

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/11

Core Studies 1

General Comments

This sitting of Paper 1 was the second for the new specification. The two major changes to the paper should therefore have been familiar to candidates: the inclusion of new studies, and the change in essays in **Section B**. The essay format changed from a choice to two compulsory questions and from questions asking for description as well as evaluation/application to two questions requiring only the latter.

With respect to the essays, almost all candidates followed the instruction to answer both questions in **Section B**, and many also focused on analysis rather than description in their answers. So, although candidates are now following the rubric in terms of the number of questions, there are still some who need to attend more carefully to the requirements of the new style essay questions which demand evaluation (and application) in detail rather than simply description and evaluation. This aspect is improving although candidates need to be able to present more ideas and relate them more effectively to the study they have chosen. In **Section A** responses were much improved, with very few candidates referring to inappropriate study such as Loftus & Palmer (1979) rather than Loftus & Pickrell. Indeed, some candidates had learned the new studies in detail and were readily able to answer questions about their content.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

Mann et al: This question asked for two reasons for believing that liars would not show nervous behaviours. Many candidates were able to identify both cognitive load and behavioural control, although answers in relation to the latter tended to be more vague. For weaker candidates, an attempt at describing this effect was likely to be their only mark for this question.

Question 2

Loftus and Pickrell: Part (a) of this question asked for two events that were always in the false story and part (b) wanted two things from the relatives that were used in the false event story. Most candidates were able to gain marks in part (a), with many accurate responses. In part (b) candidates gave similarly detailed answers with answers spread over the full range of four possible facts.

Question 3

Baron-Cohen et al: Part (a) of this question wanted one problem with the original version of the eyes test and part (b) asked how the identified problem was solved in the revised version. The most common responses in part (a) were forced choice between two and the use of semantic opposites and many of these answers earned full marks. In part (b) either of these could be readily solved, with candidates offering the increase in number of choices and inclusion of different distractors, again with many gaining both marks. Some candidates mentioned other problems and were also able to access full marks.

Question 4

Held and Hein: The question told candidates that Held & Hein's research was an improvement on earlier studies and asked them to describe two ways that the visual-spatial experience of animals in the earlier research had been restricted. Very few candidates were able to answer this question accurately. The context of an experiment is an important starting point to understanding the reasons for the method and techniques used. For any of the studies, candidates should be aware of this context as described in the paper.

Question 5

Milgram: Part (a) of this question asked the candidates to outline an ethical guideline *broken* in the research. Part (b) of this question asked candidates to outline an ethical guideline that was *not* broken. The focus of these questions was on a description of the guideline rather than the way it was employed or not in Milgram's study. Although candidates could gain the expansion mark for describing their chosen guideline within the context of the study, simply describing the study did not necessarily describe the guideline, thus some candidates were unable to gain the second mark in either part (a) or part (b).

Question 6

Haney, Banks and Zimbardo: Part (a) of this question wanted to know the dispositional hypothesis being tested and part (b) asked the extent to which this was supported by the results. Some candidates mistakenly presented a situational hypothesis in place of the dispositional hypothesis which Zimbardo set out to test, so scored zero. Others, however, were able to report the dispositional hypothesis in excellent detail, readily earning full marks. In part (b) some candidates who had not scored marks in part (a) were nevertheless able to earn at least one mark here. Those who understood the dispositional hypothesis typically earned full marks with many candidates giving excellent answers.

Question 7

Piliavin et al: Part (a) of this question asked for one of the conclusions from the study and part (b) for the evidence from the study supporting this conclusion. Although many candidates scored full marks here, some were unable to distinguish between conclusions, which are general statements and were required for part (a), and evidence, which is the findings – including data – and was required for part (b). Where marks were lost, these were typically from part (a) rather than part (b).

Question 8

Bandura et al: This question asked for a description of two findings about the imitation of aggression. Many candidates answered this question well. Where they did not earn full marks this was because there were not two complete pieces of evidence, most commonly where a finding was given a comparison was lacking, for example 'boys were more likely to imitate male models' (more likely than?).

Question 9

Freud: This question was based on methods Freud used in his study of little Hans. Part (a) asked for one weakness of the method and part (b) asked for one strength. In each part of the question it was important that the candidate focused on an evaluation of the method not of the findings, and many candidates did so effectively. They included such ideas as the bias introduced by using Hans' father to record data, with justifications such as his understanding of Freud's work in part (a). In part (b) a common error was to identify the longitudinal design. This, in itself, is not a strength – indeed it is an inevitability in a developmental study of this kind. Such candidates needed to describe why it is advantageous to use such a design, that it enables the close tracking of developmental changes or allows for the collection of detailed data over time. Not also that the collection of a lot of data is not necessarily specific to case studies – lab experiments may collect a lot of data too. What is special in a case study is that the data are in depth.

Question 10

Langlois et al: Part (a) of this question focused on study 1 and asked candidates to describe two features of the slides used. Part (b) could be answered with respect to any part of the study and asked why slides were used instead of real people. Although many candidates were readily able to identify two features of the slides in part (a), some mistakenly described aspects of the way the slides were used, such as how long they were shown for, or the fact that stimuli were alternated. These procedural issues were not creditworthy. In part (b) many candidates identified the problems of control and some were able to give good answers illustrating potential problems such as movement or changing facial expressions. Furthermore, some excellent answers indicated how these effects might influence the infants' preferences (and thus why it was important to control them). An alternative explanation was that it could be unethical to ask real people to pose as attractive or unattractive models and thus that the unattractive models may be difficult to recruit.

Question 11

Nelson: This question asked for two differences in the responses of the children from the two age groups. Although some answers were too general, such as statements about younger children being less moral than older children, many answers presented Nelson's findings well giving comparative statements about the numbers of errors made by the two age groups with regard to different aspects (motives, outcomes, valence etc.).

Question 12

Maguire et al: Part (a) of this question asked about the technique used to measure brain activation. Part (b) asked candidates to identify two areas of the brain activated by the topographical tasks. This question was not answered well by all candidates. Although some were able to identify and briefly describe PET scanning for part (a), some were unable to even identify the technique used. In part (b) many answers were again simplistic, merely stating 'hippocampus', with few candidates accurately naming two specific brain areas.

Question 13

Demattè et al: The stem of the question told the candidates that this study used a repeated measures design and that, as a consequence, counterbalancing was necessary. Part (a) asked what 'counterbalancing' means and part (b) asked how this was employed in the study. Many responses to part (a) were poor, scoring only 1 or 0 marks. However, in part (b) many candidates who had been unsuccessful in part (a) illustrated that they did, in fact, understand something about the process of counterbalancing as they were able to make an attempt to explain why it was necessary.

Question 14

Rosenhan: This question asked about the behaviour of physicians on the wards. Part (a), asked often they appeared on the wards and part (b) asked how they responded to questions from the pseudo-patients. For part (a) many candidates gave brief or inaccurate answers that only scored 1 mark as they did not offer any data relating to frequency. Some referred to the time spent on the wards rather than the frequency of visits, others to the behaviour of nurses. Similarly in part (b) answers were often too simplistic, merely indicating that physician responses were brief.

Question 15

Thigpen and Cleckley: This question asked candidates for two pieces of evidence used to conclude that Eve was suffering from MPD. This question was often very well answered, with a range of sources of evidence being used. Findings relating to IQ, memory and personality from the Rorschach test were the most commonly and competently presented.

Section B

Question 16

This question asked for an evaluation of one of **Tajfel / Billington et al / Veale & Riley** in relation to *two strengths*.

Candidates chose from the full spread of studies and were generally able to identify two strengths but often struggled to elaborate or evaluate above the middle band. Better answers were able to describe and relate appropriate elements of the chosen study but few were able to provide the depth or detail required for top band answers. This is surprising as candidates are also required to describe strengths in **Section A**, so it is not an unfamiliar task. There was, however, less irrelevant description of the study than in the previous session and the use of terminology was better.

Question 17

This question asked for a discussion of one of **Tajfel / Schachter & Singer / Demattè et al** in relation to the *physiological approach*.

Responses included a good spread of studies and there was again a full range of marks. Candidates were typically aware of the meaning of 'the physiological approach' but either appropriate contextualisation, or depth and detail, was lacking. Some candidates simply described the study they had chosen, making weak attempts to link this to physiological psychology. Such responses scored few marks. Better answers outlined aspects of the methods or findings (or both) of the study they had chosen and illustrated how these related to the physiological approach. The best answers considered methods, findings and/or theoretical background to the study and showed how these illustrated the characteristics, strengths and weaknesses of the physiological approach to psychology.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/12
Core Studies 1

General Comments

This sitting of Paper 1 was the second for the new specification. The two major changes to the paper should therefore have been familiar to candidates: the inclusion of new studies and the change in essays in **Section B**. The essay format changed from a choice to two compulsory questions and from questions asking for description as well as evaluation/application to two questions requiring only the latter.

With respect to the essays, almost all candidates followed the instruction to answer both questions in **Section B**, and many also focused on analysis rather than description in their answers. So, although candidates are now following the rubric in terms of the number of questions, there are still some who need to attend more carefully to the requirements of the new style essay questions which demand only evaluation (and application) rather than simply description and evaluation. In **Section A**, responses were much improved, with very few candidates referring to an inappropriate study such as Loftus & Palmer (1979) rather than Loftus & Pickrell. Indeed, some candidates had learned the new studies in detail and were readily able to answer questions about their content.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

Mann et al: This question, asking for two features of the participants, was generally answered well, with few candidates mistakenly offering results. Many answers contained ample detail, for example giving the numbers of suspects for each type of crime or the ethnicities of participants and most candidates clearly distinguished their two features. Some, however, appeared to know little beyond there being 16 police suspects.

Question 2

Loftus and Pickrell: Both parts of this question related to retroactive inhibition, with **(a)** asking for a definition and part **(b)** for an explanation of how this was tested in the study. Answers here varied widely and, although some candidates clearly understood the term and could explain how Loftus and Pickrell's study related to retroactive inhibition, others were much less certain. For part **(a)** many candidates were unclear about retroactive inhibition working *backwards*, i.e. that new information interrupts the recall of old information, so tended to score 1 rather than 2 in part **(a)**. Without this explicit knowledge it was difficult for them to give definite answers in part **(b)** that would score 2 marks.

Question 3

Baron-Cohen et al: Many candidates scored full marks here. Those who did not generally lost marks because they did not include a comparison in their statements. Note that as the question asked candidates to *describe* the prediction, a simple statement identifying what the prediction was about was not sufficient for full marks.

Question 4

Held and Hein: This question asked about experimental designs. This is an area in which candidates are typically not very strong. In answer to part (a), although some candidates understood that the experimental design is the way in which participants are allocated to conditions (levels of the IV) many did not, so marks were lost with candidates often giving irrelevant descriptions of different types of experiments (e.g. lab and field), which scored 0. In part (b), some candidates who had scored 0 in part (a) demonstrated that they did, in fact, understand experimental designs, and were able to answer the question fully, for example explaining how the paired kittens may have differed, introducing error which would not have arisen if a repeated measures design had been possible.

Question 5

Milgram: This question required two features of the experiment that could explain the high levels of obedience. It was typically well answered with candidates illustrating their knowledge of the study and its conclusions and providing two distinct and accurate reasons. Although the use of 'may explain' in the question allowed candidates to use possible explanations which Milgram subsequently countered, most chose to use those reasons which were supported by the findings. One exception was the role of payment, which many candidates correctly observed *could* have caused participants to feel obliged to continue (even though, in fact, it did not).

Question 6

Piliavin et al: Part (a) of this question asked why a field experiment was used. Although answers did not have to be contextualised to the study, many candidates did so and thus obtained full marks here. Where candidates did not gain full marks this would have been an easy way to elaborate their answer. In part (b) candidates were readily able to identify a disadvantage of field experiments with many providing appropriate elaboration of their answer which, in this case, had to be contextualisation as specified in the question,

Question 7

Bandura et al: This question was generally answered well, with candidates clearly identifying two separate ethical issues of which there were many. Some candidates, however, answered in terms of consent from the parents. Since this is not described in the paper, marks could not be awarded for comments relating to this aspect (except where candidates made an explicit point that it was *not* mentioned by Bandura and should have been considered).

Question 8

Freud: Part (a) of this question, asked about a problem with 'this type' of question and was well answered with candidates demonstrating a clear awareness of the issue (regardless of whether they were able to label the question as a 'leading' question). Similarly in part (b), many candidates were able to give a good description of Freud's interpretation. Where candidates did not score full marks they could often have improved their answer by giving more detail (or identifying the issue as relating to the Oedipus conflict).

Question 9

Langlois et al: Part (a) of this question required a simple, accurate answer indicating how the parents were prevented from seeing the facial stimuli and many candidates were able to supply one. Those who gained only partial marks typically gave inaccurate answers, such as 'blindfolded'. In part (b) many candidates again showed that they had understood the study, making clear the way in which the parent being able to convey their preference to the child would confound the results.

Question 10

Nelson: Part (a) of this question required identification of two features of the sample and many answers fulfilled this requirement. Even though candidates only had to identify two features, not describe them, some candidates were still unable to earn full marks, however. In part (b) candidates typically correctly identified that allocation was random, although some misunderstood the question and described the levels of the independent variable so did not gain marks.

Question 11

Schachter and Singer: In part (a), which asked for methods used to record responses of participants, the vast majority of candidates gave observation and self-report. A small minority scored only 1 mark as they identified only one method, or attempted to describe interviews and questionnaires (although no interviews were in fact conducted). A very small number of candidates correctly identified the measurement of pulse rate as a method of data collection. There were also many good answers to part (b) with good justifications of both commonly chosen methods. It is worth noting that making bland statements which could apply to any method, such as simply stating that it is 'valid', scored no marks.

Question 12

Dement and Kleitman: In response to this question requiring **two** of the relationships investigated, answers here were generally good with candidates clearly presenting two distinct parts to their response. In good answers, each of these offered a clear comparison within the relationship. Some answers, however, were vague such as some of those relating to the direction of eye movements.

Question 13

Maguire et al: This question, asking about the aims of the study, allowed good candidates to shine and a full range of marks was awarded, with minimal credit going to the simplest answers 'to investigate the neural basis of memory' and maximum credit to those making two precise statements about two separate aims. This was one question where there was some evidence of candidates having learned the wrong study, although these instances were rare.

Question 14

Thigpen and Cleckley: In part (a) candidates could typically identify a test, generally the IQ test, Rorschach/ink blots or the memory test, but fewer were able to elaborate on this with any description. It was surprising that candidates had accurately learned the names of the tests without having learned what they tested or how so could not earn full marks in (a) yet demonstrated good recall of the results in order to answer part (b).

Question 15

Billington et al: This question simply required the statement of **four** subjects categorised as physical science. A full range of marks was awarded with many candidates scoring 3/4. One common error was the inclusion of biology.

Section B

Question 16

This question asked for an evaluation of one of **Mann et al / Tajfel / Veale & Riley** in relation to *usefulness or applications*.

Candidates chose from the full spread of studies although Tajfel was the most popular. It did not, however, necessarily produce the best marks.

Although in **Section A**, candidates could apply their knowledge to the extent of giving advantages of - or problems with - methods in context, they typically found the detailed application of the findings of a study in terms of its usefulness much more difficult. Better candidates were able to describe ways in which their chosen study either was, or was not, useful but few were able to give really good answers which tackled the question from both angles giving balance and moving their answer into the top band. Answers using Veale and Riley or Mann et al were generally able to offer appropriate applications (as these are explicit in the studies) although they often lacked depth and detail and contrasting *problems* with usefulness were generally absent. Some answers using Tajfel were excellent, with candidates genuinely thinking about how the findings can be applied to real-world situations, such as increasing competition to improve performance (in sport, schools or the workplace), or the disadvantages of doing so, and the extent to which such conclusions may not be appropriate as the sample and methods of the study were limited in a number of ways.

Question 17

This question asked for a discussion of one of **Haney, Banks and Zimbardo / Rosenhan / Demattè et al** in terms of whether it supports *an individual or situational explanation*.

Responses included a good spread of studies and a full range of marks. As with **Question 16**, the choice which was the most popular, Zimbardo, did not necessarily produce the best marks. Candidates often presented the situational explanation but failed to address individual explanations so their answers were unbalanced, therefore did not meet the criteria for top band marks. The best answers relating to Zimbardo were those which began by quoting the article in relation to the deplorable nature of prisons and making an explicit statement of the dispositional hypothesis. This allowed the candidate to set themselves up to write a relevant, balanced answer. Many good answers were also given using Demattè et al, by exploring the possibility that factors in the environment (i.e. ones other than the limited range of experimental smells) might influence attractiveness versus the idea that one's perception of attractiveness is individual (and such differences may or may not have been accounted for in the study, such as sexual orientation).

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/13

Core Studies 1

General Comments

This sitting of Paper 1 was the second for the new specification. The two major changes to the paper should therefore have been familiar to candidates: the inclusion of new studies and the change in essays in **Section B**. The essay format changed from a choice to two compulsory questions and from questions asking for description as well as evaluation/application to two questions requiring only the latter.

With respect to the essays, almost all candidates followed the instruction to answer both questions in **Section B**, and many also focused on analysis rather than description in their answers. So, although candidates are now following the rubric in terms of the number of questions, there are still some who need to attend more carefully to the requirements of the new style essay questions which demand only evaluation (and application) rather than simply description and evaluation. In **Section A** responses were much improved, with very few candidates referring to inappropriate study such as Loftus & Palmer (1979) rather than Loftus & Pickrell. Indeed, some candidates had learned the new studies in detail and were readily able to answer questions about their content.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

Loftus & Pickrell: This question asked for a description of two characteristics of the participants and was generally answered well with candidates making two distinct points. Many answers contained ample detail, for example giving the numbers of males and females and the age spread of participants.

Question 2

Baron-Cohen et al: Part **(a)** of this question asked for the meaning of 'theory of mind' and the majority of candidates were able to attempt an explanation although some answers lacked detail. Question part **(b)** was less well answered with many simply concluding that all the findings tell us is that people with autism lack a theory of mind. This is a simplistic observation and Baron-Cohen et al go beyond this in their conclusion. Importantly, this observation allows us to conclude that the normal role of ToM is to allow a connection to be made between facial expressions (which people, including those with autism, can see) and mental state (which only people without autism can then *infer*).

Question 3

Held and Hein: The stem of this question stated that this study was a laboratory experiment and candidates were then required to describe two features of a laboratory experiment. The answer did not require contextualisation to Held and Hein's study but it did require elaboration of two features. Even though this was not a complex question, some candidates did not gain full marks. One way to elaborate each feature would have been to relate the idea to Held and Hein's study or, alternatively, to give details about each of the aspects (such as the IV being deliberately manipulated).

Question 4

Piliavin et al: The stem of this question told candidates that the study was a field experiment. Part (a) asked for one independent variable and this was generally very well answered although a small number of candidates confused the IV with the DV. In part (b), which asked for an advantage of this method in the context of this study, the most common answer was about ecological validity and many candidates were able to fulfil the requirement to elaborate this answer by explaining why the ecological validity of this study was high.

Question 5

Tajfel: The stem of this question provided candidates with an example matrix and stated the three outcome options (maximum in-group profit, maximum joint profit and maximum difference). Part (a) asked the candidate to identify the number pair indicating maximum joint profit. Part (b) asked the candidate to identify the number pair indicating maximum difference. Most candidates correctly answered at least one of the question parts although 14/14 was a common incorrect answer for part (a).

Question 6

Bandura et al: Part (a) of this question asked the candidate for one difference in the findings between male and female participants and part (b) asked for a reason for this difference. Answers to this question were typically excellent, with differences being explicit and offering a comparison (e.g. of the effect on girls versus boys, or of the model type male versus female / aggressive/non-aggressive). In part (b) reasons were often well detailed, for example with reference to qualitative data to support explanations relating to the social expectations of female aggressive behaviour.

Question 7

Freud: This question asked candidates to outline two criticisms of the scientific value of Freud's work. Although many candidates earned full marks, offering good explanations of two criticisms, other candidates struggled to separate their ideas. For example, two different criticisms of working through Hans's father might have been implicit in the response but candidates could have improved their answer by making the points separately.

Question 8

Langlois et al: This question asked candidates to describe two findings. Numerical data were not necessarily required for full marks and many candidates made two explicit and identifiably different points in answering this question, so earned full marks. Those who did not, tended to make incomplete statements, such as 'Infants looked for longer at unattractive faces' (longer than what?) or 'boys looked for longer at male faces' (longer than at female faces or longer than girls did?)

Question 9

Nelson: This question asked candidates to describe two conclusions and there were many different ones reported by candidates. Most commonly, they described differences in understanding situations with opposite valence and the development of an understanding of 'bad' before 'good'. Some candidates reported findings as conclusions, and in this case they are virtually synonymous. However, some candidates were confused about the findings relating to young children's understanding of motives and outcomes. The key difference here was that younger children recalled motives less well than they recalled outcomes.

Question 10

Schachter and Singer: Part (a) of this question asked for two features of the sample other than having all been given health clearance. Many appropriate features were given by candidates, such as numbers, gender and details about being candidates. Part (b) asked candidates to describe why it was necessary to obtain health clearance for every participant, which was typically well answered although weaker candidates needed to go beyond 'to be ethical' to explain why.

Question 11

Maguire et al: Part (a) of this question wanted a description of the sequential non-topographical task and part (b) asked candidates why it was necessary to do this in addition to the sequential topographical task. In answer to part (a) many candidates were able to indicate that the task involved remembering films although some candidates mistakenly identified the recalling of scenes rather than plots. The best answers explicitly stated the experimental requirement to outline what happened in the film between two points in the story. Answers to part (b) were generally good with candidates observing the need for comparison between tasks to deduce whether the same brain areas were activated in both cases.

Question 12

Demattè et al: The stem of this question told candidates that a questionnaire about senses and general health had been given to participants. Part (a) asked for two examples of questions asked and a full range of possible answers was offered by different candidates with many gaining full marks. In part (b) good explanations were given for the need for one of the questions, typically explaining that the question was necessary to control for factors that would reduce the participant's ability to smell the odours in the experimental task thus invalidating the findings.

Question 13

Rosenhan: This question asked about the interpretation of the pseudo-patients' behaviour by (a) the staff and part (b) the real patients. Both parts of this question were well answered by many candidates with appropriate levels of detail and accurately reported details from the study to support the examples and interpretations.

Question 14

Thigpen and Cleckley: This question asked candidates for the findings of two tests conducted during the study. The IQ test was the most commonly chosen and the results were almost always reported accurately. A small number of candidates confused the results on the Rorschach test, which was another frequent choice. When the findings of the memory test were given, these were also typically accurate.

Question 15

Billington et al: Part (a) wanted to know why, according to the cognitive-behavioural model, mirror gazing in BDD is damaging. Few answers here explicitly related to the cognitive-behavioural model as required by the question, so candidates tended to score only 1 mark. These answers could have been improved by observing that mirror gazing is a problem of *selective attention*, which has detrimental effects, and that it can further distort *judgments*, both of which are cognitive explanations. Part (b) asked for two objects other than mirrors used by BDD patients for mirror gazing and this part was typically very well answered although some candidates guessed, offering reflective surfaces such as mobile phones, ipads or water.

Section B

Question 16

This question asked for an evaluation of one of **Mann et al / Milgram / Haney, Banks & Zimbardo** in relation to *ethnocentric bias*.

Although many candidates clearly understood the meaning of ethnocentric bias they were less well able to apply this concept to the study or to do so critically. Some good answers were given using the Mann et al study, with candidates considering both the existence of more than one ethnic group in the sample (especially given the difficulty with obtaining data) and the bias in this sample. The same arguments were sometimes effectively applied to a discussion of Zimbardo's study, however here some candidates misreported the sample so their answers were incorrect. Other candidates expanded the argument using Zimbardo as an example, observing that there may be cultural differences within prisons themselves and furthermore that much aggression in prisons is race-related, making Zimbardo's study even less valid. With regard to Milgram's study, some candidates made assumptions about the ethnic bias (or otherwise) of the sample although others used effectively qualified statements such as 'Milgram's sample was likely to be ethnocentric as the population in the area local to the university in the 1960s was probably not very diverse'. Good answers also made use of observations such as about Milgram's original intention to test Germans as well.

Question 17

This question asked for a discussion of one of **Dement & Kleitman / Langlois et al / Billington et al** in relation to *gathering quantitative data*.

Responses included a full spread of studies with specific points being linked effectively to the chosen study with good answers including a genuine discussion, i.e. both benefits and the ways in which quantitative data may not be beneficial. For example, the inadequacy of quantitative data alone for Dement and Kleitman, thus the importance of the qualitative data they collected too. Conversely for the other two studies, candidates could observe that by collecting quantitative data alone important ideas were missing (descriptions of babies' reactions to attractive faces in Langlois et al and people's reasons for their choices in Billington et al).

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/21

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, where and who. Extended evaluative points linked to their own study are necessary in **part c** to gain full marks.

Question 2

It is important for candidates to know how each study is linked to the approach it has been placed under – so for this examination, why Held and Hein was Cognitive. For **part c** candidates need to have a named approach for comparison and make direct comparative points themselves in their answers. For **part d** candidates need at least two strengths *and* two weaknesses linked to the named study to gain 7+ marks.

Section B

Candidates must focus their answers in **part b** to what feature(s) the question is asking (in this exam longitudinal or ecological validity) 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 with 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 properly for this paper.

The majority of candidates appeared to manage their time well. There was some evidence that candidates who over-answered **Question 3b or 4b** wrote much shorter answers for **3c or 4b** as a result. 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 for the two questions (**Question 3 or Question 4**). These candidates usually did poorly.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to both **Sections A and 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.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1a

The vast majority of candidates could access at least one mark for this question by stating something general about observations. Only very few could access more marks by writing about features of participant observations and how they are different to other types of observation. Many candidates confused participant observation with general covert observations either conducted in a laboratory or in the field and therefore could not gain credit for their answers as a result.

Question 1b

There was a wide variety of ideas given by candidates on how to examine criminal lying using participant observation. Only a few candidates actually used the participant observation technique in their descriptions and these were usually very good answers. Many candidates confused participant observation with general covert field or controlled observations and could only gain minimal credit as it had to be about participant observations. Candidates usually did well outlining the who and where aspects of the study whilst many did not cover the major aspects of what (e.g. which behaviours would be noted) and how (e.g. the sampling technique) so could not get above 4 marks.

Question 1c

Many candidates could highlight one or two evaluative points about their own study they had designed in **Question 1b**. Common points made were about the sample used, how valid the situation would be and aspects of observer bias. A large number of candidates evaluated their study on ethical grounds but the question was about practical and methodological analysis so they could not gain credit for these well-made points. 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.

Question 2a

Many candidates gained at least 1 mark for this question by mentioning the setting for a laboratory experiment. Only a few candidates could take this further by mentioning something about controls or that there is an independent and dependent variable. Many repeated themselves either about it being artificial or controlled by writing the same point just in a different way which could still only gain 1 mark.

Question 2b

Candidates could mention at least one aspect of the Held and Hein study that showed it was a Cognitive study – this is pleasing as it is a new study to the specification. The most common answer was to mention the perceptual abilities of the kittens. Some candidates described the Cognitive Approach succinctly and then linked it to the Held and Hein study effectively to gain maximum marks. This approach to the answer was the most successful way.

Question 2c

Candidates did find this question particularly difficult and a sizeable number did not answer it at all. The most common comparison approaches were physiological and social. There were many different ways in which candidates attempted to answer this question. The stronger answers directly compared the cognitive approach to one other pointing out what the similarities and differences were including looking at research methodology and studies. A few candidates did not do any comparison work and just wrote about the cognitive approach to gain minimal credit. Others 'compared' the cognitive approach to another un-named one and these were usually still not identifiable after reading the whole answer. Some candidates simply compared studies from different approaches and gained some credit but the question was specifically on approaches only. Many candidates simply wrote about the cognitive approach then about a second approach and did not do any direct comparison so they scored low marks for this.

Question 2d

Many candidates could write about at least one strength and/or weakness *and* link them directly to Held and Hein. It would appear that some candidates did not understand '...using Held and Hein as an example' and

made some excellent points but did not use them in the context of this study – they still gained credit but could not get more than 4 marks. Many candidates did relate their answers back to Held and Hein but not for every point made and this also limited them in terms of the number of marks they could score. Only a handful of candidates wrote about at least *two* strengths and weaknesses *and* related them to Held and Hein to access the higher marks available for this question (7+ marks). Again it was pleasing to see that many candidates knew about the study in detail given it is a new to the specification.

Question 3a

Virtually all candidates could note the 'long term' factor of a longitudinal study to gain 1 mark. Only a few candidates could take the description further by mentioning things like the same people are studied to gain the 2nd mark.

Question 3b

There were many very good answers to this question as candidates could pick out the necessary aspects of each study that showed they were longitudinal in nature. Specific details about each study in terms of its duration were crucial to gain the 3 marks per study. Thigpen and Cleckley was well answered with many knowing about the 100+ hours over 14 months aspect of the study. Some candidates did write a lot about the study that was not about the longitudinal aspect of it and wasted time. Freud was also answered well with many being able to write about when the study took place and for how long. Again, some candidates wrote much more about the study which had nothing to do with the longitudinal aspect of it. Rosenhan was also well answered in terms of its longitudinal nature but again some candidates over-answered giving a well detailed outline of all aspects of the study.

Question 3c

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 at least outline some advantages like seeing the change over time or getting lots of details but their answers stopped there. Only a few candidates then went on to relate it to a study to show how it is an advantage. Still 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.

Question 4a

Candidates appeared to know what ecological validity was but found it difficult to get this across clearly to gain the two marks. Many could write about realism or how it may or may not reflect real life in some way to gain at least 1 mark.

Question 4b

Candidates appeared to know the three studies well with only the new one (Dematte) proving a little bit troublesome for some. A good proportion of candidates could easily pick out at least one aspect of each study that might be low in ecological validity. For Tajfel many candidates picked out the estimation aspect of the study and how this was not what happens in real life – some candidates then went on to compare it to something similar in real life to show the difference which was very good to see. Milgram had the longer answers as many candidates could pick more than one aspect that was low in ecological validity – there were some very long answers here and these tended to be the ones that simply outlined all of his study which was not good for time management. For Dematte, a pleasing amount of candidates knew exactly which aspects of the study had low ecological validity and they could convey them very well to the Examiner. 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.

Question 4c

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 of trying to make studies ecologically valid with ethics and control being the most popular answers. 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 3c, some candidates made the same point several times using different studies but this could still only score the maximum of 3 marks for one well-made point with evidence.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22
Core Studies 2

KEY MESSAGES

Section A

Question 1

Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in **part b** and also ensure their study is a field experiment. 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 the psychodynamic perspective. Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

Section B

Candidates must focus their answer on the question asked in **part b** of the essay rather than writing lots of detail of the studies. Candidates should aim to use three points in **part c** and give evidence for each point to back up their answer.

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. In addition, it was pleasing to see that many candidates answered the questions in a different order to the paper and were able to answer their best question first which gave them more overall marks.

It was pleasing to see that there were fewer rubric errors this sitting. Candidates do need to be aware that they must answer both questions in **Section A** and one of the two questions for the **Section B** essay. When a candidate did answer both questions they were awarded the mark for the better of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually performed very poorly.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to the questions in **Section A** where there is no choice of question. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in the **part c** of their **Section B** essays to achieve higher marks. **Question 3** and **Question 4** were fairly evenly chosen by candidates with neither proving to be more popular.

Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to access some marks for this question. Many candidates were able to define what was meant by independent measures design. Knowledge of this term seemed to be Centre specific. Therefore all Centres must make sure they cover all terminology for the course. However, even if candidates could not define the term, most could achieve some marks by describing the design of the Nelson study. Some were confused and believed that the children did all three conditions. A few candidates mentioned the different age groups and achieved marks for this in their response. The correct names of the groups are as follows: picture-motive explicit group, picture-motive implicit group, verbal-only presentation group.
- (b) Some candidates correctly described a field experiment and understood that this study needed both an independent and a dependent variable.

Top marks were achieved by those who suggested straightforward ideas and were able to give clear details of the measure of morality to ensure replicability. Many failed to achieve top marks due to the dependent variable being very unclear or too complicated to achieve replicability.

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

Others gave good descriptions of the method but failed to explain how the children's morality judgments would be found. A number of candidates evaluated a field study rather than described one.

- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points. Many candidates used improved ecological validity and lack of control as points. 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. Some did write too much for this section which left less time for the rest of the questions in the exam.

Question 2

- (a) A mixture of responses. Some candidates had not learned this term and could not give a correct definition. Many gave confused or very brief responses which achieved half-marks. There were some excellent responses that referred to many different aspects of the psychodynamic perspective including the unconscious mind and the three part personality.
- (b) Most candidates were able to access some marks here regardless of their response in **part a**. Most were able to give a result from the study and this varied from the horse phobia, the various fantasies (with the giraffe fantasy the most popular) to phobia of the bath. Candidates did struggle to link the result to the psychodynamic perspective.
- (c) Candidates did do very well on this question and many did give accurate strengths and weaknesses of the psychodynamic perspective. Most also referred to the little Hans study and were able to achieve higher marks. Many could only achieve 6 out of 10 marks as they did not refer to two strengths and two weaknesses.
- (d) Again, many excellent answers were given. Both methodological and practical issues were described with clear reference to the study given throughout the candidates' answers. As in previous questions, some candidates gave many points but each one was quite brief (one or two sentences) and this prevented top marks from being awarded. To improve, candidates should give fewer points but in more depth to achieve full marks on this questions.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates were able to achieve 2 marks for this question as they knew that a snapshot study meant a study carried out over a short period of time. Some weaker candidates, who did poorly in this question overall, believed that the snapshot method had something to do with photographs.
- (b) Many candidates were able to do well on this question and knew the studies in depth. Candidates were able to give very clear and detailed responses for the Dement and Kleitman study and most achieved full marks for this part of their answer. Many did well describing how the data was collected in the Langlois study although failed to mention that it was looking time that was measured and therefore achieved less well. Almost all candidates described the eyes task as the data collection method but most failed to mention that the participants also had to identify the gender of the eyes.
- (c) To achieve well on this section of the question candidates should identify and discuss three points with clear reference to the core studies. Many found it difficult to think of three advantages to the method. It was acceptable for candidates to use problems with the longitudinal method as advantages for the snapshot method (e.g. lack of subject attrition, not time consuming).

Some good answers but in general a lack of detail to explain the evaluation points made. The weakest candidates tended to write many one short sentence points rather than elaborating on any one of them, limiting the marks available to them. Most were able to identify advantages but many did not refer to a core study so achieved fewer marks.

Question 4

- (a) Most candidates achieved at least 1 mark for their response by making reference to differences between individuals. Many then did go onto achieve full marks by referring that these differences could be due to personality, behaviour, etc.
- (b) There were some good responses but in many cases candidates failed to explain why the study was about individual differences.
- Many did well in describing the gender differences shown but then failed to mention that not all males were systemising or all females empathising. Good descriptions of the results of Thigpen and Cleckley were given but there was a lack of focus on how this made Eve different to others. There were some excellent and very detailed responses with regard to Veale and Riley with some candidates describing in great depth either the differences between the body dysmorphic participants and the controls or the unique behaviours of some of the BDD participants.
- (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 generalisability and were sometimes able to give clear examples from the listed core studies. Similar to **Question 3 part c** many gave very brief answers that limited their marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/23
Core Studies 2

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 sometimes all candidates from a Centre did not know what was meant by reliability. Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

Section B

Candidates must focus their answer on the question asked in **part b** of the essay rather than writing lots of detail of the studies. Evidence must be given in **part c** 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. In addition, it was pleasing to see that many candidates answered the questions in a different order to the paper and were able to answer their best question first which gave them more overall marks.

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 performed very poorly.

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

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1a

The vast majority of candidates were able to access some marks for this question. Most candidates could define what was meant by the longitudinal method. Many could give some detail about how it was used in the Thigpen and Cleckley study. A few did mention that the study lasted for 14 months and involved over 100 hours of sessions. Those that mentioned these specific details were awarded full marks. No credit was given to strengths and weaknesses of the longitudinal method.

Question 1b

Most candidates correctly described a snapshot study and understood that this type of study needed to take place over less than a day. A few candidates were confused and described an alternative study that involved more participants but took place over many weeks or months and this answer received no marks. Candidates could gain up to full marks in the **part c** of the question, however, even if no marks were achieved in **part b**.

Candidates did use many of the original data collection techniques used by Thigpen and Cleckley but omitted the hours of therapy from their procedure. Quite a few described having more participants and many gave good details of these participants. Very few gave the sampling method and could not, therefore, achieve full 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 it as this is the correct response to **Question 1c**.

Question 1c

The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points. Many candidates used less time consuming and improved representativeness due to the larger sample as points. 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. Some did write too much for this section which left less time for the rest of the questions in the exam.

Question 2a

Candidates generally did very well in this question and were able to clearly explain what is meant by reliability. There were a few Centres where it seemed candidates had not been taught this term or had not revised it for the exam.

Question 2b

Most candidates were able to access some marks here by showing an awareness that observers compared their ratings. A few also mentioned that the observers were unaware of whether the faces were attractive or unattractive.

Very few candidates achieved full marks for this question. To improve, candidates need to be aware that the observers viewed some of the videotaped sessions throughout the study and these results were compared to each other and achieved high inter rater reliability correlation.

Question 2c

Candidates did do very well on this question and many did give accurate practical strengths and weaknesses of working with children. Most referred to the Langlois study in their response. Some could only achieve 6 out of 10 marks as they did not refer to two strengths and two weaknesses. A few gave ethical points which received no credit.

Question 2d

Again, many good answers were given. A few could clearly describe similarities and differences between the ethical issues of working with children versus adults and some did give some excellent examples from the Langlois study. Some candidates just described ethical issues of working with children and did not state any similarities or differences and this type of answer received no or very minimal marks. Some gave examples from studies other than Langlois and this received few marks as the question directly asks the candidates to refer to Langlois in their response. Most looked at the differences with regard to informed consent, debrief and right to withdraw. Many recognised the similarities with regard to confidentiality and harm and distress

(although some did describe this as a difference and were credited). If just similarities or just differences were given the candidate could receive a maximum of 6 marks out of 10.

Section B

Question 3a

Most candidates were able to achieve 1 mark as they were aware that the situational explanation involved the effect of the environment or situation on behaviour. A few gave more detailed definitions or examples that enabled them to achieve full marks.

Question 3b

Many candidates were able to do well on this question and knew the studies in depth. The biggest issue was where responses focused on describing the study and achieved less well due to the lack of focus on the situational explanation. Too many were listing findings without a clear link to the question so it was more difficult to achieve higher marks. Candidates need to give examples from the situation and the effect this had on the participant's behaviour in each study to achieve full marks.

Question 3c

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

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

Question 4a

Most candidates achieved at least 1 mark for their response by making reference to biology or chemistry in their response. Many then did go on to achieve full marks by explaining the link between biology and behaviour.

Question 4b

Candidates did achieve well in their answers to this question. Most achieved full marks for their description of the data collection in the Dement and Kleitman study. Fewer marks were achieved for Schachter and Singer's study as many did not give the question that was asked of the participants at the end of the study. But marks were achieved by mentioning the observations and the fact that the participants were asked a question about their emotions. Many have been taught the incorrect Maguire study and therefore it was difficult for the candidates to achieve any marks for this part of their answer. In this study, a PET scanner was used, not an MRI scan.

Question 4c

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 advantages of the equipment used and the scientific nature of the results and were sometimes able to give clear examples from the listed core studies. Several candidates made a list of advantages with no attempt to expand or give examples.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/31
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- It is essential that candidates know the difference between the injunctions: description, evaluation and suggestion.
- Candidates should write answers equivalent to the mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 6, 8 or 12 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- For **Section B** part **(b)** a *range* of evaluation issues should be included not just the named issue.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge (e.g. names and dates) 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

This is the first November sitting of the new syllabus and modified examination format and it is encouraging to see most candidates following the requirements of the syllabus, question papers and mark schemes quite closely, due largely to competent teachers concerned that their candidates are well prepared. It is always pleasing to be able to award some very high marks to some superbly written answers. As always there are ways in which Centres can improve the results for their candidates.

Administration: many candidates correctly used string to tie together their answer pages. However, rather than tying pages loosely so an Examiner could turn and read each page, many scripts were tied so tightly together an Examiner had to untie the string in order to read the answer. This was extremely time consuming and a waste of Examiner time.

Section A (all options):

- (a) Most candidates scored full marks in response to the short answer questions on all options.
- (b) Most answers for this question part were appropriate, although many answers were far too short. If part (a) scores 2 marks and part (b) 4 marks, then an amount of writing equivalent to four marks needs to be done.

Section B (all options)

Question part (a) with the injunction 'describe' did not differ in format from questions appearing on previous examinations. As with previous questions a candidate could choose what to write from the three bullet-points of the syllabus and marks were awarded based on the range, detail and quality of the answer.

Question part (b) differed from previous questions because rather than just being asked to 'evaluate' there is the additional requirement to include one specifically named evaluation issue. In the past a candidate could evaluate using any issues. The requirement now is to include the named issue as one of a number of issues.

Many candidates mistakenly interpreted the question as 'write about this one issue only' despite the question stating 'evaluate...and include a discussion about'. Such answers could not achieve the top mark band and neither could answers which did not consider the named issue at all.

Many answers would receive significantly higher marks if candidates knew the difference between description and evaluation. **Section B** question part (a) will always be 'describe' and question part (b) will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description. Evaluation is a different skill which 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. For this question part all candidates could be divided into three types of answer: those who evaluated using a number of issues in addition to the named issue (the perfect strategy); those who focused exclusively on the named issue or excluded it altogether (maximum of half marks); and those who did not evaluate at all (and scored no marks). It is desirable to see all candidates achieve the first type of answer.

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. To suggest is 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.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a)** This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by improving learning effectiveness. A large number of candidates answered this question appropriately, gave some elaboration or an example, and scored full marks. Some candidates incorrectly focused on teaching styles.
- (b)** This question part asked candidates to describe the PQRST study skill. Many candidates answered this question correctly but *identified* what PQRST stands for (P=Preview, etc.) without elaboration rather than *describing* and giving detail. Four marks will never be gained by mere identification (when a question uses the injunction 'describe') and some elaboration should always be given.

Question 2

- (a)** Candidates were invited to describe what psychologists have found out about perspectives on learning. Marks awarded to this question covered the entire range. At the bottom end there were those who did not know what a perspective was. Some candidates knew about a perspective, but focused largely on describing the basics with very little reference to education. Those at the top end linked the brief basics of the perspective with how the approach applies to education. For example, these candidates wrote about the behaviourist approach and Pavlov and Skinner and then went on to mention the applications by Bloom (1971) and Keller (1968) for example as well as mentioning how the approach related to modifying disruptive behaviour.
- (b)** Candidates had to evaluate what psychologists have found out about perspectives on learning and to specifically include a discussion of the applications to education. For many candidates this was an opportunity to continue *describing* what they had started in part **(a)**. This is not a good strategy because there are no marks for description in this section. Candidates must answer the question, describing when instructed and evaluating when instructed. Other candidates evaluated specific studies rather than evaluating the actual perspectives.

Question 3

- (a)** This question part wanted a description of a specific technique to help children overcome their dyslexia. Some candidates did not know *any* technique to help children with dyslexia and from what was written, some candidates did not show any understanding at all of what dyslexia actually is. Some candidates made common-sense suggestions whilst the best answers referred to specific techniques such those by Selikowitz (1998) and Hornsby and Shear (1976) who devised the Alpha-Omega scheme.

- (b) This question part wanted candidates to suggest a strategy for educating children with special needs. Most candidates scored good marks here because they were able to identify and describe at least one if not two and sometimes even three different strategies. Most commonly mentioned were acceleration and enrichment and some candidates even mentioned specific strategies such as those proposed by Renzulli (1977) and Stanley (1976).

Question 4

- (a) Candidates were invited to suggest one theory to explain why we attribute causes to behaviour. Some candidates did not know anything about attribution theory. Some candidates did know, but could not relate the theory of Weiner (1984) for example to education. At the top end of the mark range candidates explained Weiner's three dimensions (of causality, stability and control) and explained how we attribute successes and failures in education differently.
- (b) In this question part candidates had to suggest how negative attributions, such as learned helplessness, could be changed. This question part was generally poorly answered. Some answers suggested nothing more than 'tell people to be less negative and more positive' and very few candidates wrote about the suggestions by deCharms (1972) even though this appears on the syllabus. DeCharms suggests that if children feel internally motivated, that their actions are theirs, and chosen by and originating from them then they will begin to become more responsible for their own learning and attribute successes and failures differently.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

- (a) This question part asked for an explanation of what is meant by 'psychogenic pain'. Most candidates scored full marks for this question part when describing that psychogenic pain occurs as a result of some underlying psychological disorder, rather than as a response to some immediate physical injury. Sometimes examples were given which guaranteed candidates achieved full marks.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe the gate control theory of pain proposed by Melzak. There were three types of answer: those who did not know the theory (and scored no marks); those who provided a few lines of description, but with little detail in their answer (and mainly scored 2 marks); and those who wrote detailed answers showing knowledge and understanding (and more often than not, were awarded all four marks).

Question 6

- (a) Candidates were invited to describe what psychologists have discovered about adherence to medical advice. There were a few anecdotal answers where it was evident that the details of the syllabus had not been covered. On the other hand there were some excellent answers where it was evident that a significant amount of time had gone into teaching and into preparation of answers by candidates. Quite a number of answers showed a wide range of relevant skills and scored the maximum 8 marks out of 8.
- (b) Candidates had to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about adherence to medical advice discussing the use of quantitative and qualitative data. Two problems were seen here. Firstly, candidates made the common error of not evaluating according to the requirements of the question (see general comments). Secondly candidates had to *evaluate and* include a discussion about the use of quantitative and qualitative data. Some candidates did not know what these terms meant and often those that did could not say what was advantageous or disadvantageous about them. This was disappointing given that they should have been covered for the AS component of the syllabus.

Question 7

- (a) This part required candidates to describe one study which has measured stress physiologically. Some candidates did not know what a physiological measure was; some wrote about a physiological measure, but could not describe a relevant study. Some candidates could describe a relevant study, but rather than describing one, they described two and sometimes even three! This is inefficient because marks can only be given for one description if that is what the question asks.

- (b) This part required candidates to suggest a measure to find out the causes of stress. This **Section C** question gave candidates the choice of method, rather than naming a specific method, to measure the causes of stress. Some candidates merely wrote 'I suggest a questionnaire like that of Holmes and Rahe' and proceeded to *describe* the work of Holmes and Rahe. This question part asks for a suggestion and here candidates are free to think for themselves and suggest whatever they think is appropriate based on their psychological knowledge.

Question 8

- (a) This question part wanted candidates to suggest a strategy to help reduce accidents in a school science laboratory. Answers to this question were generally poor because they were 'common-sense' rather than based on any psychological knowledge that could be followed up in part (b). It appears that candidates learn information but never think about how that information can be applied beyond that specific study to other situations or the principles on which the study is based. For example, Fox et al (1987) gave tokens to workers in a mine for practising safe behaviour. The use of tokens to be exchanged for rewards could also be used with candidates to reduce accidents.
- (b) This question part wanted candidates to outline the theory on which their suggestion is based. To continue with the example from part (a) above, giving tokens means they can be exchanged for rewards and this is called a 'token economy' and is based on the work of Skinner who believed that if we receive a reward we are likely to repeat that behaviour. Safe behaviour is then rewarded whilst the opposite applies that negative or unsafe behaviour can be punished. The principles of conditioning should be carried through from AS and applied in A2.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

- (a) This question asked for an explanation of what is meant by 'community environmental design'. Most candidates scored 1 mark when they answered that it is 'the design of buildings for public use' and those scoring 2 marks went a little further and gave an example 'e.g. housing design such as Newman's Clason Point'.
- (b) This question asked for a description of one investigation into the design of either a gambling casino or a shopping mall. Despite the question stating in bold **one** investigation a number of candidates provided more than one. The psychology behind the building design of casinos and shopping malls is fascinating. Casinos are often designed so it is very difficult to move quickly and directly from the entrance to the exit, exactly in the same way that the store IKEA is designed. Candidates showing knowledge of this design feature (amongst others) scored good marks, whilst others merely provided anecdotes which often scored no marks at all.

Question 10

- (a) This question part wanted a description of what psychologists have learned about environmental cognition. There were some very impressive answers written in response to this question. The best answers covered a wide range of different aspects, in effect including detail from all three bullet points of the syllabus. What also impressed was the way in which studies were summarised briefly, but not gone into in any great detail. Writing concisely is a good skill to show when an answer has to be compacted into the 20 minutes time allocation for this question part.
- (b) This question part wanted an evaluation of what psychologists have learned about environmental cognition debating the ecological validity of the ways in which environmental cognition has been studied. As has been mentioned for all **Section B** part (b) answers, many candidates evaluated just the named issue. As has been mentioned before, this scores a maximum of 6 marks out of the 12 available and so could prevent a top grade from being achieved. Questions are unambiguous and candidates are advised to write about a range of different issues.

Question 11

- (a) Candidates were invited to describe a laboratory experiment which has investigated the effects of noise on pro-social behaviour. For candidates who knew the studies from the syllabus, this was a straightforward question and many answers received full marks. There were those however who did not and instead wrote about field experiments or experiments on anti-social behaviour. These answers were wrong and scored no marks.
- (b) Candidates were invited to suggest what variables should be controlled, and why, when investigating the effects of noise on pro-social behaviour. This question part revealed another common error made by many candidates, which is to describe rather than suggest. Candidates are not required to describe the variables that were controlled in a particular published study. Instead they are required to suggest what variables *they think* should be controlled in *any* study that might be conducted for this topic area.

Question 12

- (a) In this question part candidates were required to describe how psychologists can prevent crowding by using visual escapes. The classic study in this topic area is that by Baum et al (1976) who suggest that a visual escape, such as a window to look through or a book, magazine or similar to look at, can distract a person from something that is aversive, or something as basic as helping to pass the time and prevent boredom. As is becoming a common statement, the difference in marks was between those who knew about this study and those who made up something using the words 'visual escape'.
- (b) This question asked candidates to suggest how they would investigate the effectiveness of a visual escape on public transport. As with many **Section C** questions candidates have to design a study to investigate some aspect of behaviour, in this case the use of visual escapes on public transport. This question, like others, gave candidates a free choice of method. Those candidates providing good answers often chose a field experiment suggesting that some passengers be given a visual escape (such as a book or magazine) and others not (the control group). The measure of the effectiveness of the escape was often done by a questionnaire given at the end of the journey.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) Part (a) wanted candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'addiction'. A number of candidates chose to define addiction in the 'narrow' sense, restricting themselves to a definition of addiction to substances, particularly drugs. This approach was perfectly acceptable, as was a 'wider' explanation, which explains the features applying to an addiction to anything rather than just a substance.
- (b) Part (b) wanted a description of one way in which addiction has been defined. Those candidates opting for the narrow definition in part (a) sometimes just repeated the same answer without elaboration. Some candidates gave the DSM (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual) definition. Those candidates opting for the wider definition described the six features of addiction outlined by Griffiths (2005) which are salience, euphoria, tolerance, withdrawal, conflict and relapse. These features suggest that a person can become addicted not just to a substance (including things like chocolate) but to anything, including work (workaholic),

Question 14

- (a) This part of the essay question invited candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about abnormal affect. A number of candidates misinterpreted this question, writing a very general answer about abnormal *psychology* rather than focusing specifically on the topic area of abnormal affect. Abnormal affect is clearly identified as one of 6 topic areas, and as all **Section B** questions will focus on just one of those 6 areas, mistakes like this should not be made. On the other hand there were many excellent answers scoring full marks which were very pleasing to read.

- (b) This part of the essay question invited candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about abnormal affect to and include a discussion about reductionism. Candidates at the top end of the mark range discussed reductionism but often showed higher level skills by relating reductionism to other issues. For example, to suggest abnormal affect is caused by a chemical imbalance is to be reductionist; to suggest abnormal affect is nature (rather than nurture), is to be reductionist. At the bottom end of the mark range answers were often disappointing because there was either very little or nothing that could be credited as evaluative.

Question 15

- (a) Part (a) asked candidates to describe the approach on which the token economy programme is based. There were many superb answers written here with candidates describing the behaviourist approach and the principles of reinforcement as outlined by Skinner. A few candidates even mentioned the pioneering work in this area by Ayllon and Azrin (1968). At the bottom end of the mark range candidates went little further than a sentence about tokens being exchanged for rewards.
- (b) Part (b) asked for a suggestion of how a token economy programme could be used for schizophrenic patients in their care. Some candidates misunderstood the use of token economy with schizophrenics believing it is a treatment that can provide a cure rather than a way to modify everyday basic behaviour. Other candidates suggested that token economy can be used to help rehabilitate those recovering from schizophrenia and such answers showed very good understanding and received very high marks.

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe one way in which obsessive compulsive disorder has been measured using a questionnaire. The syllabus identifies the Maudsley obsessive-compulsive inventory (MOCI) and many candidates described this questionnaire. It has 30 questions divided into four main aspects of OCD: checking, washing/cleaning, slowness and doubting. Some candidates made up a questionnaire and some candidates, also scoring no marks, described the case study by Rappaport of Charles.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to suggest a way in which obsessive compulsive disorder can be measured **without** using a questionnaire. This question confused some candidates, one writing 'but we have not been taught how to measure OCD without a questionnaire'. If this candidate had, he or she would have probably *described* that measure and scored no marks. The point of **Section C** questions is for candidates to think and suggest. It is not a complex task to think that observing a person would give some clues as to whether or not that had OCD.

Psychology and Organisations

Question 17

- (a) Candidates were required to explain, using their own words, what is meant by 'need theory of motivation'. This question caused little difficulty for most candidates and maximum marks were frequently awarded. A few candidates rewrote the words of the question and this is not advisable because it does not score any marks.
- (b) Candidates were required to describe McClelland's need theory of motivation. Those scoring maximum marks described McClelland's theory in detail, mentioning the three work-related needs for achievement, for affiliation and for power. Some impressed by giving that little extra detail when mentioning that the TAT (thematic apperception test) can be used to measure these needs.

Question 18

- (a) This essay question asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about satisfaction at work. At the bottom end of the mark range were candidates who wrote anecdotally about what they thought led to satisfaction at work. Such answers showed naivety and often no evidence at all that they had studied any psychology. The purpose of having a syllabus is to study what is on it and then to write about the things that have been learned in an examination. If this is ignored then a pass grade will not be achieved. At the top end of the mark range there were superb answers written by very competent candidates who had clearly covered relevant aspects from the syllabus.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about satisfaction at work and to include a discussion of questionnaires to measure job satisfaction. Those writing anecdotally in part (a) did not evaluate and so scored no marks in this question part. Those who had written appropriate answers in part (a) generally did very well in this part but sometimes failed to address the question of questionnaires being one of a number of issues that should be written about.

Question 19

- (a) This **Section C** question invited candidates to suggest an experiment to discover whether noise affects the workers concentration. As has been mentioned throughout this report is that in **Section C** candidates often have to design their own study. In this instance they had to design an experiment to investigate noise and worker performance. Some candidates suggested their IV have two conditions, such as workers with and without noise, a DV, many controls, and their knowledge of experimental methodology applied to noise at work was in no doubt. This is the type of answer candidates should aim for.
- (b) In this part candidates had to describe evidence showing two effects of physical working conditions on workers. In this question part candidates could choose any two physical conditions to describe, from noise, illumination, and temperature for example. This question part carries 6 marks (3 marks for each effect) and so candidates do need an appropriate amount of detail, rather than a single sentence, to access all the marks available to them.

Question 20

- (a) This question asked candidates to suggest how they would manage a group to reduce group conflict if they were leader. This application question invited to candidates to put themselves in the position of a manager and to suggest how they would manage group conflict should it arise. Some candidates wrote very good answers that showed knowledge from a range of different topic areas in addition to the specific syllabus bullet point of group conflict. Those at the bottom end knew nothing about how to manage conflict.
- (b) This question asked candidates to outline the theory on which their suggestion was based. For most candidates answering this question appropriately, the work of Thomas (1976) featured prominently, and a few candidates showed excellent understanding when making the comment that the role of the manager is to use a strategy that will best resolve the conflict dependent on the type of conflict being experienced.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/32
Specialist Choices

Key messages

It is essential that candidates know the difference between the injunctions: description, evaluation and suggestion.

Candidates should write answers equivalent to the mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 6, 8 or 12 marks should be correspondingly longer.

For **Section B** part **(b)** a *range* of evaluation issues should be included not just the named issue.

Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge (e.g. names and dates) 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

This is the first November sitting of the new syllabus with modified examination format and it is encouraging to see most candidates following the requirements of the syllabus, question papers and mark schemes quite closely, due largely to competent teachers concerned that their candidates are well prepared. It is always pleasing to be able to award some very high marks to some superbly written answers. As always there are ways in which Centres can improve the results for their candidates.

Administration: many candidates correctly used string to tie together their answer pages. However, rather than tying pages loosely so an Examiner could turn and read each page, many scripts were tied so tightly together an Examiner had to untie the string in order to read the answer. This was extremely time consuming and a waste of Examiner time.

Section A (all options):

- (a)** Most candidates scored full marks in response to the short answer questions on all options.
- (b)** Most answers for this question part were appropriate, although many answers were far too short. If part **(a)** scores 2 marks and part **(b)** 4 marks, then an amount of writing equivalent to four marks needs to be done.

Section B (all options)

Question part **(a)** with the injunction 'describe' did not differ in format from questions appearing on previous examinations. As with previous questions a candidate could choose what to write from the three bullet-points of the syllabus and marks were awarded based on the range, detail and quality of the answer.

Question part **(b)** differed from previous questions because rather than just being asked to 'evaluate' there is the additional requirement to include one specifically named evaluation issue. In the past a candidate could evaluate using any issues. The requirement now is to include the named issue as one of a number of issues.

Many candidates mistakenly interpreted the question as 'write about this one issue only' despite the question stating 'evaluate...and include a discussion about'. Such answers could not achieve the top mark band and neither could answers which did not consider the named issue at all.

Many answers would receive significantly higher marks if candidates knew the difference between description and evaluation. **Section B** question part (a) will always be 'describe' and question part (b) will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description. Evaluation is a different skill which 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. For this question part all candidates could be divided into three types of answer: those who evaluated using a number of issues in addition to the named issue (the perfect strategy); those who focused exclusively on the named issue or excluded it altogether (maximum of half marks); and those who did not evaluate at all (and scored no marks). It is desirable to see all candidates achieve the first type of answer.

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. To suggest is 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.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'learned helplessness'. Many candidates were able to answer this question correctly, but some struggled, instead writing about children who were helpless because they could not learn.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe **one** explanation of learned helplessness. There were some candidates who guessed, and these candidates always guessed incorrectly. There were those candidates who could define the term but not provide an explanation and there were those candidates who provided good explanations, either based on the work of Seligman or Dweck.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates were invited to describe what psychologists have found out about disruptive behaviour in schools. A few candidates wrote anecdotes about their own school experiences where children had been disruptive and answers like this scored bottom band marks where the anecdotes matched with relevant psychology. At the top end of the mark range candidates mentioned different types, different causes and effects and also often mentioned both corrective and preventive strategies. In other words they covered a range of appropriate material from the syllabus.
- (b) Candidates were invited to evaluate what psychologists have found out about disruptive behaviour in schools and to include a discussion about the behaviourist approach to controlling disruptive behaviour. Two problems were seen here. Firstly, candidates made the common error of not evaluating according to the requirements of the question (see general comments) and secondly candidates had to *evaluate* and include a discussion about the Behaviourist approach to controlling problems. Many candidates confused the terms describe and evaluate and simply described how behaviourists would control disruptive behaviours. This approach scored no marks simply because, as always, there are no marks allocated for description in the evaluation question part.

Question 3

- (a) This question part wanted an outline of Grasha's six styles of learning. Some candidates just identified the six styles and others did not know what they were, substituting many different things instead, but scoring no marks in doing so. The best answers described the six styles in detail and wrote sufficient detailed answers to be awarded all six marks.

- (b) This question part wanted candidates to suggest how they would conduct a study to compare Grasha's styles with an alternative explanation of learning styles. Many different types of answer were seen here, and two types stood out. Some candidates merely described an alternative explanation of learning styles. This type of answer scored no marks because it did not answer the question set. Candidates are referred to the general **Section C** comments above. The second type of answer revealed some superb answers by candidates who designed an experiment with half of the participants using one or more of Grasha's styles and the other half using an alternative style. Particularly impressive here was the use of methodological knowledge in explaining the suggested study.

Question 4

- (a) Candidates were invited to suggest an alternative way of measuring creativity without asking questions. This question seemed to confuse many candidates, typified by one candidate who wrote 'you could ask them to' and crossed it out three times before answering **Question 3**. Those candidates providing answers either went for a suggestion of putting a book somewhere noticeable and using observation to see what people would do with it; and those who quite legitimately moved from the question and suggested looking at creativity in a piece of artwork.
- (b) In this question part candidates to describe **two** alternatives to intelligence. Answers should have balanced each alternative according to the 3 marks allocated to each. Some candidates did this, whilst many other answers were imbalanced. Most popular was the theory of emotional intelligence proposed by Goleman (1995) and that of Gardner (1983) who outlined his theory of multiple intelligences.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

- (a) This question part asked for an explanation of what is meant by 'practitioner style'. Most candidates were able to score at least one mark and many scored two when explaining that practitioner style is the approach the practitioner adopts during a consultation with a patient.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe **one** explanation of practitioner style. Most candidates provided a correct answer, marks being distinguished by the amount of detail and understanding in the answers. Some candidates opted to describe a 'whole' explanation, such as that by Savage and Armstrong for example, and included both practitioner styles, whilst others (legitimately) opted for a 'partial' explanation and wrote about just one of the two possible styles.

Question 6

- (a) Candidates were invited to describe what psychologists have learned about stress. Most candidates wrote answers which covered a range of appropriate aspects taken directly from the content of the syllabus which included causes or sources of stress, ways in which stress is measured and ways in which stress can be managed. Within each of these sub-topics there was often excellent detail and clear understanding of the subject matter. Some candidates wrote very anecdotal answers showing very little understanding of this topic area.
- (b) Candidates had to evaluate what psychologists have learned about stress and include a discussion about the physiological approach to stress. A few candidates did not evaluate at all, deciding to describe even more about stress. Some answers only evaluated physiological measures and some answers evaluated but did not mention physiological measures at all. All these types of answer score no more than half marks; the former scoring no marks at all. Candidates should evaluate using a range of issues including the named issue in order to access the whole mark range.

Question 7

- (a) This part required candidates to suggest how they would measure non-adherence to medical requests using biochemical/physiological tests. There were some excellent answers here with candidates providing appropriate suggestions showing very good understanding of physiological measures that can be used to measure adherence. Some candidates were uncertain about what a physiological or biochemical test is and so may have scored more marks choosing the alternative question in this section.
- (b) This part required candidates to describe two ways to measure non-adherence that do not involve biochemical/physiological tests. Many candidates provided excellent answers when choosing two non-biochemical measures of non-adherence, describing each in good detail and showing competent knowledge and understanding. Most popular were the studies by Chung and Naya, Sherman et al and Roth.

Question 8

- (a) This question part wanted a description of research on being accident prone and personality. Some candidates wrote nothing more than anecdotal examples showing they knew no research at all for this topic area and so not providing an answer to the question. Better answers wrote about relevant research for example describing different types of human error, the illusion of invulnerability and cognitive overload, often in addition to the theory of accident prone personality.
- (b) This question part wanted candidates to suggest how they could investigate accident prone personality using a questionnaire to gather quantitative data. This question was looking for two components to score full marks. Firstly some knowledge about questionnaire design (e.g. open-ended or closed) and secondly to show some knowledge about accident prone personality and relate it to the design of the questionnaire, such as in an example of a question that could be asked.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

- (a) This question asked for an explanation of what is meant by the term 'way-finding'. Some candidates attempted an 'it is how to find your way' type of answer, and in this case the 'common-sense guess' is partially correct. All that is needed is a little elaboration such as it being to successfully follow a route from point A to point B.
- (b) This question asked for a description of two studies which have investigated way-finding in a laboratory rather than in a real situation. Some candidates could not provide a description of any study at all, despite the Maguire et al AS core study being directly relevant. Some candidates did quote this study and also that by Janzen et al (2001) who used a virtual maze and had a mouse follow a route to find food.

Question 10

- (a) This question part wanted a description of what psychologists have found out about noise. Most candidates answering this question part scored high marks. Better answers were organised around the three sub-sections of the syllabus and some candidates mentioned every single aspect of the indicative content whether it be a model, theory or study. In doing this answers were very long and meant that there was very little time to answer question part (b). This is not good examination technique because half an answer here (e.g. 4 marks) and half an answer for part (b) (e.g. 6 marks) is better than an 8 mark answer in part (a) and 0 marks in part (b).
- (b) This question part wanted an evaluation of what psychologists have found out about noise and to include a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of using quantitative data. Some candidates, as mentioned, wrote either no answer or very short answers because of extensive part (a) answers. Other candidates evaluated without mentioning the named issue and others mentioned only the named issue. Due to errors such as these very few candidates scored high marks.

Question 11

- (a) Candidates were invited to suggest how they would gather data on how prepared people are for a disaster/catastrophe. Unlike some **Section C** questions where a specific method must be addressed, this question had the general requirement to 'gather data' leaving the choice of method to gather data open to the candidate. Whilst many candidates chose a questionnaire, others appeared to be unable to think of any psychological method at all. A basic principle of the whole syllabus is that information about methods, approaches, issues, etc. is carried through from AS to be used at A2.
- (b) Candidates were invited to describe evacuation principles such as those outlined by Loftus (1972). There were some superb answers written in response to this question. Answers included the evacuation principles outlined by Loftus and also went beyond this and included the evacuation strategies proposed by Sugiman and Misumi (1988). A few candidates guessed and as usual such guesses revealed a lack of understanding and scored very low or no marks at all.

Question 12

- (a) In this question part candidates were required to describe one study which has looked at how people defend public territory. The most logical study to choose to describe was one by Ruback because that is the example given on the syllabus. Ruback did a number of studies: one in a car park and another on people waiting to use a telephone. The study by Hoppe et al would also have been relevant. However, many candidates did not choose these studies, instead describing studies that were focused on defending primary territory rather than in public places.
- (b) This question asked candidates to suggest how the observation method could be used to study how people use territorial markers. Many **Section C** questions ask candidates to use a particular method to investigate some aspect of the syllabus. The observation method is common in psychology and so candidates should be able to use it to investigate something like territorial markers. A significant number of candidates did just that and wrote excellent answers showing understanding of observations and how they could be applied. Other candidates did not get beyond 'I would do an observation' and some candidates incorrectly described research that had already been conducted.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) Part (a) wanted candidates to explain what is meant by 'biological explanations of depression'. The majority of candidates scored both available marks and had little problem explaining the term, often mentioning that the term 'biological' incorporates both genetic and biochemical explanations.
- (b) Part (b) wanted a description of two biological explanations of depression. The approach taken by most candidates was to mention the genetic explanation (e.g. Oruc et al) and the biochemical explanation (e.g. the catecholamine/dopamine hypothesis) and this saw many candidates achieve full marks. Two marks were allocated to each explanation, so only a relatively short answer of each was required. It was also good to see that most candidates understood that both chemical and genetic explanations are biological in the wider sense.

Question 14

- (a) This part of the essay question invited candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about schizophrenia. A number of answers scored top marks because candidates covered a wide range of sub-topics from the syllabus, had included appropriate theories (such as the genetic, biochemical and cognitive explanations), included relevant names (and dates) and had shown good understanding in their explanations. Some candidates just described different types of schizophrenia and whilst this is good, it will not score as many marks as those who show both range and depth in their answers.

- (b) This part of the essay question invited candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about schizophrenia and include a discussion about the nature - nurture debate. Answers here followed the same pattern as for other questions (see general comments above) and were of three types: those candidates who do not know how to evaluate; those candidates who only considered the named issue (and so score a maximum of 6 marks); and those who evaluate skilfully using a range of issues, one of which is the named nature - nurture debate.

Question 15

- (a) Part (a) asked for a description of the genetic explanation for phobias. Research on this had been done by Ost (1992) and most candidates choosing this question described this study. Some candidates went further and provided a thorough review of the area, whilst others stopped after two lines or so, seemingly unable to provide any further detail. Questions like this carry 6 marks and so there should be sufficient detail to allow the awarding of all the available marks.
- (b) Part (b) asked candidates to suggest how they would investigate whether phobias are inherited. Extremes of answer were seen in response to this question. Some candidates merely wrote 'I would ask them' showing little understanding and no psychological knowledge whatsoever. Others outlined twin studies, adoption studies and sometimes longitudinal studies to see if a phobia developed across different generations.

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe one cognitive-behavioural treatment. As reported in most sections there are those candidates who are 'in-the-know' and write answers which answer questions specifically based on relevant psychological knowledge, and there are those who know no psychology at all and guess, or as applies to this question, know a treatment but do not know on what it is based. A few candidates for example wrote about the use of medication or psychodynamic psychotherapy, neither of which are cognitive-behavioural in any sense.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to suggest how they would test the long-term effectiveness of the treatment described in part (a). The most appropriate way to do this would be to conduct a longitudinal experiment. One group could be given a cognitive-behavioural treatment and another control group given a different or no treatment. At a later date, several months or a year later, they could be assessed and so the effectiveness of the treatment determined.

Psychology and Organisations

Question 17

- (a) Candidates were required to explain, using their own words, what is meant by the term 'job enlargement'. This question part linked with job enrichment and job rotation in question part (b). Many candidates wrote perfect answers showing they understood what job enlargement meant, whilst others muddled the terms. Job enlargement widens jobs and allows workers to take on additional tasks. It is not working harder or with more responsibility.
- (b) Candidates were required to describe job enrichment and job rotation giving an example of each. Many candidates confused job enrichment with job enlargement and some candidates assumed they were the same thing. Job enrichment is where workers are given more responsibility in the task they do. Job rotation is where workers are moved from one task to another and can prevent boredom and monotony. Sometimes relevant examples were given as required by the question and sometimes they were not, restricting marks.

Question 18

- (a) This essay question asked candidates to describe what psychologists have learned about organisational work conditions. Many candidates could identify and list relevant factors and often the distinction was made between psychological and physical factors, but what very few candidates could do was to write anything more than an outline of each and most answers had a distinct lack of relevant theories, studies and psychological terminology.

- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have learned about organisational work conditions and to include a discussion about generalisations. Some candidates do not know what a generalisation is, and so could not address this part of the question. A generalisation is something that applies to most people most of the time. For this topic area a generalisation would be that excesses of noise, temperature and lighting have a negative effect on performance. Some candidates knew about generalisations and in addition considered a number of other issues scoring good marks in doing so.

Question 19

- (a) This **Section C** question invited candidates to suggest how they would gather data on the characteristics of effective leaders. The fundamental mistake made by most candidates answering this question was that they simply described the characteristics of effective leaders. This is not what the question asked. The emphasis of this question part was for a *suggestion* to be made and not a *description*. Those candidates who did answer the question correctly suggested using a questionnaire to give to effective leaders and others suggested doing a participant observation to gather data on why certain leaders are effective in the job they do. Even these types of answers often lacked the necessary methodological knowledge to allow full marks to be awarded.
- (b) In this part candidates had to describe the path-goal theory of leadership (House, 1979). This question had a slightly different emphasis, though not unusual, in that the path-goal theory is specifically named rather than appearing on the syllabus as an 'example' study. House proposes that the leader can affect the performance, satisfaction, and motivation of a group in different ways: offering rewards for achieving performance goals; clarifying paths towards these goals; removing obstacles to performance.

Question 20

- (a) This question asked for a suggestion of what the problems of appraisal are and what can be done to improve appraisals. A number of answers scored full marks because both the problems and ways in which they can be resolved were addressed. Some candidates provided three, four and even more problems and each had an associated resolution, all of which were appropriate and based on appropriate psychological knowledge.
- (b) This question asked for a description of one quantitative appraisal technique. As nearly all appraisals are based on rankings, checklists and rating scales (such as the Behaviourally Anchored Rating Scale) they are, by nature quantitative. Whilst some candidates described one technique in some detail, other answers were too superficial or not quantitative.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/33
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- It is essential that candidates know the difference between the injunctions: description, evaluation and suggestion.
- Candidates should write answers equivalent to the mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 6, 8 or 12 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- For **Section B** part **(b)** a *range* of evaluation issues should be included not just the named issue.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge (e.g. names and dates) 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

This is the first November sitting of the new syllabus and modified examination format and it is encouraging to see most candidates following the requirements of the syllabus, question papers and mark schemes quite closely, due largely to competent teachers concerned that their candidates are well prepared. It is always pleasing to be able to award some very high marks to some superbly written answers. As always there are ways in which Centres can improve the results for their candidates.

Administration: many candidates correctly used string to tie together their answer pages. However, rather than tying pages loosely so an Examiner could turn and read each page, many scripts were tied so tightly together an Examiner had to untie the string in order to read the answer. This was extremely time consuming and a waste of Examiner time.

Section A (all options):

- (a) Most candidates scored full marks in response to the short answer questions on all options.
- (b) Most answers for this question part were appropriate, although many answers were far too short. If part (a) scores 2 marks and part (b) 4 marks, then an amount of writing equivalent to four marks needs to be done.

Section B (all options)

Question part (a) with the injunction 'describe' did not differ in format from questions appearing on previous examinations. As with previous questions a candidate could choose what to write from the three bullet-points of the syllabus and marks were awarded based on the range, detail and quality of the answer.

Question part (b) differed from previous questions because rather than just being asked to 'evaluate' there is the additional requirement to include one specifically named evaluation issue. In the past a candidate could evaluate using any issues. The requirement now is to include the named issue as one of a number of issues.

Many candidates mistakenly interpreted the question as 'write about this one issue only' despite the question stating 'evaluate...and include a discussion about'. Such answers could not achieve the top mark band and neither could answers which did not consider the named issue at all.

Many answers would receive significantly higher marks if candidates know the difference between description and evaluation. **Section B** question part (a) will always be 'describe' and question part (b) will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description. Evaluation is a different skill which 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. For this question part all candidates could be divided into three types of answer: those who evaluated using a number of issues in addition to the named issue (the perfect strategy); those who focused exclusively on the named issue or excluded it altogether (maximum of half marks); and those who did not evaluate at all (and scored no marks). It is desirable to see all candidates achieve the first type of answer.

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. To suggest is 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.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

No candidate answered questions from the Psychology and Education option.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

- (a)** This question part asked for an explanation of what is meant by 'physiology of stress'. All candidates scored at least one mark when providing a basic sentence that hinted at what the physiology of stress actually is. Other candidates gave examples of stress-related hormones and some candidates mentioned that stress comprises both physiological and a psychological components which showed good understanding.
- (b)** This question part asked candidates to describe the general adaptation syndrome (GAS model) proposed by Selye. Answers were of three types: those who did not know the GAS model at all and provided no answer or guessed; those who gave a correct but brief answer, writing that there are three stages and identifying them; and thirdly those who described the GAS model in detail with examples and showed full understanding.

Question 6

- (a)** Candidates were invited to describe what psychologists have discovered about health promotion. Most candidates wrote answers that covered a range of appropriate aspects taken directly from the content of the syllabus and included the Yale model of communication, techniques such as providing information and fear appeals and studies conducted in schools, worksites and communities. However, some candidates wrote about *lifestyles* and what an individual could do to live a healthier life. This is not what is indicated on the syllabus as health promotion. It was encouraging to see candidates use examples from their own countries to illustrate the various techniques.
- (b)** Candidates had to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about health promotion and include a discussion of the ethics of health promotions. A few candidates did not evaluate at all, simply choosing to describe more health promotion studies. Some candidates for example did not describe the Janis and Feshback study in part **(a)** instead choosing to describe it in part **(b)**. In part **(b)** it scored no marks because part **(b)** has marks for evaluation only. Some candidates chose to evaluate using the issue of ethics only and this restricted such answers to a maximum of 6 marks. At the top end of the mark range there were answers which evaluated using a number of different issues including that of the ethics of health promotions.

Question 7

- (a) This part required candidates to suggest a cognitive strategy for reducing *acute* pain. Some candidates confused acute and chronic pain and so sometimes the suggested strategy was inappropriate. Many candidates made anecdotal suggestions rather than basing their suggestion on psychological knowledge. For example, a suggestion based on non-pain imagery, attention diversion or cognitive reinterpretation would have led to better answers in question part (b).
- (b) This part required candidates to explain the theory that would enable the strategy suggested in part (a) to work. Some candidates could not suggest any theory, or made a brief reference to 'cognitive theory'. Some candidates wrote about the experiences of Beecher who found cognitive strategies were used to overcome pain. However, the best answers were those candidates who described the gate control theory proposed by Melzack which accounts for the control of pain using various cognitive techniques.

Question 8

- (a) This question part wanted candidates to suggest an appropriate way to observe a medical practitioner. The majority of candidates suggested the use of a video camera, which was unusual because no AS core study uses a video camera to record observed behaviour. Most answers did not identify a type of observation, even though the syllabus has core studies which use controlled and participant observation, for example. Although the use of video camera was suggested, very few candidates actually identified what behaviour they would be looking for. Most observations have response categories pre-determined (e.g. the study by Bandura) rather than just observing to see what happens.
- (b) This question part wanted candidates to describe why we have non-verbal communication and to outline one study which has investigated non-verbal communication. Nearly all candidates provided an appropriate explanation for NVC and scored both marks. Regarding the outline of the study, some candidates could not describe any at all, others referred to the uses of NVC as identified by Argyle, but most used the McKinstry and Wang study as indicated on the syllabus. A few candidates referred to other studies which were also acceptable as they were of the use of NVC in medical settings.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

No candidate answered questions from the Psychology and Environment option.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) Part (a) wanted candidates to explain what is meant by a 'type of schizophrenia'. The majority of candidates scored both available marks and had little problem in including an example of a type (catatonic, etc.) in their answer to show they understood the term.
- (b) Part (b) wanted a description of two types of schizophrenia. Here too most candidates scored full marks. Many candidates chose two appropriate types, such as paranoid and catatonic, and those not scoring full marks only did so not because their answers were incorrect but because they were just too brief and lacking detail.

Question 14

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about models of abnormality. A number of candidates decided to focus more on explaining the basics of each model rather than focusing on what the model had to say about abnormality. For example, there were sometimes long descriptions of classical conditioning without relating the model to abnormality such as stating that this shows how fears can be learned and mentioning Little Albert as conditioned by Watson. Some candidates mistakenly assumed 'models of abnormality' meant 'definitions of abnormality' and such answers scored no marks because they are incorrect for a 'models' answer. At the top end of the mark range candidates mentioned the basics of various models briefly and then focused on the aspects of them specifically relevant to the question.

- (b) This part of the essay question invited candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about models of abnormality including a discussion about competing models. There were three types of answer to this question. (i) there were those candidates who evaluated each model in turn stating what was good or not so good about each. (ii) candidates who gained higher marks also did this but went a step further by comparing or contrasting each model as the question asked, writing 'model x believes this and so does model y' for example, which shows good evaluative skills. (iii) candidates who gained the highest marks were those who did all this but went on not only to discuss competing models but also evaluated models using evaluative issues such as reductionism, determinism, and the nature – nurture debate for example.

Question 15

- (a) Part (a) asked for a description of how alcoholics could be treated using aversion therapy. A number of candidates did not know what aversion therapy was, so this was not the right question for them to choose to answer. Many candidates described what *they* would do and this usually involved giving something unpleasant to the alcoholic (such as an electric shock!) but often without any reference to the basics of classical conditioning involving the association between UCS, UCR, etc. Those candidates including some part of the 'conditioning formula' in their answers as well as their 'aversion' procedure scored the highest marks.
- (b) Part (b) asked for a *suggestion* of how the effectiveness of the treatment programme could be assessed. Some candidates stated nothing more than inviting the person to come back a year later and asking them whether the procedure had worked. Other candidates suggested doing a range of different things such as conducting interviews (with both person and family), observations, and some candidates even suggesting obtaining a blood sample to check alcohol levels. Whilst these suggestions were fine, more marks would have been scored if there were some acknowledgement of the reason, or advantage of using a particular method, such as blood test being more objective rather than a subjective self-report.

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked for a suitable treatment to target both obsessions and compulsions. Nearly all candidates suggested a suitable treatment. Many suggested the use of a token economy programme; others suggested the use of cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) as used by behaviourists, whilst others used the CBT version of Beck and Ellis. A few candidates suggested the use of SSRI's, sometimes in isolation but some candidates suggested their use in conjunction with some form of CBT. A small number of candidates assumed that OCD is a phobia and suggested systematic desensitisation. As phobias are in a different sub-topic area, no credit could be given for answers based entirely on phobias.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe the assumptions of the approach or model on which the suggested treatment in part (a) is based. There were some excellent answers here with many candidates understanding the assumptions of models on which treatments are based. As always there were a small number of candidates who confuse models and treatments and there was a small number who appeared not to know what a model of abnormality is.

Psychology and Organisations

No candidate answered questions from the Psychology and Organisations option.