978).

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

Question 8

(a) This question allowed candidates to choose a method of their own to answer the question, but it needed to be a method that could be used on the same participants after an period of time had passed. Most candidates suggested a laboratory study be conducted (similar to that by Janis and Feshbach for example) linked with follow-up self-reports done after a week, a month, six months and at one year. Most candidates suggested a questionnaire be used, 'have you started smoking cigarettes again',for example, and the best answers commented on the fact that this would determine the true effectiveness of the original study if participants had not smoked cigarettes since. Importantly most candidates here had attempted a suggestion (and were credited) rather than described some piece of inappropriate information.

(b) This question part required a description of one snapshot study that has promoted health. There were some excellent descriptions of the study by Janis and Feshbach and the best answers emphasised why this study is categorised as snapshot. The Janis and Feshbach study is apposite to any health promotion ***Section B*** answer because of the wide range of evaluation issues it raises: laboratory experiment, ethics, self-report, quantitative data and situational (rather than individual) for example. A few candidates did not understand the term 'snapshot' which is a study that takes a participant a very short period of time to complete the study, such as a few hours at most rather than one which is longitudinal where the same participant is involved for weeks, months or years.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

There were too few responses to provide comments on these questions.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

(a) In order for both available marks to be awarded in this question a mention of both the cognitive *and* the behaviour component of this type of therapy were needed. Most candidates did this successfully when mentioning that this therapy involves changing both the way in which a person thinks and the way in which a person behaves.

(b) Part **(b)** wanted a description of how cognitive-behaviour therapy (CBT) can be used to treat obsessions and compulsions (OCD). Here too many candidates scored full marks by showing good knowledge of both CBT and OCD. Marks were awarded for accuracy and detail. A few answers were rather brief and a few answers suggested using not just CBT but also a range of different biochemical (drug) treatments. Although such answers did not lose marks (as marks are never deducted) they did not score marks simply because the use of biochemical treatments were not relevant to the question.

Question 14

(a) Some candidates are confused about the term 'abnormal affect' because they assumed it meant 'abnormal psychology' and wrote about anything from this option including models of abnormality, schizophrenia and phobias. Such answers did not receive credit. The term 'affect' relates to mood or emotions, and abnormal affect concerns extremes of mood, namely mania and depression. The best answers outlined the different types of abnormal affect, considered a number of explanations (biological, cognitive and learned) and mentioned various treatments (such as biochemical, electro-convulsive therapy and cognitive restructuring).

(b) A number of candidates only considered the named issue, that of biological explanations, and so were restricted to a maximum of 4 marks. Other candidates mentioned a number of issues but failed to say what the issues were or debate them. For example a candidate would write 'the biological model is reductionist' without any mention of what reductionism is, or without a mention of why being reductionist is an advantage or disadvantage. Many candidates took an 'evaluation by explanation' approach to this question. Whilst this approach will score good marks it will never score top marks. For example, candidates would write about the biological model in relation to 'nature' (rather than nurture) and reductionism. They would then repeat the same points for the behavioural and for the cognitive explanation, etc. A much more effective way to score top marks is to organise the answer by evaluation issue. This would be to consider the nature-nurture debate (for example) and use the different explanations as examples, followed by a consideration of

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013

reductionism, defining it, giving advantages and disadvantages of it and then using the explanations as examples.

Question 15

(a) This question asked about two different ways in which abnormality can be defined and 3 marks were allocated to each definition. In this instance definitions of deviation from social norms and failure to function adequately were required. A small number of candidates had not heard these terms and scored no marks and a small number described all four definitions listed in the syllabus. What distinguished the good from the maximum mark answers was the detail, accuracy and understanding shown in the answers. With regard to detail, an answer does need to be more than a sentence in length to score maximum marks.

(b) For this question part candidates were asked to gather data to test the failure to function adequately definition. A wide range of suggestions were produced ranging from the basic 'ask them if can they cope' to quite sophisticated questionnaires which suggested using a standardised format of questions asking whether a person can (or cannot) do everyday life things. This would be on a scale with a certain score needed for a person to pass. Good methodological understanding was shown in some answers who went on to comment on the reliability and validity of this suggested questionnaire.

Question 16

(a) This question part asked candidates to describe a case study of schizophrenia and candidates could describe either a published study or describe an anecdotal example. This is because the syllabus subsection states 'Types; characteristics; case studies/examples'. All this meant is that details of the symptoms or characteristics (or the type) be included along with ways in which the person featured was treated. Most candidates opted for the latter strategy of using an example. At the top end of the mark range candidates emphasised appropriate psychological terminology and considered a range of different features such as type, characteristics and treatments.

(a) This question part asked about generalising from one person to others with schizophrenia. Marks covered the whole range. A number of interesting suggestions were made, related to gathering data that allowed features to be compared. At the top end of the mark range methodological knowledge was evident with case studies and reliability and validity of measures being prominent.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

There were too few responses to provide comments on these questions.

www.theallpapers.com
© 2013