

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/11
Core Studies 1

General comments

As always there were superb answers written by very knowledgeable and well prepared candidates whose answers were a pleasure to read. Others struggled for various reasons and the purpose of this report is to explain aspects of the mark scheme and to point out weaknesses in examination technique so that in the future candidates will not make the same mistakes.

Many candidates do not follow the rubric and answer all questions on the paper. Many write too much for **Section A**, and have no time for **Section B**. Some candidates do not read questions, often writing about questions they want to see rather than the questions that are actually there.

Perhaps the two areas that need most attention are as follows:

1. Candidates often write too little detail for **Section A** answers. If the question wants two things to be identified for 2 marks, then answers can be very brief. However, if the question wants a description of one thing for 2 marks, then the answer needs to be more detailed in order to score both the available marks. The aim is not to complete the paper as quickly and as briefly as possible. The aim is to achieve a good grade and this is best done by showing the extent and depth of psychological knowledge. Adding an example to an answer; adding that little additional detail will score the second mark. For example in **Question 13(b)**, which asked for a disadvantage of participant observation, many candidates stated simply 'it is unethical'. This is true, but such a brief answer would score 1 mark. Moreover, writing three words is a very brief answer and does not show any depth to psychological knowledge. To put it another way, if there are two marks available, why should a brief answer like this score the full 2 marks? Adding why participant observation is unethical to this answer would score 2 marks, or by giving an example from the study would also score 2 marks.
2. When examiners set questions they do not use any particular textbook, they use the original studies. This is stated in the specification. Whilst any summary book is useful, it may not contain the full detail of the original study. Examiners do not aim to trick candidates with questions about obscure detail in a study, but they will set questions on important parts of studies which are clearly evident. **Question 5** on Tajfel's generic norm is a perfect illustration of this, as is **Question 2** on the apparatus used by Hudson.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This question required candidates to look at a table of data and describe two findings. This should have been a straightforward question because candidates could describe any two findings and all that was required was a consideration of the data in the table. For example, candidates could comment on the data: 16 saw broken glass whereas 34 did not; which could be repeated for hit and control groups. Conclusions were acceptable, provided they were derived from the data in the table. However, many candidates referred incorrectly to speed estimates and many could not draw any conclusions at all.

Question 2 (a) asked candidates to describe the apparatus used by Hudson for studying perceived depth. A drawing of the actual apparatus appears in the study. It consists of an electroluminescent panel with polaroid sheet (with the man/antelope/elephant picture); a half silvered mirror; a polaroid sheet to cover one eye; and an adjustable spot of light. Any of these two features scored 2 marks. 1 mark was given for



identifying the hunter/antelope/elephant picture if there was no other description. Some candidates wrote perfect answers, identifying many features, whilst others could not identify any aspect of the apparatus at all. **Part (b)** required candidates to suggest one advantage of using the same apparatus with each participant. The aim of this question was to elicit a response based on controls, the aim of which is to ensure as much is standardised as possible for all participants. Whilst many candidates answered this question clearly and directly, many others seemed not to understand that using the same apparatus is a control.

Question 3 (a) asked simply: 'What is meant by the term 'longitudinal study'? Whilst many candidates could go no further than a 1 mark answer by stating that 'it is done over a period of time', others scored 2 marks by going further and stating that 'it is a study done on the same individual over a period of time so developmental changes can be recorded'. **Part (b)** asked candidates to suggest one reason why this study on Washoe was a longitudinal study. The most logical answer was that it took time to teach Washoe sign language and to record her progress. Most candidates were able to answer this question correctly, scoring all the available marks, but many failed to make the link.

Question 4

This question asked for two reasons why the Haney et al. study should have been done. Many candidates either did not or could not answer the question set and many revealed their lack of understanding of this study. Many candidates wrote 'the study should not have been done because...' Some candidates wrote why the study was unethical; others wrote that the study should have been done in a real prison. This study could not have been done in a real prison as it was designed to test the dispositional or situational hypothesis and this could only be done with people without a criminal record and not on those who are in prison already. Many other candidates answered the question correctly stating that, for example, it gives an insight into the importance of social roles; that participants are not really harmed and will have no long-term damage; and that it tests the dispositional hypothesis/supports the situational hypothesis.

Question 5 (a) asked candidates 'What is meant by the term 'generic norm' in the study by Tajfel on intergroup categorisation.' Tajfel defines this as 'whenever we are confronted with a situation to which some form of inter-group categorisation appears directly relevant, we are likely to act in a manner that discriminates against the out-group and favours the in-group'. Whilst candidates would never be expected to quote this word for word, an understanding of the meaning would score marks. Many candidates were able to do this successfully, whilst others referred to some incorrect aspect of the study. **Part (b)** asked candidates to outline one consequence that follows from the generic norm. Tajfel lists three consequences and again many candidates were able to provide an appropriate answer. Reference to the key study itself will reveal full details, or see a copy of the mark scheme for full details.

Question 6 (a) asked for two ways in which arousal could be reduced in the study by Piliavin, et al. Although the answer is part of the cost-benefit model, a fundamental part of the study, many candidates could only guess at the answer. Arousal can be reduced in many ways, most obviously by helping the person, or by looking the other way and making the decision not to help. **Part (b)** asked for an outline of the model of response to emergency situations proposed by Piliavin. This model is where a situation creates arousal but actual helping is determined by cost-benefit matrix which can involve the costs of helping; the benefits of helping and costs of not helping. A consideration of any of these aspects gained marks. As usual, some candidates provided clear and detailed answers easily scoring full marks, whilst others provided an incorrect answer or no answer at all.

Question 7 (a) asked: Why were the children asked the 'pre-transformational' question in the study by Samuel and Bryant on conservation. This question was asked because it replicated the standard procedure by Piaget and it was a control question to check that the child understood that the amounts were the same before the transformation. Many candidates understood this, but many candidates could not make a distinction between the pre and post transformational questions. **Part (b)** asked: Why were the children asked the 'post-transformational' question? The most logical answer is to determine whether the child could conserve, to reflect on the pre-transformational question and make a judgement about the transformation. Many candidates fully understood both question parts and scored full marks, whilst yet again, some candidates appeared not to have studied this core study at all.

Question 8 The study by Hodges and Tizard on attachment used psychometric tests, and question **Part (a)** wanted candidates to identify one psychometric test used in this study. The main problem here was that many candidates assumed that the only psychometric test is an IQ test. This is not the case. In this study the parent completed the 'A' scale questionnaire (Rutter, 1970) on the adolescent's behaviour and the Rutter B scale was given to teachers. **Part (b)** asked for one advantage of any psychometric test. Whilst many

candidates provided perfect answers, others were fixated on the IQ test and could not go beyond the numbers resulting from an IQ test.

Question 9

This question required an outline of the two objections Freud believed would be made about his study of little Hans. Despite the two objections being outlined by Freud right at the beginning of his article, very few candidates knew what these objections were, instead there were many guesses, and often these were incorrect. The two objections are: firstly 'Hans was not a normal child; it would be illegitimate, therefore, to apply to other normal children conclusions which might perhaps be true of him'. The second, 'an analysis of a child conducted by his father must be entirely devoid of any objective worth'. These quotes are taken directly from the article by Freud.

Question 10 wanted a brief description of the function of two cortical regions of the brain. Whilst many candidates provided clear and accurate answers, many candidates did not know the difference between the cortical and any other region of the brain. Some candidates, for example, thought the amygdala was a cortical region. The Raine et al. article clearly labels these regions. Appropriate cortical areas include the frontal, parietal, occipital and temporal lobes and the cerebellum.

Question 11 (a) focused on the procedure of the study on vision and memory. Many candidates looked at other aspects such as vision and speech and handedness. The perfect answer would be: 'the participants were presented with an image to their left visual field and then to the right visual field and asked if the second time they saw the image they could remember seeing it before'. If question **Part (a)** was incorrect then candidates would also get **Part (b)** incorrect. A correct answer would be 'the image would only be recalled if it was presented to the same hemisphere. If it was presented to the other hemisphere the person would say that they had not seen the image before'.

Question 12 (a) asked for any one conclusion from the review by Gould on intelligence testing. As any conclusion was acceptable, nearly all candidates were able to score at least one mark. The most common conclusions were in relation to the testing, the findings, and also in relation to the eugenics argument. For question **Part (b)** candidates were required to provide evidence to support the conclusion in **Part (a)**. Many candidates could do this successfully but many realised that they needed to re-write their answer to question **Part (a)** to match the answer they wanted to give to **Part (b)**. Candidates are reminded that they should read both the question parts before beginning an answer.

Question 13 required candidates to describe one piece of anecdotal evidence from the Thigpen and Cleckley study. Most candidates were unable to answer this question. Many wrote about the letter that was started by Eve White, completed by Eve Black and sent to Thigpen. This is not anecdotal because the letter actually existed; it is not a story which may or may not be true. The most quoted piece of anecdotal evidence was where Eve White was said to have gone on a shopping trip but for which Eve White had no memory, because it was the personality of Eve Black who went shopping. **Part (b)** required candidates to suggest one problem with anecdotal evidence. The most likely answer is that anecdotal evidence may be true; it may be partially true (e.g. exaggerated) or it may be totally false. Most candidates answered this question part correctly.

Question 14 (a) asked: What is participant observation? Participant observation is where the aim is to gain a close and intimate familiarity with a given group of individuals (in this case the psychiatrists, nurses, etc. in the institutions) and their practices through an involvement with them in their natural environment. The participants do not know they are being observed, assuming the 'participant' is one of them. Candidates writing about one or more of these aspects scored full marks. **Part (b)** asked for one disadvantage of participant observation, and one disadvantage is that it is often unethical because those being observed are deceived, and neither do they give informed consent.

Question 15 (a) asked for the skin colours of the participants in the studies by Clark and Clark and Haba and Grant. In the latter study there were three groups which were: light (practically white); medium (light brown to dark brown); dark (dark brown to black). Whilst many candidates knew this, others reverted to simply 'black' and 'white' which was awarded 1 mark. **Part (b)**, asked: what difference was found in relation to skin colour. Whereas Clark and Clark found that light skin colour children showed the greatest preference for the white and the black doll, Haba and Grant did not find this trend, therefore concluding that attitudes had changed.

Section B

Question 16

The concern of **Question 16** was ethics, more specifically the issue of deception. By far the most popular choice of study was that by Milgram simply because there were more instances of deception in his study than any of the others, although the Schachter and Singer study is a very close second. **Part (a)** required a description of the procedure, and many candidates provided excellent descriptions although many went beyond a description of the procedure, including results as well. **Part (b)** required a description of how deception was used, and many candidates adopted a list-like approach. **Part (c)** required both reasons for and reasons against the deception of participants. If a candidate wrote only about advantages (or disadvantages) then they scored a maximum of 5 marks, however good the answer was. The most common reason for deceiving participants was that the knowledge gained from the study outweighed any ethical concerns, whilst the most common reason against was simply that it is unethical to deceive participants. **Part (d)** required consideration of an alternative way of gathering data, and the focus this time was how the study could be conducted without deception. As usual, the first half of this question caused candidates few problems, but many candidates still fail to consider how the change might affect the results.

Question 17

This question was on controls with the studies of Dement and Kleitman, Bandura et al. and Baron-Cohen et al. being available for selection. **Part (a)** required a description of the findings of the chosen study. This does not mean that candidates should describe the procedure first. There are no marks available at all for the procedure here. Candidates must answer the question set; in this case it was findings. **Part (b)** focused on the controls used in the study. These could be to control participant variables, such as Bandura using an independent groups design because it would be illogical for a child to see the model behave aggressively and then for the same child to see the model not behave aggressively. Moreover, situational variables could be controlled, and for some studies experimenter variables could be controlled by having two or more observer's record behaviours or conduct tests. **Part (c)** looked for advantages and disadvantages of applying controls. The advantage of controls mean that the dependent variable is more likely to be due to the independent variable; that is confounding is less likely. On the other hand, the greater the control, the less ecologically valid and the more reductionist the study becomes. **Part (d)** looked for another way in which data could be collected. A simple way of answering this question is to think of an alternative method. If an experiment was used, then a questionnaire could be constructed, or an observation could be done. The question does ask for a suggestion and rather than to quote a study that has already been performed.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/12
Core Studies 1

General comments

As always there were superb answers written by very knowledgeable and well prepared candidates whose answers were a pleasure to read. Others struggled for various reasons and the purpose of this report is to explain aspects of the mark scheme and to point out weaknesses in examination technique so that any future candidates will not make the same mistakes.

Many candidates do not follow the rubric and answer all questions on the paper. Many write too much for **Section A**, and have no time for **Section B**. Some candidates do not read questions, often writing about questions they want to see rather than the questions that are actually there.

Perhaps the two areas that need most attention are as follows:

1. Candidates write too little detail for **Section A** answers. If the question wants two things to be identified for 2 marks, then answers can be very brief. For this paper **Question 7(a)** is a perfect example where writing EPI MIS and EPI IGN would score 2 marks out of 2. However, if the question wants a description of one thing for 2 marks, then the answer needs to be more detailed in order to score both the available marks. The aim is not to complete the paper as quickly and as briefly as possible. The aim is to achieve a good grade and this is best done by showing the extent and depth of psychological knowledge. Adding an example to an answer; adding that little additional detail will score the second mark. For example in **Question 13(a)**, which asked for a way in which the Tajfel study was unethical, many candidates stated simply 'participants were deceived'. This is true, but such a brief answer would score 1 mark. Moreover, writing three words is a very brief answer and does not show any depth to psychological knowledge. To put it another way, if there are two marks available, why should a brief answer like this score the full 2 marks? Adding how participants were deceived to this answer, for example 'they were deceived because they were allocated to groups randomly rather than by being under or over estimators' would score the full 2 marks.
2. When examiners set questions they do not use any particular textbook, they use the original studies. This is stated in the specification. Whilst any summary book is useful, it may not contain the full detail of the original study. Examiners do not aim to trick candidates with questions about obscure detail in a study, but they will set questions on important parts of studies which are clearly evident.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1 (a) focused on the study by Loftus and Palmer and wanted two differences between watching film clips, as in the study, and watching a real car accident. Any appropriate difference would receive credit, such as the expectation of the event on video but not in real life; that the camera controls panorama and sound, where in real life what is seen is determined by each individual. Many candidates scored full marks, but some candidates seemed to just guess and often provide incorrect answers.

Question 2 (a) wanted two depth cues appearing in Hudson's picture of the hunter, antelope and elephant. Many candidates could not provide an answer presumably because they had either not seen the actual picture or because they did not know why the hunter was spearing the antelope. If the answer to **Part (a)** was not known, then the answer to **Part (b)** was also not known. On the other hand there were many candidates who could identify two of the three depth cues: height in plane; relative or familiar size; and superimposition or overlap. No other depth cue (gradient of texture or clarity/focus) applied in this case. For **Part (b)**, candidates wrote answers such as: height in plane: the elephant is higher in picture than either man or antelope; and for relative or familiar size: the elephant is smaller than either man or antelope.

Question 3 (a) produced some impressive answers with many candidates providing a full table of data with all the numbers correct for each group and question. The data is as follows: All children answered the naming, reality and memory questions correctly. 23 out of 27 (85%) 'normal' children answered the belief question correctly. 12 out of 14 (86%) of Down's syndrome children answered the belief question correctly. 16 out of 20 (80%) autistic children answered the belief question incorrectly. It should be noted that actual numbers were not needed to score full marks. For **Part (b)** candidates were required to suggest a disadvantage of quantitative data, most candidates gave the correct answer that quantitative data gives useful numbers and statistics but no explanation or reason why participants behave in the ways they do.

Question 4

This question also produced some impressively detailed answers in response to the question: Briefly describe the groups which participants were allocated to within conditions. Some candidates provided a word for word repetition of the paragraph from the actual study whilst others gave a briefer but equally correct answer. Some candidates wrote about the response categories, which was incorrect because response categories are ways in which participants behaved and not groups into which they were put. **Part (b)** asked a logical question which needed nothing much more than a common sense answer for those understanding the study. Participants were allocated to these conditions so it could be seen whether or not observing an aggressive model would be copied. Having a non-aggressive group and a control group meant groups existed for comparisons with the experimental group.

Question 5 (a) asked: why were the children in the Hodges and Tizard study 'ex-institutional'. The simple answer to this question, and the one provided by most candidates, was that the children had been in institutional care for at least two years and then were either adopted or restored to a biological parent(s). **Part (b)** asked for one effect that institutionalisation had on the children, most candidates provided a correct answer, which could have included that they were: less likely to be selective in choosing a friend; less likely to have a special friend; and more likely to be adult oriented amongst a number of other possibilities.

Question 6 asked about the case study method as used by Freud to investigate little Hans. **Part (a)** asked for one advantage of the case study method as used in this study. This meant there were two components to this answer. The first was to provide an advantage of any case study, and the second was to explain how this advantage could be applied in this study. For example, an advantage of a case study is that it can be done over a long period of time, and in this way Freud (or the father) could gather lots of information about Hans as he grew and developed. The same format applied to **Part (b)** which asked the same except that it related to a disadvantage of case studies.

Question 7 wanted the identification of the two groups who copied the behaviour of the stooge in the study by Schachter and Singer. The correct answer was the EPI MIS (epinephrine misinformed) and EPI IGN (epinephrine ignorant) groups. Those in the EPI INF (epinephrine informed) and control/placebo groups did not copy the stooge. This question is an example of where the answer could be very brief, in fact just four words would suffice. **Part (b)** asked for a suggestion of why these participants copied the behaviour of the stooge. Schachter states 'Participants with no explanation of bodily arousal are more likely to seek an explanation from situational cues'. The EPI MIS (epinephrine misinformed) and EPI IGN (epinephrine ignorant) had no or false clues so were more likely to copy stooge. The other two groups either had an appropriate explanation or had no injection so had no need to explain their arousal.

Question 8

This question asked candidates for two conclusions from the table of the relationship between eye movement and estimation of dream duration. Many candidates drew conclusions that could never be concluded from the table, such as 'dreams occur during REM sleep'. Any two conclusions were acceptable provided that they were drawn from what appeared in the table. Candidates scoring only one mark provided answers without any further elaboration: e.g. 'there is a relationship between the duration of the dream and the duration of eye movement'. Answers scoring full marks made the same conclusion but went on to add the numbers which supported the conclusion.

Question 9

This question focused on a different aspect of the study by Sperry on split brain patients. Many candidates gave the right answer and many other candidates worked out the right answer. If participants were presented with an odour through their right nostril to their right hemisphere, then they would not be able to identify the smell because the language Centre is in the left hemisphere. As Sperry states 'Participants are unable to name the smell but may grunt, make aversive reactions or exclamations such as 'phew' to a strong unpleasant smell but not be able to state verbally whether it is garlic, cheese or some decayed matter'.

Question 10 (a) asked candidates to describe the procedure of the continuous performance task in the study by Raine et al. on brain scans. The article states: 'Ten minutes before the FDG injection, subjects were given practice trials on the CPT. Thirty seconds before injection; the task was started so that initial task novelty would not be FDG labeled. After 32 min of FDG uptake, the subject was transferred to the adjacent PET scanner room'. Some candidates answered this correctly. Others tried to say what the actual task was despite this not being clear in the study itself. **Part (b)** asked for a suggestion as to why participants had to complete this task. The main reason is that 'it has been shown to produce increases in relative glucose metabolic rates in the frontal lobes in normal controls, in addition to increases in right temporal and parietal lobes' according to Raine et al.

Question 11 (a) Before his study on obedience, Milgram asked candidates to predict the levels to which participants would go in the actual experiment. Milgram found that there was considerable agreement, all predicting that only an insignificant minority would go to the end of the shock series. Estimates ranged from 0 – 3% and the class mean was 1.2%. Many candidates wrote some or all of this detail, whilst others wrote that the prediction was that everyone would go to 450 volts. **Part (b)** invited candidates to suggest whether the findings supported the prediction. The findings did not support the prediction because 65% of participants went to 450 volts, differing totally from the prediction.

Question 12 (a) asked for a reason why the prison simulation study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo was stopped early. Zimbardo gives two reasons: that the behaviour of the guards was becoming increasingly degrading and the prisoners were becoming increasingly stressed; and secondly, to cut a long story short, he was told to stop the study by Maslach, his partner. Most candidates were able to provide an answer along these lines. **Part (b)** asked whether this study should or should not have been done. The split was 50-50, many candidates suggesting that it was simply too unethical, with others arguing that it did reveal interesting findings.

Question 13

This question wanted one ethical guideline that was broken in **Part (a)** and one ethical guideline that was not broken in **Part (b)**. A perfect answer for **Part (a)** would be 'deception – the participants were deceived when they were told that they were categorised based on being under/over estimators and Klee/Kandinsky when they were categorised randomly.' Here the ethical issue is identified and a correct example of it given. Full marks would be awarded for this answer. Of course there are a number of other ethical issues that were broken and could have been used.

Question 14

The focus of this question was to identify two features that were the same between the study by Hraba and Grant in 1969 on doll choice and that carried out by Clark and Clark in 1939 and **Part (b)** asked for two features that were different. The question accepted any similarity or difference and some candidates took the easy option of stating that one was done in 1939 and another in 1969. This is a difference and so scored one mark. Other candidates were more sophisticated, writing for a similarity that white children always preferred white dolls or for a difference that in 1939 black children preferred white dolls whereas in 1969 black children preferred black dolls.

Question 15

To be awarded both marks **Part (a)** required an explanation of what a longitudinal is and for the second mark it had to be supported with an example from the study by Thigpen and Cleckley. Many candidates correctly stated that a longitudinal study is carried out over a period of time, citing the example that Eve was studied over at least 14 months with 100 hours of interviews. For **Part (b)** an advantage of a longitudinal study was required and most candidates scored full marks by stating that it can record changes in behaviour for the same person over a period of time.

Section B

Question 16

The concern of this question was ethics, more specifically the issue of informed consent. **Part (a)** required an outline of the main findings of the chosen study, and many candidates provided excellent answers although many felt it necessary to include details of the procedure as well. Some candidates then found themselves writing about the procedure again, except this time it would be credited as this was what **Part (b)** required. **Part (b)** also wanted a description of how informed consent was given or not but some candidates did not address this at all. **Part (c)** required both advantages and disadvantages for gaining the informed consent of participants. If a candidate wrote only about advantages (or disadvantages) then they scored a maximum of 5 marks, however good the answer was. The most common reason for gaining informed consent is that it is ethical, whereas the most common reason against was that participants remain naïve and so perform in a more natural way. **Part (d)** required consideration of an alternative way of gathering data, and the focus this time was how the study could be made more ethical. The first half of this question caused candidates few problems, but many candidates still failed to consider how the change might affect the results.

Question 17

This question was on observations made in the studies of Rosenhan, Bandura et al. and Piliavin et al. being those available for selection. **Part (a)** required a description of how observational data was gathered in the chosen study. Often this became a description of the procedure, with some candidates failing to mention how data were actually gathered. For example in the Piliavin et al. study, where some candidates even drew the carriage to show where everything took place, amazing detail was provided but no mention of how the observational data was actually gathered. Answers which did not mention this important aspect were still awarded marks. **Part (b)** focused on the results of the study and often a reasonable range was provided by candidates although some candidates mentioned the comments made by passengers. Such comments are not observational data. **Part (c)** looked for advantages and disadvantages and those relevant to this question included: that those being observed behave naturally, which is high in ecological validity; but on the downside that there may be observer bias in the reliability of recording since, to use the Piliavin et al. study, the two observers recorded different things. **Part (d)** looked for another way in which data could be collected. For those choosing the Piliavin et al. study, most logically this would be through a questionnaire and for those choosing to write about the Rosenhan study this was also a popular option. For those who went for the Bandura et al. study an observation in the home (or School) of each child was the most popular suggestion.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/21
Core Studies 2

General comments

As in previous years, the marks achieved by candidates sitting this examination covered the entire range of the mark spectrum. Many candidates provided very good answers which showed that they were very well prepared and could sometimes extend their answers beyond the core studies themselves. This was particularly evident for the **Part (a)** section in **Section B**.

Some candidates showed a very good understanding of the core studies but achieved less well because of poor time management or a misunderstanding of some of the questions in **Section B**. Candidates should aim to spend half an hour on **Section A** and an hour on **Section B** as this is worth more marks. It is pleasing to see that most candidates did write something for every question on the paper. Very few candidates attempted all three essays. When this did happen the candidate was awarded the mark for the best of the three questions (**Question 6, Question 7 or Question 8**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

As in previous years, some candidates were poorly prepared for the content required in the exam. Some did have knowledge of the core studies but spent very little time answering the questions. Centres should be aware that in order to achieve a good mark on this paper, candidates should aim to write for quite a bit of the time allocated. There was an even spread of candidates choosing **Question 6** and **Question 8** for **Section B**. **Question 7** was somewhat less popular.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) The majority of the candidates were able to achieve at least one mark for this question. Most knew that the purpose of the split brain operation was connected to the patients' epilepsy. Many were able to explain the operation reduced the fits. Some candidates achieved no marks as they explained what a split brain operation involves.
- (b) Candidates described a range of problems with generalising. Most candidates concentrated on the issue of generalising from this specialised sample or they focused on the size of the sample. Candidates who performed poorly on this question did not understand what is meant by the term 'generalising'.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to achieve at least one mark for this question by referring to one of the verbs in the question and the affect this had on whether the participants recalled broken glass. Many candidates gave a clear finding from the study by giving a comparison between two of the conditions. In addition, some candidates gave overall conclusions which were also deemed credit worthy.
- (b) There were a few excellent answers to this question and some candidates were able to clearly explain the difficulty with studying cognitive processes. Many achieved one mark by identifying a problem such as individual differences, lack of ecological validity, etc. Some candidates gave general problems with the Loftus and Palmer study but this was not specific to cognitive processes and therefore they achieved no marks.

Question 3

- (a) Many candidates were able to achieve full marks by identifying a technique used by the Gardners and then giving a brief description of this technique. Quite a few candidates only achieved one mark as they just named the technique. Some candidates achieved no marks as they described the study in general.
- (b) Most candidates did identify consent, harm or right to withdraw but failed to explain why this was an issue with the technique. Some candidates gave a methodological issue not an ethical one and achieved no marks.

Question 4

- (a) The majority of candidates achieved one mark for this question as most just mentioned these two groups of children were studied as a comparison group. A few were able to explain why one (or both) of the groups were included. For example, the Down's syndrome children were included to show that lack of theory of mind is not something that is shared with other types of special needs.
- (b) This was not well answered by candidates. Most failed to recognise that it was to prove that MA and theory of mind are unconnected. A few candidates did know that the autistic group had the highest MA.

Question 5

This was a four mark answer that was worth two marks for each description. Many candidates achieved full marks by correctly describing both quantitative data and qualitative data. Some candidates achieved only one mark for the description as it just named the data (e.g. EEG) without any description. A few candidates achieved no marks either by getting the two types of data mixed up or by giving general descriptions of the study.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) There were some good answers from candidates. Candidates had a good knowledge of the core studies and were able to describe the procedures and findings of these studies. Many candidates were able to identify how each study was useful. Some gave very long answers in this section where they could just focus on how each study is useful. This did leave some with less time for the other two sections. A few gave very brief answers (often just a few words) which achieved fewer marks.
- (b) Many candidates were able to identify a number of problems. Problems on their own with no explanation or reference to the core studies could only achieve one mark per problem up to a maximum of four. Some candidates were able to achieve more marks as they gave explanations of the problems and used the studies to back up their points. Very weak candidates gave long lists of problems which were often confused. These candidates achieved very few marks.
- (c) Many candidates failed to use evidence and were restricted to 3 or 4 marks. Many answers were anecdotal and included little reference to psychology. Some candidates achieved marks in the middle band as they went through each study in turn but did not extend beyond the core studies in order to achieve in the top band. However, there were some excellent answers to this question that did do this.

Question 7

- (a) There were many high quality answers where the candidates could clearly describe the ethnocentric bias in the four core studies in the question. Some candidates' answers were very brief or included a lot of irrelevant information about the procedures of the studies which achieved fewer marks.
- (b) Many candidates were able to give accurate and often detailed problems that psychologists have when they study ethnocentric bias. Similar to other essay questions in previous years many candidates identify problems that were not relevant to ethnocentric bias. These candidates could



only achieve one mark for each problem. Some candidates did include evidence from the core studies to back up their points which help them to achieve higher marks for this part of the essay.

- (c) There were some insightful answers and some did include core studies to back up their points and were able to achieve in the middle band. Many included no evidence or just anecdotal evidence and were therefore restricted to just 3 or 4 marks.

Question 8

- (a) This was well answered by many candidates. Most candidates were able to accurately identify whether each core study included in the question was longitudinal or snapshot. A few candidates did incorrectly identify the method. Many were able to identify how long the study was carried out for and were often able to give other details of how the study was conducted. Many candidates incorrectly believed the Freud study was carried out until Hans was 19 as this is mentioned as a small point at the end of the discussion in the Gross textbook that Freud did meet Hans as an older teenager. This is not a part of Freud's original study.
- (b) Many candidates were able to identify a few weaknesses with longitudinal research. Many found it difficult to identify four separate weaknesses. Quite a few candidates could give clear and accurate descriptions of these weaknesses and used the studies to extend their answers. These candidates either achieved full marks or were very close to this. Some candidates did not use the evidence and therefore achieved poor marks.
- (c) Candidates found it difficult to discuss snapshot studies and found it challenging to produce a sustained argument. Many gave very brief answers. Similar to other **Part (c)** answers in this exam, evidence again was often lacking, resulting in the mark being limited to 3 or 4 marks.



PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22
Core Studies 2

General comments

As in previous years, the marks achieved by candidates sitting this examination covered the entire range of the mark spectrum. Many candidates provided very good answers which showed that they were very well prepared and could often focus their answer very clearly on the question asked. This was particularly evident for the **Part (a)** section in **Section B**.

Some candidates showed a very good understanding of the core studies but achieved less well because of poor time management or a misunderstanding of some of the questions in **Section B**. Candidates should aim to spend half an hour on **Section A** and an hour on **Section B** as this is worth more marks. It is pleasing to see that most candidates did write something for every question on the paper. Very few candidates attempted all three essays. When this did happen the candidate was awarded the mark for the best of the three questions (**Question 6, Question 7 or Question 8**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

Compared to previous years, the **Section B** essay questions were particularly well answered. The majority of candidates seem to be aware that psychological evidence is required when answering all three parts of the essay. This really helped candidates to achieve higher marks. There was a fairly even spread of candidates choosing **Question 6, Question 7** and **Question 8** for **Section B**, although **Question 7** did prove to be slightly more popular with some Centres.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

This question was worth four marks. The marks were split with a maximum of two marks being awarded for each way the Milgram study was low in ecological validity. Most candidates struggled to get above one or two marks for this question. The examiner was looking for the candidate to state the way and then give a clear example from the study. Many candidates were able to say the study was in a laboratory but did not extend their answers. Some candidates chose to discuss sample sizes and sampling methods which were awarded no marks.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to achieve full marks for this question. Most could give a clear finding from the study. Candidates that achieved one mark gave a brief finding often without providing a comparison between REM and non REM sleep.
- (b) There were many excellent answers to this question with candidates being able to discuss quite a range of reasons why the conclusions of the study could not be generalised. Most focused on the limited sample but quite a few discussed the problems with the ecological validity of the study as well as the controls used and the effect this had on the generalisability of the conclusions of the study.

Question 3

- (a) Candidates found this question very challenging and many received no marks. Most candidates confused the functions of the left and right hemispheres or seemed to believe that the left visual field was connected to the left hemisphere. However, there were a few correct answers and many could clearly explain one problem.
- (b) Most candidates were able to gain one mark by suggesting the patients use both of their eyes. A few candidates were able to explain that this would mean the information would reach both hemispheres. These candidates achieved full marks for the question.

Question 4

- (a) Many candidates achieved one mark for this question by stating that the white children chose the white doll. Quite a few candidates were able to achieve full marks by explaining how this choice of doll was ethnocentric.
- (b) Many candidates were able to give some very well developed and well explained answers going beyond the requirements of the question. Some brought in Hraba and Grant as the example to explain their point. Some also discussed Gould and Deregowski's study as the question did not ask for the answer to be specifically related to the Hraba and Grant study. However, quite a few candidates mentioned just a problem and could only gain one mark. Sometimes the discussion of the problem did not match the term used (e.g. naming reliability as the problem and then discussing validity) and therefore the candidate only achieved one mark.

Question 5

- (a) Candidates did very well in their answers to this question. Many were able to give the IQ scores of both Eve White and Eve Black although this was not necessary to gain full marks for this question. Some candidates named the EEG or ink blot test as the psychometric test which achieved no marks.
- (b) There was quite a variety of responses to this question. Some candidates did discuss problems directly related to psychometric tests and linked this to the Thigpen and Cleckley study and were able to gain full marks. However, quite a few candidates discussed general problems with the study (e.g. generalisability) which had nothing to do with psychometric tests and gain no marks.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) There were some good answers from candidates. Candidates had a good knowledge of the core studies and were able to describe the procedures and findings of these studies. Some candidates were able to identify the overall conclusions/generalisations that could be made from each study. Some gave very long answers in this section where they could just focus on the results and conclusions/generalisations for each study. This did leave some with less time for the other two sections. A few gave very brief answers (often just a few words) which achieved fewer marks. In addition to this, some candidates just wrote about one of the four core studies listed in the question and could only gain a maximum of three marks for this question.
- (b) Many candidates were able to identify a number of problems. Problems on their own with no explanation or reference to the core studies could only achieve one mark per problem up to a maximum of four. Some candidates were able to achieve more marks as they gave explanations of the problems and used the studies to back up their points. Very weak candidates gave long lists of problems which were often confused. These candidates achieved very few marks.
- (c) Many candidates did not use evidence and were restricted to 3 or 4 marks. Many answers were anecdotal and included little reference to psychology. Some candidates achieved marks in the middle band as they went through each study in turn but did not really address their answer to the question.

Question 7

- (a) There were many excellent answers where very detailed knowledge of the core studies was demonstrated. Many candidates achieved full marks for this question and could clearly relate the findings to development. Some candidates' answers were very brief or included a lot of irrelevant information about the procedures of the studies which achieved fewer marks.
- (b) Many candidates were able to give accurate and often detailed problems that psychologists have when they study development. Their answers were well focused on development and most gave clear examples. Similar to the other essay questions, some candidates did not include any evidence to back up the problems and achieved fewer marks for this part of the essay.
- (c) There were many very good answers and most candidates did use evidence to back up their points. Some candidates did extend beyond the core studies and were able to achieve marks in the top band as some discussed the impact education and the media have on children. Those that included no evidence or just anecdotal evidence were restricted to just 3 or 4 marks.

Question 8

- (a) This was well answered by the majority of candidates with many achieving very high marks for this question. Candidates could clearly identify the aspects of the situation in each study and the effect this had on behaviour. Similar to the other essay questions, some candidates gave very long descriptions of the procedures, samples and results without clearly pulling out the aspects of the situation in each study and the impact this had on behaviour. These candidates achieved fewer marks.
- (b) The candidates were able to discuss many relevant problems and many achieved high marks for this part. Some found it difficult to find four problems but could still achieve good marks for the three problems they did discuss. Candidates did often use evidence to explain their problems. Where evidence was lacking these candidates achieved few marks.
- (c) Most candidates found the question quite straight forward and were able to give a discussion around the greater influence on behaviour. Some just focused on either personality or situation and did not give a balanced argument. Many used core studies and quite a few used more than just the core studies listed in the question. Candidates did find it difficult to extend beyond the core studies which meant their marks were limited to 8 marks. Many gave very brief answers. Similar to other **part (c)** answers in this exam, evidence again was often lacking, resulting in the mark being limited to 3 or 4 marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/31
Specialist Choices

General comments

This examination produced the usual mixture of emotions. There is pleasure in reading superb answers which receive very good and even maximum marks. On the other hand there is frustration because there are candidates who make the same mistakes which are reported here regularly.

Attempting to answer all twenty questions on the paper is not a good strategy. It does not gain more marks as only the best four answers, from two options, count. Such candidates usually get the same 2 or 3 marks for each answer and nothing more.

Many candidates use **Section B Part (a)** and as an introduction and provide expansion in question **Part (b)**. This strategy is a false one because **Part (a)** is description and **Part (b)** is evaluation. Any description in **Part (b)** is credited to **Part (a)** and if there is no evaluation in **Part (b)** then no marks will be awarded.

Many candidates do not evaluate by issues. These are the issues, debates, etc. which form the basis of paper 1 and paper 2, but are totally forgotten by candidates when writing paper 3 answers.

Another regular comment is that there are some candidates who think that this specialist choices paper allows them to write about their own real-life experiences. This is a false assumption. A number of questions on this paper produced totally anecdotal answers from many candidates, such as **Question 3** on individual differences, **Question 8** on crowds, **Question 12** on lifestyles and **Question 19** on leadership. Candidates rarely write anecdotal answers about abnormality because they have little or no experience of being abnormal. Whilst psychology is about people and their experience, the purpose of an examination is for candidates to show what they have learned and the best way to do this is to quote psychological knowledge. If there is no psychological knowledge evident then no marks will be awarded.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

For **Part (a)** candidates had to explain what was meant by the term 'psychometric test'. Typically this is a standardised test that is reliable, valid and provides a statistical measure of performance. Most candidates scored two marks as appropriate answers were provided. For **Part (b)** candidates frequently named a test of intelligence, such as the Wechsler, but occasionally mentioned some aptitude or diagnostic test. **Part (c)** required a strength and an implication of psychometric tests. The most common strength was the standardised nature of intelligence tests; that they can be used to produce scores that are reliable and valid. The main implication was that once a person had been tested if they achieved a low score, that label tended to remain with them.

Question 2

For **Part (a)** candidates had to explain what was meant by the term 'gifted'. Although there are different types of giftedness, it is usually the educational ability of those who are statistically at the right-hand end of the normal distribution curve. This caused few problems for most candidates. **Part (b)** did cause some problems because a number of candidates believed incorrectly that there was 'negative giftedness' where such children had learning difficulties or disabilities. Other candidates correctly referred to exceptional educational performance or to those who are gifted in music or in sport. For **Part (c)** many answers correctly included that gifted children could be educated either by acceleration, segregation or enrichment of their environment.

Question 3

This question was on individual differences in educational performance which gave candidates an opportunity to write freely on this topic area. Many did just that and wrote excellent answers showing detailed knowledge and understanding. Some looked at the way a male brain might be 'wired' differently from a female brain, as reflected in different performance on spatial awareness tasks. Many social differences were mentioned, particularly in relation to culture and family upbringing. **Part (b)** answers covered the whole mark range. **Part (c)** asked how the performance of poorly performing girls could be improved. A wide range of answers mentioned that the girls could be segregated from the boys, that they could be given extra classes to enrich their learning or that appropriate reinforcement and reward strategies could be implemented.

Question 4

Part (a) required candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about motivation and educational performance. Many candidates began with the traditional theories by Freud and particularly Maslow, but many avoided the temptation to write about Maslow and motivation related to work. It was also good to see various approaches included, with both behaviourist and humanist theories being mentioned. Some candidates even included attribution theory and learned helplessness, very relevant concepts to motivation in education. Some **Part (b)** answers were excellent but others disappointed with the obvious lack of issues. For **Part (c)**, motivating candidates, many anecdotal answers were present such as 'they could give us sweets' but many wrote psychological answers referring to different types of motivation and by what Brophy (1981) calls 'effective praise'.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 5

Part (a) asked: What is a natural disaster? Nearly all candidates scored maximum marks by stating that a disaster has 'natural' causes (i.e. natural disaster) rather than being technological (technological catastrophe). Answers to **Part (b)** were disappointing because many candidates merely suggested what they might do themselves rather than writing answers based on psychological evidence. The work of Le Bon on panic and contagion gives some insight, but more recent work by Cocking and Drury (2007) suggest that panic is rare. Clarke (2002) suggests people help each other and develop 'we-ness'. **Part (c)** focused on preparation for an event and for earthquakes Japan have regular 'earthquake drills'; people in New Zealand are issued with leaflets and people in China are said to be given no preparation information at all. Very few candidates were aware of such differences and very rarely mentioned any procedure that existed in their own country.

Question 6

Part (a) asked about community environmental design and typically this is the design of buildings for public use. It can include the design of shopping centres/malls but also the design of housing communities such as Newman's Clason Point. **Part (b)** asked for two examples of community environmental design and candidates could either quote relevant material or they could not. Relevant work is that of Whyte (1980) and Brower (1983) who outlined street designs. In relation to housing, Newman (1976) designed Clason Point in New York City and Five Oaks, in Ohio. Again candidates were not allowed to mention any designs that had been implemented where they lived. **Part (c)** wanted one effect of urban living on social behaviour. Some appropriate work was quoted here, such as the studies by Altman (1969) and Amato (1983) but as usual answers were often anecdotal.

Question 7

This question was on crowding (and density) whereas **Question 8** was on crowds (and collective behaviour). No candidate got these two areas confused. For this answer the more able candidates looked at distinctions between density (physical) and crowding (psychological), methods (laboratory and naturalistic) and both human and animal studies. For human studies some candidates looked at performance, social behaviour and health. Often relevant issues were considered in **Part (b)** but this was not always the case. **Part (c)** looked at ways in which the negative feelings of crowding in a public place could be reduced. Some anecdotal and flippant answers merely stated 'don't go there' whereas the more able candidates quoted psychological studies such as those by Langer & Saegert (1977) who suggest attention diversion or increasing cognitive control.



Question 8

This question focused on crowd behaviour. In **Part (a)** some candidates defined what a crowd is, distinguished between different types of crowd, considered various explanations and then referred to studies such as those by Zimbardo (1969) and Diener (1976). Answers like this scored very high marks, whilst those candidates who were unable to mention such studies, or indeed failed to mention any studies at all, scored no more marks than those in the bottom band. If **Part (a)** was poor, question **Part (b)** followed the same pattern. Simply if very little was described in **Part (a)** then very little could be evaluated in **Part (b)**. Question **Part (c)** asked about preventing crowd problems. A number of recent events had acquisitive crowds stampeding and even death resulting, despite plans for successful crowd control existing. Candidates in the know described such plans, whilst those who did not merely provided common sense guesses.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 9

Part (a) was answered fully by most candidates, although some read the question as non-adherence rather than adherence to medical advice and so wrote an incorrect answer. Adherence is the extent to which people carry out the instructions given to them by a medical practitioner. **Part (b)** wanted two ways in which adherence can be measured. Such measures include those that are (1) Subjective: [a] ask practitioner to estimate: [b] ask patient to estimate (self report): [c] estimation of family member/medical personnel. (2) Objective: [a] quantity accounting (pill count) where number of pills remaining is measured. [b] use of medication dispensers which record and count number of times used. [c] biochemical tests such as blood or urine sample. [d] The tracer/marker method where a tracer is added to medication e.g. riboflavin (vitamin B2) fluoresces under ultraviolet light. [e] recording number of appointments kept. **Part (c)** wanted ways in which adherence can be improved and most candidates provided appropriate detail to score all three available marks.

Question 10

In **Part (a)** many candidates correctly focused on managing stress rather than just explaining what is meant by stress. In **Part (b)** most candidates mentioned one or more questionnaires used to measure stress psychologically, most commonly the Holmes and Rahe (1967) Social Readjustment Rating Scale, Kanner et al. (1981) Hassles and Uplifts checklist and Friedman and Rosenman's (1974) Type A personality were mentioned. **Part (c)** wanted two ways in which stress can be managed psychologically. The most common answers here were behavioural /cognitive strategies such as progressive relaxation (Jacobsen, 1938); systematic desensitisation (Wolpe, 1958); and biofeedback. Also mentioned was cognitive restructuring (Lazarus, 1981); rational-emotive therapy (Ellis, 1962) and imagery (Bridge et al., 1988).

Question 11

This question on patient-practitioner relationships attracted good candidates who wrote some very good answers. Most made a distinction between verbal and non-verbal communications and many looked at the way a practitioner dresses when with patients. Some candidates looked at practitioner styles, including both patient-centred and practitioner-centred styles. Some candidates also included over-use and under-use of health services. **Part (b)** answers were varied. At the top end were those who evaluated a number of issues. Those in the middle mentioned a number of general issues and as always there were candidates at the bottom end who do not know how to evaluate. **Part (c)** looked at how misuse of health services could be discouraged and a number of interesting suggestions were provided.

Question 12

Answers were often disappointing in response to the question on lifestyles. Too many candidates who knew very little psychology thought they could score marks by writing about their own lifestyle. This strategy never works. Candidates must quote psychological knowledge. Health belief models concern lifestyles more than any other, so the work of Becker and Rosenstock (1984), Azjen (1985) or Weinstein (1998) would be most appropriate. More details of these studies can be found in the mark scheme. If **Part (a)** was lacking for many candidates, so was **Part (b)**. For **Part (c)** candidates had to focus on a community-wide campaign for reducing heart disease, and so work from the area of health promotion could be usefully included. More able candidates did precisely this and scored good marks.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

For **Part (a)** a model of abnormality is defined as a collection of assumptions concerning the way abnormality is caused and treated. It includes medical, psychological (behavioural, psychodynamic, etc.) approaches. Most candidates scored full marks for their answer to this question. **Part (b)** wanted a description of the behavioural model. Many candidates got no further than descriptions of Skinner and Pavlov, but others went on to say how the basics of conditioning explained abnormality. **Part (c)** wanted two behavioural treatments of abnormality and most candidates mentioned either systematic desensitisation (Wolpe 1958), or cognitive behaviour therapy which changes the way a person thinks (the cognitive part) and the way a person behaves (the behavioural part). Some candidates mentioned token economy which has been used in the treatment of schizophrenics.

Question 14

This question focused on compulsive gambling. Gambling, like kleptomania and pyromania, is an impulse control disorder where a person has to gamble to gain euphoria or relieve tension and typically includes feelings of gratification or relief afterward. Here the term compulsive is used in addition to gambling and compulsions are recurring actions that the individual is forced to enact. **Part (b)** asked for one explanation and appropriate explanations would include the Psychodynamic: the inability by the ego and superego to suppress the urges of the id: 'I want'; Cognitive where gambling would include thrill seeking and faulty thought patterns. **Part (c)** focused on treatments for compulsive gamblers, and the most common and most appropriate technique is cognitive-behaviour therapy. This focuses on gambling-related thought processes, mood and cognitive distortions that increase one's vulnerability to gamble.

Question 15

Many candidates began their answer on schizophrenia with a description of the term which is from the Ancient Greek schizein (split) and phren (mind). Many candidates considered the different types of which there are five. Candidates often focused on explanations of schizophrenia with genetic and family explanations being most common, followed by behavioural, cognitive and psychodynamic. Many candidates used the different explanations as a basis for evaluations in **Part (b)** whilst weaker candidates just extended their **Part (a)** answers. **Part (c)** asked how schizophrenia may be treated and some excellent and very thorough answers were written covering a wide range of approaches including drugs, electro-convulsive and behaviour therapies.

Question 16

This question focused on abnormal affect and **Part (a)** wanted to know what is meant by 'overcoming abnormal affect'. Most candidates included some words that related to both components: the 'overcoming' part and the 'abnormal affect' part. **Part (b)** asked for a type and a characteristic of abnormal affect and most candidates used their often extensive knowledge of unipolar or bipolar disorder. Some candidates legitimately wrote about seasonal affective disorder. **Part (c)** focused on explanations for abnormal affect. Most candidates provided appropriate and detailed explanations including chemical imbalance (possibly hormonal); genetic/familial; and significant life events.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

This question was on motivation and performance. Most candidates were able to answer this question, although some struggled because the question linked motivation and performance. **Part (b)** required a description of one theory of motivation, and the theory of Maslow was by far the most common. Many other theories do exist which are much more up-to-date than Maslow. **Part (c)** asked for two reasons why motivation and performance are not always related. This might be because of systems and technology variables, such as inadequate systems, substandard tools and equipment. Also there are individual difference variables. Workers without basic skills and talents, and new employees may be most motivated but least productive. There are group dynamics variables where group dynamics may hinder a motivated individual. Finally, there are organisational variables: does each department work equally efficiently? Organisational politics may affect motivation and performance too.



Question 18

Part (a) of this question required an explanation of an 'operator-machine system'. Chapanis (1976) provides a very good explanation which includes: human systems including senses, information processing/decision-making and controlling; and machine systems involving controls, operation and display (feeding back to human senses). For **Part (b)** any one example of an operator-machine system was required and this could range from a person using hammer and a nail to a very complex system such as an air traffic controller. It may even be a person working with a computer. For **Part (c)** the focus was on the design of operator-machine systems and this should involve displays, which can be visual such as the monitor and a keyboard or auditory such as sounds and alerts. Controls include the knobs, switches, buttons etc. necessary to operate the machine.

Question 19

This question allowed candidates to write all they knew about leadership and management. Candidates wrote about a wide range of theories including contingency theories, such as that of Fiedler through to charismatic leaders and Behavioural and Universalist theories. In **Part (b)** evaluations covered the whole mark range. In **Part (c)** the focus was on leader-worker satisfaction, and although rarely quoted by candidates, the most pertinent work is that of Dansereau et al. (1975). This leader-member exchange model suggests that it is the quality of interaction between leaders and group members that is important in an organisation, and this model has received much acclaim due to the success it has achieved when applied to real life situations.

Question 20

This question was on interpersonal communication systems. There were those who merely described how people can communicate in an organisation: talking, telephoning, faxing, emailing, etc. and as these methods are actually used in organisations, some marks were awarded. However, higher marks are always awarded to those who quoted relevant psychological theories and evidence such as those considering Leavitt's centralised and decentralised networks for example. In **Part (c)** candidates were asked to suggest a network for a manager and a team assembling a toy. Some candidates suggested an appropriate network, with the production manager being at the centre of a wheel formation.



PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/32
Specialist Choices

General comments

This examination produced the usual mixture of emotions. There is pleasure in reading superb answers which receive very good and even maximum marks. On the other hand there is frustration because there are those who make the same mistakes and which are reported here again.

Attempting to answer all twenty questions on the paper is not a good strategy. It does not gain more marks as only the best four answers, from two options, count. Such candidates usually get the same 2 or 3 marks for every answer and nothing more.

Many candidates use **Section B Part (a)** as an introduction and provide expansion in question **Part (b)**. This strategy is a false one because **Part (a)** is description and **Part (b)** is evaluation. Any description in **Part (b)** is credited to **Part (a)** and if there is no evaluation in **Part (b)** then no marks will be awarded.

Many candidates do not evaluate by issues. These are the issues, debates, etc. which form the basis of paper 1 and paper 2, but are totally forgotten by candidates when writing paper 3 answers.

Another regular comment is that there are some candidates who think that this specialist choices paper allows them to write about their own real-life experiences. This is a false assumption. A number of questions on this paper produced totally anecdotal answers from many candidates, such as **Question 1** on assessment in schools, **Question 7** on crowds, **Question 12** on stress and **Question 19** on communications. Candidates rarely write anecdotal answers about abnormality because they have little or no experience of being abnormal. Whilst psychology is about people and their experiences, the purpose of an examination is for candidates to show what they have learned and the best way to do this is to quote psychological knowledge. If there is no psychological knowledge evident then no marks will be awarded.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

For question **Part (a)** candidates had to explain what was meant by 'gender issues in education'. Most candidates scored two marks as appropriate answers were provided. For **Part (b)** candidates could mention any gender difference. Some candidates referred to psychological differences, such as females having better verbal ability; whereas males have better spatial ability. Some candidates just gave random differences between males and females whether they were related to education or not. **Part (c)** required two explanations for gender differences and most candidates were able to make at least one appropriate suggestion. Most common were biological differences, raising the question of whether the male brain and female brain are different, and many candidates referred to social or cultural differences.

Question 2

Question **Part (a)** asked for an explanation of the term learning difficulty or disability, and most candidates stated that this is where a child has a significantly greater difficulty in learning than most children of the same age, or a child has a disability that needs different educational facilities from those that schools generally provide. **Part (b)** wanted two types of learning difficulty or disability. Most candidates referred correctly to disabilities such as dyslexia or dyscalculia, dyspraxia and dysgraphia. Some candidates however, said that there was positive disability and negative disability, and believed that giftedness is a positive disability. Giftedness is not a disability. For **Part (c)** any appropriate form of assessment could be used. However, an IQ test would not be used to assess dyslexia, rather something much more specific diagnostic test.

Question 3

Many candidates assumed that educational performance is only assessed in schools by the use of IQ tests. Whilst IQ tests may be used sometimes, more likely is the use of diagnostic tests to assess some disability and by far the most common will be assessed work that is done regularly and assessed by teachers and examiners in the form of a recognised qualification. Competent answers in **Part (a)** provided something to evaluate in **Part (b)** and for those with very little in **Part (a)** their answers to **Part (b)** contained very little evaluation. **Part (c)** asked how a mentally gifted child could be assessed. One way is through an IQ test, but that only assesses one form of giftedness when there are many types. Reference to the mark scheme will reveal types of giftedness and how they can be assessed.

Question 4

This question on approaches or perspectives focused specifically on the behaviourist approach to education. In **Part (a)** most candidates were able to provide a good explanation of the basics of classical and operant conditioning but often this made up their entire answer. The question concerns 'how the approach has been applied to learning' rather than just 'describe behaviourism'. It was expected that candidates would write about behaviourism in a classroom and not about pigeons in boxes and Pavlov and his dogs. In **Part (b)** evaluation was often sparse although some candidates were extremely well prepared and provided excellent answers. For **Part (c)** candidates had to apply the behaviourist approach specifically to the teaching of mathematics. Most logically this would involve programmed learning with positive reinforcement based on a schedule of reinforcement. For some candidates this was what they wrote about, but for others they could simply not go from the original laboratory experiments to how learning theory might apply in a classroom.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 5

Part (a) asked what was meant by the term 'defending space and territory'. The most common answer was to use territorial markers such as bag placed on a desk in a classroom or an item of clothing placed on a seat. **Part (b)** asked for a description of two ways in which personal space could be measured. Some candidates were well prepared to answer this question and covered measures such as the simulation and stop-distance methods, naturalistic observations, the comfortable interpersonal distance scale and invasions of personal space. Other candidates had apparently not covered measures at all and so struggled to answer this question part. **Part (c)** asked for a description of one type of territory and for those able to answer this question, the most common work mentioned was that of Altman (1975) who distinguished between primary, secondary and public types of territory.

Question 6

Part (a) asked about the term 'urban living'. This is living (having a place of residence) in a relatively densely populated area and most candidates managed an answer that was creditworthy. **Part (b)** wanted two effects urban living may have on social behaviour. Three studies were the most commonly quoted. Firstly Altman (1969) and Amato (1983) looked at pro-social behaviour and secondly Zimbardo looked at anti-social behaviour. Zimbardo left his car for few days. In a city it was totally vandalised; in a rural area his car was left untouched. **Part (c)** wanted one effect of urban living on health. Many candidates wrote about the poor quality of air in a city and a few others quoted psychological research such as that by Soderberg (1977) and Franck et al. (1974).

Question 7

This question focused on crowd behaviour. In **Part (a)** some candidates defined what a crowd is, distinguished between different types of crowd, considered various explanations and then referred to studies such as those by Zimbardo (1969) and Diener (1976). Answers like this scored very high marks, whilst those candidates who were unable to mention such studies, or indeed failed to mention any studies at all, scored no more marks than those in the bottom band. If **Part (a)** was poor, **Part (b)** followed the same pattern. Simply put, if very little was described in **Part (a)** then very little could be evaluated in **Part (b)**. **Part (c)** asked about preventing crowd problems. A number of recent events had acquisitive crowds stampeding and even death resulting, despite plans for successful crowd control existing. Candidates in the know described such plans, whilst those who did not merely provided common sense guesses.

Question 8



Question 8 was on environmental cognition. This is an interesting area because all candidates must use their own cognitive maps in every day life. There are ways of measuring maps, animal studies, errors made by humans and how cognitive maps are acquired by children. Answers to **Part (a)** covered the entire mark range; at the top end there were superb answers, whilst at the bottom end were candidates who knew nothing at all about cognitive maps. Answers in **Part (b)** reflected the detail and quality of **Part (a)**. **Part (c)** asked candidates to design a 'you are here' map for visitors to their School. Many answers were very anecdotal rather than evidence based, but some candidates correctly quoted the work of Levine (1982).

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 9

Part (a) asked about the term 'misuse of health services'. Most candidates scored 2 marks when answering 'the extent to which people do not use health services in a usual way'. For **Part (b)** most candidates looked at either over-use or under-use of services. For excessive over-use, candidates referred to people with either Munchausen Syndrome or Hypochondriasis. On the other hand, some candidates referred to under-use and focused on the work of either Safer (1979) or Pitts (1991) who provide reasons why people delay seeking help from health services. For **Part (c)** some candidates suggested changing physician behaviour, changing physician appearance or changing communication style.

Question 10

Answers were often disappointing in response to the question on lifestyles. Too many candidates who knew very little psychology thought they could score marks by writing about their lifestyle. **Part (a)** wanted an explanation the term lifestyle and most candidates did score 1 mark here. **Part (b)** wanted two ways in which lifestyles could be measured. There were two ways to answer this question, either way acceptable. The first was by quoting studies which had measured lifestyles, such as those by Harris and Guten, and Turk. The second was to suggest the use of a questionnaire or by use of an interview. The mark allocated was determined by the depth and quality of the answer. **Part (c)** wanted a behaviour that would improve health. Some candidates merely suggested 'exercise more' whereas others were more sophisticated by suggesting things like using health services appropriately.

Question 11

This was a popular choice for candidates because some candidates had been very well prepared. Such answers included a range of relevant areas including types of non-adherence, ways in which adherence can be measured and reasons for non-adherence. **Part (b)** often matched **Part (a)** in quality and depth with candidates looking at issues such as qualitative (e.g. asking a patient their level of non-adherence) compared with quantitative measures (e.g. pill counts or biochemical tests). Some candidates compared and contrasted models of health beliefs, which consider reasons for adherence or non-adherence. **Part (c)** asked about measures of non-adherence that could be used by a medical practitioner and most candidates gave a number of appropriate suggestions.

Question 12

In **Part (a)** many candidates structured their answers logically, mentioning definitions, causes, measures and ways to control stress. Causes were typically life events, personality or daily hassles. Measures were also included and many candidates mentioned both physiological measures and psychological measures. In **Part (b)** some candidates enjoyed the range of issues pertinent to this area, and others struggled with where to begin. **Part (c)** asked about how the stress of a candidate can be managed. Stress in candidates can be managed in the same way as the stress of any other person, namely through a psychological questionnaire or through some physiological measure such as blood pressure.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

Part (a) wanted candidates to explain what is meant by 'classifying abnormality'. This is placing an abnormality into a category of DSM or ICD which most candidates were able to answer successfully. Two definitions of abnormality were required for **Part (b)**. The four most common are: deviation from statistical norms; deviation from ideal mental health; failure to function adequately; and deviation from social norms with the amount and quality of detail being reflected in the mark awarded. **Part (c)** wanted any type of abnormality and answers to this could be general such as 'psychoses' and 'neuroses' or they could be specific such as mania or depression or manic depression.

Question 14

This question focused on abnormal affect and **Part (a)** wanted to know what is meant by 'overcoming abnormal affect'. Most candidates included some words that related to both components; the 'overcoming' part and the 'abnormal affect' part. **Part (b)** asked for a type and a characteristic of abnormal affect and most candidates used their often extensive knowledge of unipolar or bipolar disorder. Some candidates legitimately wrote about seasonal affective disorder. **Part (c)** focused on explanations for abnormal affect. Most candidates provided appropriate and detailed explanations including chemical imbalance (possibly hormonal); genetic/familial; and significant life events.

Question 15

Part (a) asked candidates to 'describe models of abnormality'. A number of candidates began by outlining the different definitions of abnormality, following this with a description of the various models. The usual format was to describe the medical model followed by psychological (behavioral, psychodynamic and humanist) models. Many candidates referred to types of abnormality which the models explained. **Part (b)** provided some good evaluations, where different models were compared and contrasted. **Part (c)** was to suggest treatments for any abnormality, and whereas many candidates excelled with their in-depth knowledge of abnormalities and their treatments, others knew treatments but not the models on which they are based.

Question 16

This essay question focused on somatoform disorders, and generally there were some excellent answers, although many were list-like. The list included: Hypochondriasis: a preoccupation with and exaggerated concerns about health, or having a serious illness; Conversion: where patients have neurological symptoms such as numbness, paralysis, or fits, but where no neurological explanation can be found. Somatisation: where patients who chronically and persistently complain of varied physical symptoms that have no identifiable physical origin. Psychogenic pain is where people report pain that has no physical cause. Body dysmorphic disorder is where the affected person is excessively preoccupied by an imagined or minor defect in his or her physical features. **Part (b)** answers were less impressive because any underlying model of abnormality, or whether somatoform disorders are learned or inherited for example, was not emphasised and evaluated. **Part (c)** looked at treatments and again there were some very good answers, with cognitive behaviour therapy featuring most prominently. Some candidates believe that body dysmorphic disorder can be treated with cosmetic surgery. This is not the case at all because BDD is a psychological problem rather than a physical one.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

Part (a) asked for an explanation of the term 'personnel selection'. Typically this is the choosing from a sample of job applicants the individual best suited to the job available. Most candidates were able to provide an answer similar to this definition. **Part (b)** wanted a description of two types of selection interview. By far the most common answer compared structured with unstructured interviews or formal compared with informal. **Part (c)** asked for a pitfall or weakness in the decision making process and most candidates mentioned possible bias or misinterpretation on the part of the person making the selection decisions. Some candidates also mentioned a possible failure to adhere to equal opportunities.



Question 18

Part (a) of this question required an explanation of the term 'job analysis'. This is the systematic study of the tasks, duties and responsibilities of a job, and most candidates answered this correctly. **Part (b)** wanted two job analysis techniques. Some candidates suggested 'asking the worker' whilst others wrote about more formal techniques from the United States such as the FJA, CIT and PAQ. For **Part (c)**, a weakness in job analysis techniques, most candidates mentioned possible bias or misinterpretation on the part of the person applying the technique. Some candidates suggested that most techniques are mechanistic and take out the human element. Some candidates even mentioned Taylor's scientific management the historical beginnings of job analysis techniques.

Question 19

This question was on interpersonal communication systems. There were those who merely described how people can communicate in an organisation: talking, telephoning, faxing, emailing, etc. and as these methods are actually used in organisations, some marks are awarded. However, higher marks are always awarded to those who quoted relevant psychological theories and evidence such as those considering Leavitt's centralised and decentralised networks for example. In **Part (c)** candidates were asked to suggest a network for medical staff in a hospital, encouraging candidates to think and apply theory to a real world setting. Many candidates could not do this and suggested things that would simply not work, whereas others were inventive and showed very good understanding.

Question 20

It appears that many candidates either have not realised that the topic of work design was added to the syllabus several years ago, or that they do not need to study the topic in order to provide an acceptable answer. This area involves human factors which are concerned with the design of tools, machines, work systems and work places to fit the skills and abilities of workers. Chapanis (1976) outlines the 'operator-machine system:' which can include human systems: senses, information processing/decision-making and controlling; and machine system involving controls, operation and display (feeding back to human senses). Also relevant are displays, which can be visual or auditory and controls which can be of many types, but should be matched to the operator's body; they should be clearly marked and they should mirror the machine actions they produce. Errors in operator-machine are also important. There can be errors of: omission (failing to do something), commission (performing an act incorrectly), sequence errors (doing a step out of order) and timing errors: too quickly or slowly. If these topics are covered in an answer then top marks should be awarded. **Part (c)** asked candidates to focus on errors, details of which appear above.