

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/11
Core Studies 1

Key Messages

- Methodology underpins psychology. Candidates need a good grounding in methodological concepts to understand, describe, evaluate, discuss and apply the core studies effectively.
- Candidates need to practise applying the general issues and debates to each of the core studies.
- The central aspects of each core study (its background, aim, procedure, results and conclusions) need to be carefully learned.

General Comments

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as background, procedure, results and evaluation. In **Section A**, the candidates' knowledge of procedure (**5(a)**, **10(b)**), results/conclusions (**1(a)**, **1(b)**) and evaluation (**13(a)**, **13(b)**) was fairly good. Many candidates could improve by having a better general understanding of the background of studies (for example in response to **Question 3**), although in some cases this was good (e.g. **Question 10(a)**). Candidates would also benefit from a more effective grasp of methodology in psychology so that they can see how the study illustrates these principles, for example to be able to improve their answers to questions about experimental design (**Question 4(a)/(b)**) and controls (**Question 12**), although the understanding of methodology was good in some areas (e.g. **Question 13**) and the understanding of ethical implications was good (for example **Question 2(a)/(b)**). One very common error was to give the way in which results were collected (the procedure of the study or the operationalisation of the DV) rather than the actual results (the findings of the study) e.g. in **Question 15** or indeed, in other questions, the reverse (e.g. in **Question 6**).

Some candidates offered good responses to **Question 16** in **Section B**, writing essays that were relevant and focused on evaluation rather than description. However, many candidates could have improved their answers by illustrating their evaluative points with examples from the content of the chosen study. The answers to **Question 17** were not as good, candidates need to practise applying each of the debates and issues to each of the studies in order to prepare for any essay.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify one or both of the correct behaviours, although a few gave incorrect answers such as twitching or arm waving. Some candidates gave longer answers than were required for the command 'identify', which simply required the candidates to name the behaviours.
- (b) Some candidates answered this question well, typically with comments about the existence of some behaviours that were characteristic of lying, such as blinking less or pausing more. More informed candidates observed that although this was true, these were the only consistent behaviours, so it can be concluded that 'lying behaviour' in general does not exist, because there are so many individual differences. A small number of candidates used ideas of the Nixon effect or cognitive load to draw conclusions, but such answers were rare and more often references to cognitive load were irrelevant.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates gained full marks here, although many gave very lengthy answers which were not required by the command 'outline'. Typical responses included confidentiality, protection from harm, right to withdraw, informed consent and avoiding deception.
- (b) Although this question part was often answered well, many responses were not sufficiently detailed. Answers were not always applied to the study, as specified by the question, and could only gain limited credit. The strongest answers were given for the guidelines protection from harm, debriefing, deception and right to withdraw.

Question 3

Some candidates omitted this question altogether and few earned good marks. Candidates' responses tended to describe the procedure of Held and Hein's study rather than answering the question. It is important that candidates understand the background/context of the core studies, and this question focuses on this context, i.e. the possible ways to test the intended aim, as described by Held and Hein. In this case, such knowledge helps both to understand the purpose of the study and the method used.

Question 4

- (a) Those candidates who knew what an experimental design was, almost always knew what was meant by independent groups, albeit not very precisely. Few responses were able to demonstrate clear understanding of the concept of an experimental design. Very few were unable to give a clear description that successfully focused on the central idea that participants are used in only one level of the independent variable. There were some unclear answers referring to ideas such as participants doing only one 'thing' or 'part', which gained limited credit. This is crucial knowledge for understanding studies and students are disadvantaged if they do not have such basic knowledge. A common error in response to this question was to describe the experimental method in general, so candidates also need to be clear about the difference between a research method and an experimental design.
- (b) This question part was not well answered. Although some candidates were able to say that the design was used in order to compare autistic and non-autistic participants, few were able to say that this was essential (as participants could not be both AS/HFA and normal). Some candidates attempted to use the justification that it was independent groups because this reduces the risk of the effect of demand characteristics, which would be a possible answer in a general sense but was irrelevant here.

Question 5

- (a) Most candidates demonstrated some understanding of the concept of a 'dependent variable' although for others the concept was not clearly 'the factor which is measured'. Candidates offered a range of wrong answers, such as 'the experimenter', the rigged lots and the shock generator. Many answers gained limited credit, for responses where candidates just identified 'shocks' or 'obedience' but did not include any detail or operationalisation.
- (b) In order to answer this question correctly, candidates needed to comprehend the essential aspects of an experiment i.e. having one or more independent variable(s), dependent variable(s) and controls. The dependent variable was mentioned in part (a), and there were many controls in this study. What was missing was an independent variable – in the original experiment there were no comparison conditions. Very few candidates were able to explain this, most suggested instead that the study lacked ethics so did not earn credit because, whilst following ethical guidelines is important, it is not what makes a study an experiment or not.

Question 6

- (a) This question part was generally well answered, candidates were often able to give the correct information, although other irrelevant detail was also included (such as description of the overall method, or the results).
- (b) Although many candidates were able to answer this question well, many incorrectly gave responses about quantitative data, rather than qualitative data. This was sometimes the case even when the candidate had answered part (a) correctly. Candidates need to read the question carefully to avoid confusion.

Question 7

- (a) Many candidates were able to answer this question well, both describing the method accurately and referring appropriately to its use in this study. However, a common error was for candidates to suggest that an opportunity sample is selected 'randomly'.
- (b) This question part was well answered by some candidates. However, a common error, as above, was for candidates to suggest that the sample would be 'random'.

Question 8

This question part was not well answered. Some candidates were unable to identify two pieces of apparatus, giving incomplete responses. Many candidates were unable to explain why their chosen pieces of apparatus were used. Better answers typically described the Bobo doll, the toy gun or the one way mirror. Incorrect answers included reference to the adult model as a piece of apparatus or the room used. A small number of candidates suggested that the Bobo doll was used so that the children would not hurt each other, this is incorrect so could not be credited.

Question 9

- (a) Although many candidates were able to offer a simple answer, such as 'The thing that was measured', few were able to expand on this to add the general context i.e. that is the variable which changes as a result of the manipulation of the independent variable.
- (b) As this question part asked for an advantage in this study, the candidate was required to contextualise their answer to the Langlois et al. study. Although many candidates were able to offer a generic advantage of observations, answers were often given without a link to the study, so could only earn limited credit. Some candidates gave circular answers suggesting that observations enabled the researchers to test the aim – this is the purpose of the study rather than an advantage of using observations as a measure of the dependent variable.

Question 10

- (a) Many candidates gained full marks here. However, some candidates were able to demonstrate appropriate knowledge, but only described either the 'developmental' aspect, i.e. changes with age, or the 'morality' aspect, i.e. an understanding of right and wrong. A minority of candidates reworded the question to give the response that it was the development of morality, which did not demonstrate understanding of the terms, and could not be credited.
- (b) Candidates often earned limited mark in this question part. They typically explained either how 'morality' was measured (the scenarios) or explained how the 'developmental' aspect was manipulated, i.e. the different age groups. Few answers mentioned both of these.

Question 11

- (a) There were very few relevant answers here, few answers referenced the 'pre-test' or pilot study which was used to assign values to the items on the activity scale.
- (b) Responses in (b) of this question were generally weak. Responses given were often incorrect or listed the 'fake' symptoms that were told to some participants.

Question 12

There were many irrelevant responses to this question. Those candidates who gained credit were typically able to identify that participants were asked to consume 'no alcohol and no caffeine', although few were able to describe why these controls were necessary. Another fairly common answer was that participants were all woken with the same loud bell, and here more candidates were able to say that this was so that they woke up quickly (and therefore were less likely to forget their dreams).

Question 13

- (a) Very few candidates were able to give a detailed answer. Most responses earned some credit for answers about ecological validity being a test that was 'like real life', but could have been improved by being more specific and identifying that the findings are generalisable beyond the situation tested. A small but significant minority mistakenly described ecological validity as conducting studies in the 'real world'.
- (b) This question part was answered a little better than **part (a)**, with candidates often recognising that for taxi drivers, a test which required them to think about familiar routes would be ecologically valid. However, even such answers often did not elaborate this, for example to say that this was important because this is what taxi drivers do every day. There were also a significant proportion of candidates who believed that the study itself was conducted in the 'real world', which could not be credited.

Question 14

- (a) In this question part, candidates tended to respond with the results or overall conclusions from the study itself, rather than commenting specifically on the pleasantness rating of the smells as asked, so scored zero. Nevertheless, when candidates did respond correctly, their answers were typically good.
- (b) Most answers for **part (b)** were also limited, with many candidates referring to the general aim, such as 'so that the experimenters could see if they affected how we judged faces'. However, where responses answered the question asked candidates did appear to understand important concepts such as extraneous variables.

Question 15

Many candidates did not answer the question asked. Responses often described how the data was collected e.g. 'the number of times that doctors stopped and talked' rather than giving the results themselves 'doctors rarely stopped to talk to patients'. It is important that candidates distinguish between questions asking for results (the findings of the study) and those asking about the way in which those results were collected (the procedure of the study or the operationalisation of the DV).

Question 16

This question gave candidates scope to offer comparisons between the methods, as well as the relative strengths and weaknesses of snapshot and longitudinal research. However, despite a wide range of possible material to include, many candidates gave very limited answers. Better responses were those where candidates structured their answers well, for example giving a strength of one method and then the reverse for the other – as a comparison. Essays which simply gave descriptions of each approach with a limited amount of evaluation included did not score well. There was some confusion about snapshot studies, with a range of errors relating to the data collected or the way this was done, for example suggesting that Freud gained snapshot data by following little Hans around without him knowing. Freud and Thigpen and Cleckley were the most popular studies with both offering some good answers.

Question 17

This question was not answered well by most candidates. There was confusion between the individual differences approach and independent measures design in some answers and between the individual differences approach and individual (versus situational) explanations in others. Many answers attempted to describe the individual differences identified in the studies but not the strengths and weaknesses of the approach. All three studies offered possible evaluation points, and all three were used by candidates, but there were limited strong answers to this question.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/12
Core Studies 1

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth two 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 10 marks should be correspondingly longer. **Section B** questions are not short-answer.
- For a **Section A** 2-mark answer that has the command 'describe', candidates should ensure they provide enough detail to score both marks, rather than provide a partial, very brief or vague answer.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question, **(a)** and **(b)**, in **Section A** before beginning to write an answer to ensure that the answers to both question parts are not the same.
- Where a question states 'in this study' candidates must relate what they write to the study in question, i.e. give an example from the study.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.
- The writing of some candidates is difficult to read and all candidates are encouraged to write legibly. Candidates are reminded that writing in ink that leaks through to the opposite side of the paper also makes what is written difficult to read.
- It is helpful to Examiners if candidates answer questions in the order in which they are presented on the question paper, although **Section B** could be done before **Section A**.

General comments

A number of candidates wrote answers showing extensive knowledge and understanding and evidence of hard work. However there were many candidates who gained limited marks and could have improved with improved examination technique.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a)** Mann et al. knew that the suspects were telling the truth or lying because: (i) the suspect initially denied involvement and then confessed because forensic evidence became available; (ii) substantial, reliable and independent witness statements corroborating the truth or lie was available. Candidates scored one mark if they wrote "the suspect later confessed" and candidates scored two marks if they wrote about a confession and gave a reason for the confession (as outlined above). In all answers, elaboration either to give more detail or to show understanding will help candidates to achieve full, rather than partial, marks.
- (b)** Many candidates could not provide responses to this question part. Specific examples are included in the core study, for example, "Suspect 8: lies included denial of being in the house all day". A number of candidates gave alternative examples of truths and lies and these received credit if it was explicitly stated that the example was a truth or lie. For example, because the suspects were known to the police, it was a truth if the suspect stated their name and age and it was a lie if the suspect paused for longer or blinked less.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates scored full marks in response to this question when making the distinction that the active kittens were more likely to cross to the shallow than the deep side whereas the passive kittens did not distinguish between the two sides. A small number of candidates provided numbers to support their answer (active kittens made 12 crossings to the shallow side; passive kittens making errors 6/6 and 8/4 shallow/deep) but in this instance full marks were awarded for stating the difference between the active and passive kittens without supporting data.
- (b) Marks could be awarded for explaining why the visual cliff test was valid (e.g. it mimics a real situation that kittens encounter, like stairs), or for explaining why it was not valid (e.g. because the kittens were put on a bridge rather than getting themselves there).

Question 3

- (a) In response to this question, candidates could describe one of three different sampling methods/techniques which were volunteer/self-selected sample, random sample and opportunity sample. Credit was also given for a description of how the sample was gathered, such as for the volunteer sample participation was requested by newspaper advertisement. Many candidates scored limited credit by identifying the technique without description, although significant numbers scored full marks.
- (b) This question part required one advantage of the sampling method described in **part (a)**. One advantage of a volunteer sample is that it is easier than opportunity sampling as participants come forward themselves; e.g. in this case replied to adverts; an advantage of an opportunity sample is that participants can be easily obtained as they are chosen on basis of availability so are close at hand; e.g. in this case local adults or students. Reference did not need to be made to the study for full marks to be awarded in this case, although most candidates did relate the answer to the core study.

Question 4

- (a) Nearly all candidates were able to gain full credit for this question.
- (b) Candidates needed to address 'in this study' in the question by relating the answer to the study in order to gain full credit. Most candidates were able to score limited credit when stating that an advantage is that it can provide information about mood, or feelings, etc., but need to link this detail to the prisoners or the guards of the study.

Question 5

- (a) Some candidates scored limited credit for identifying a control with no elaboration; responses would be improved by providing further detail. Candidates are advised to provide some elaboration that allows them to score full marks rather than providing a brief or basic sentence for questions requiring a description. Many candidates confused what was manipulated (the independent variables) and what was controlled. The variables that were manipulated were the 'ill and drunk' and the 'black and white' participants, which could not be credited.
- (b) Some candidates provided reasons for conducting the study, rather than reasons for controlling extraneous variables. Controls attempt to reduce extraneous variables so, for example, ensuring that the victims all appeared the same (dressed in an Eisenhower jacket) meant that helping or not wasn't due to what the victims were wearing. Similarly, the victim had to do the same thing as a drunk or ill person (falling over after 70 seconds), otherwise helping differences could have been due to different behaviour.

Question 6

- (a) Some candidates were not able to demonstrate knowledge of a repeated measures design. Common errors were that it is where the experiment itself is repeated, or the same procedure is repeated. It is not where a participant performs in one or more than one condition; participants perform in all conditions.
- (b) Tajfel used a repeated measures design to overcome any individual differences between participants. For example, if participants in one group happened to be more or less generous than those in another group then this would confound the result. To avoid this the same participant is used in both conditions. Whilst some candidates understood this and scored full marks, most did not. Many candidates simply stated “to reduce individual differences” which was correct, but more detail was required to score full credit. Many candidates were unable to give a creditable response to this question.

Question 7

- (a), (b) Nearly all candidates gained some credit in response to these questions and most of those who provided additional details gained full credit. Any appropriate advantage received credit.

Question 8

- (a) The command ‘Describe’ requires more detail than a simple identification. Some responses were limited, e.g. ‘projector and slides’, and gained limited credit. In order to score full marks candidates needed to provide description. Many candidates were able to briefly describe two pieces of apparatus and scored full credit.
- (b) Most candidates were able to describe one finding from the study, most stating simply that babies preferred attractive faces. Some candidates were able to extend their response by quoting data from the study, such as the mean fixation times, other candidates were able to extend their response by referring to details of study 1, 2 or 3, where attractiveness was preferred irrespective of race, gender or age.

Question 9

Some candidates confused variables that are manipulated and variables that are controlled (see **Question 5**). The purpose of a control is to keep conditions the same in all respects while varying/manipulating the IV. Many candidates identified the four manipulated conditions (EPI INF, etc.), which did not answer the question set. Other candidates provided correct answers and commonly referred to the scripted actions of the stooge, for example the sequence of events, such as playing basketball, in the euphoria condition. Another control was the items that were in each room, such as the paper, pencils, etc. Another possibility was the misinformation given to the participant in the EPI MIS condition: they were always told that the numbness/itching/side effects would last for 15–20 minutes.

Question 10

- (a) Most candidates were able to describe a case study as a study of only one individual (or one ‘instance’ such as a family, company; a ‘unit’). Additional detail for full credit could be provided by writing that the ‘unit’ is usually studied in-depth, that it ‘uses a variety of methods to collect data’ or that it allows the researcher ‘to study complex relationships’. These are features of all case studies; sometimes a ‘unit’ may be studied over a long period of time, but this depends on the specific study (such as that of little Hans or Eve) and in most cases the study is conducted in quite a short period of time. This means that no credit was given for ‘studied over a long period of time’ as a core component of a case study.
- (b) The most common weakness was that answers were too vague, e.g. ‘sleep and dreaming can be studied in depth’, which required further elaboration. Candidates needed to respond to all components of any question and provide sufficient detail. For example, a researcher can gain detailed information about complex interactions such as any relationship between dreams and past experience; a researcher can study one person and as sleep is a biological process, it is similar in all people; so to an extent it is possible to generalise from one case to others.

Question 11

- (a) Candidates could be grouped into three types: (i) those who could not describe a similarity between the two tasks (and so scored no marks); (ii) candidates who stated that both the tasks were sequential, but often could not elaborate further and (iii) candidates who wrote about the sequential nature of the tasks and elaborated, or candidates who provided a second similarity such as the participants being familiar with both the routes and the film plots task. A small number made the error that 'sequential' was the same as 'non-topographical'.
- (b) Most candidates mentioned the hippocampus or right hippocampus in their answer for limited credit, but very few were able to provide any further description. One way to elaborate was to distinguish between the hippocampus which is involved in processing spatial layouts and the right hippocampus which is for navigation in large scale environments.

Question 12

- (a) Most candidates were able to score limited credit for stating a brief or muddled aim. Fewer candidates were able to gain full marks for stating the aim clearly, which meant inclusion of the different 'hedonic' values Demattè et al. referred to.
- (b) Some candidates were able to express that the findings of the study did support the aim, for limited credit. For full marks a statement about why the results supported the aims was needed. The simple answer was because low hedonic value/unpleasantness of a smell (i.e. body odour and rubber) reduced perceived attractiveness, and that male fragrance and geranium increased it.

Question 13

- (a) Most candidates scored full marks when describing the observations made by the pseudo-patients and the taking of notes on what they saw. A small number of candidates suggested how *quantitative* data was gathered, which could not be credited.
- (b) A number of appropriate findings were described, where staff interpreted the pseudo-patients' behaviour as abnormal, which included: queuing early for food was described as oral-acquisitive behaviour (rather than boredom); note-taking as engaging in writing behaviour (symptom of forgetting/of schizophrenia rather than recording events); walking corridors as nervous behaviour (rather than boredom). Many other answers were possible and creditable. Most candidates correctly focused on qualitative data, but a small number of candidates referred to *quantitative* data, which could not be credited.

Question 14

- (a) Common errors were to write in general terms about empathising and systemising; or to state that the embedded figures test measures 'science' and 'humanities' students. A few candidates suggested that it measures 'reading the mind in the eyes'.
- (b) Most candidates could answer this correctly, and many candidates provided more information than was needed for full marks.

Question 15

- (a) This question required candidates to describe the results (rather than findings or conclusions). Candidates could provide a general description for limited credit, e.g. "the BDD patients were more distressed than the control patients" and the stronger response included figures to support their answer, BDD = 6.44 and controls 1.6 (and scored two marks). Some candidates confused the responses for part (a) and part (b), and should be reminded to read the whole question before responding.
- (b) Candidates could provide two types of answer: to describe the results comparing BDD patients with the controls, and include the numbers (distress ratings of 7.63 and 2.4); or describe the results comparing distress after a long session for BDD patients (7.63) with distress before a long session (6.44) showing that those with BDD experienced more distress after a long session than before it.

Question 16

A small number of candidates did not answer the question set, and simply gave a description of one of the studies, which could not be credited. Some candidates wrote about all three named studies which resulted in the best answer being credited and the other two not, and this usually ended with a very low mark being achieved. The optimal strategy to score full marks is to provide two strengths/advantages and two weaknesses/disadvantages, each of which is supported with an example from the named study. All these must be focused on the issue identified in the question, in this instance on quantitative data, rather than general points about the named study. Typical strengths covered included the collection of objective data and the ability to statistically analyse and compare the data. Weaknesses covered often included the lack of qualitative data (although the more able candidates countered this with a comment that in some studies (such as that by Milgram) qualitative data supported the quantitative data).

Question 17

As in Question 16, a small number of candidates did not answer the question set, and simply gave a description of one of the studies, and some candidates incorrectly wrote about all three named studies instead of selecting one. The comments made above in relation to the optimal strategy for achieving top marks also apply to this question. A few candidates considered only strengths or only weaknesses, for limited credit. Many answers covered the strengths and weaknesses of the named study in general, and needed to cover the strengths and weaknesses of using children in psychological research, supported by examples from the named study. A weakness covered, that was common to all answers, was to consider ethical issues and candidates are reminded that it is ethical for an adult such as a teacher to provide consent for a child rather than assuming that any research with children is automatically unethical. Some strengths/weaknesses only apply to specific studies. For example, children might have a poor understanding of language and this is why Nelson used pictures in her study. The long term potentially negative effects of participating in psychological research would apply to the Bandura et al. study (exposure to aggressive models) but not to the Nelson or Tajfel studies.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/13
Core Studies 1

Key messages

- Methodology underpins psychology. Candidates need a good grounding in methodological concepts to understand, describe, evaluate, discuss and apply the core studies effectively.
- Candidates need to practise applying the general issues and debates to each of the core studies.
- The central aspects of each core study (its background, aim, procedure, results and conclusions) need to be carefully learned.

General comments

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as background, procedure, results and evaluation. In **Section A**, the candidates' knowledge of procedure (e.g. **3(a)(b)**, **7(a)**, **8(a)** and **9(a)(b)**), results (e.g. **1(a)(b)**), and evaluation (e.g. **7(b)** and **8(b)**) was good. However, many candidates could improve by having a better general understanding of the findings of studies (for example in responses to **Questions 5** and **14**), although in some cases this was good (e.g. **Questions 4** and **10**). To improve performance still further, candidates would benefit from a more effective grasp of methodology in psychology so that they can see how the study illustrates these principles, for example to be able to improve their answers to **Questions 2(a)**, **11(b)**, **12** and **14** although the understanding of methodology was good in some areas (e.g. **Questions 11(a)** and **7(b)**) and the understanding of ethical implications was generally good (for example **Question 6(a)(b)**).

One common confusion was between a 'control', that is, a means to limit the effect of extraneous differences on the independent variable, and a 'control condition', that is a level of the independent variable from which the active IV is absent. Another point of confusion for some candidates was the difference between features of a particular experiment (e.g. one of the core studies) and features of experiments in general. In some cases the ability to relate knowledge of the study to an answer was very good indeed (for example in **Question 6(a)**), but in other areas it was not so evident (for example in order to answer **Question 2b**).

Many candidates offered good responses in **Section B**, writing essays that were relevant and focused on evaluation rather than description. Many candidates could, however, improve their answers by supporting their evaluative points with examples from the content of the chosen study.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) This question part was well answered, with many candidates gaining full marks. Common correct answers were gaze aversion and hand/arm movements. A small number of candidates appear to have misread the question and offered instead examples of behaviours which *did* show a difference, so could not earn credit.
- (b) This question part was quite well answered, although some candidates who had given correct answers in **part (a)** went on to suggest that even though these behaviours showed no consistently different cues, they could be used to detect lying. In contrast, better answers made generalisations about there being no specific set of behaviours to indicate lying. To gain full marks, such answers could have explained that this was (in part) due to the range of individual differences.

Question 2

- (a) Although some candidates scored full marks, answers which described parts of the procedure were common, and could not be credited. Many candidates were unable to state clearly key elements of the research method, such as that an experiment is a study with a manipulated IV, a measured DV and controls which looks for cause and effect relationships.
- (b) This question part was not well answered, although many candidates were able to give simple, generic answers. To improve their responses, candidates need solid underpinning knowledge for **part (a)** and then need to be able to apply this to the specific study - in this case Held and Hein – to earn full marks in **part (b)**.

Question 3

- (a) Answers to this question were variable, with many candidates earning credit. However, many responses showed confusion between a 'control used in the study', i.e. a way to limit extraneous differences between levels of the IV, and a 'control condition' such as in this case the student or adult groups. The latter did not answer the question, so earned no credit.
- (b) Those candidates who correctly identified a control in **part (a)** were also generally able to answer **part (b)** effectively. The strongest responses were those relating to the glossary.

Question 4

- (a) Most candidates were able to gain full marks on this question. However, those who did not tended to give insufficiently detailed answers, such as 'All the participants went to 300'. A small number of candidates misquoted the figures, e.g. saying that all the participants went to the highest voltage and a small minority described a *qualitative* finding.
- (b) Many candidates were also able to gain full credit here, and most gained at least some credit, although the answers were not quite as good as in **part (a)**. Where candidates did not score full marks, this was often because they described two different qualitative findings, rather than one in detail. For example, 'smiling and laughing' gained limited credit, whereas 'smiling because they were embarrassed' or 'laughing even though they did not think it was funny' gained full credit, because these offer some detail, in keeping with the nature of qualitative data.

Question 5

This question was quite poorly answered, with candidates apparently guessing at how the participants (prisoners) might have felt rather than describing how the study reports their responses. There was a range of detail that the candidates could have offered, such as that some prisoners said yes even though that meant forfeiting the money they had gained, and that this had been their original motivation to enter into the study. Many candidates attempted to link their answer to the idea of pathological prisoner syndrome, but few were able to say that this was why they responded by returning quietly to their cells when told that their parole would have to be discussed.

Question 6

- (a) This question part was very well answered with most candidates gaining full marks. The most common responses were (avoiding) deception, protection from harm, right to withdraw and informed consent. Some candidates wrote more than was required for this question, as they applied their answer to the study (which was required in **part (b)** but not here).
- (b) This question part was also quite well answered, with most candidates gaining at least some credit. There were relatively few answers which offered ways in which a guideline was 'followed' in the study, although occasional good answers did this, e.g. there was unlikely to be lasting harm from seeing someone fall and be helped and get up as it happens all the time. In contrast, there were various good applications of ways in which a guideline was 'not followed' in the study. For example, candidates suggested there was no debrief so the participants could not be returned to an unworried state; they could still have wondered if the person who had collapsed was okay or felt guilty for not helping.

Question 7

- (a) Most candidates earned at least one mark in this question part, making some attempt to describe the numbers in the columns and rows in the matrices. Fewer were able to say that the matrices differed in order to explore the different relationships (MIP/MJP/MD).
- (b) Most candidates were able to gain full marks here. As the question did not require contextualisation to the study, full marks could be gained for including detail that was either general, such as it is 'objective, as numbers do not need to be interpreted' or applied to the study, such as 'objective, for example the grids indicate the participants' choices of maximum joint profit or maximum difference'.

Question 8

- (a) This question part was well answered, with most candidates gaining full marks. Most candidates gained marks for comments about letters from Hans's father to Freud, fewer candidates noted that there were also letters from Freud suggesting details for further questions.
- (b) This question part was also quite well answered, with answers typically focusing on the level of detail obtained. Stronger responses, however, often explored ideas such as Hans knowing his father well, and therefore saying more to him as he would be trusted, so were able to offer detail and gain full marks.

Question 9

- (a) This question part was very well answered with a large majority of candidates earning full marks. Where this was not the case, candidates simply described what they could see in the figure, possibly guessing rather than using knowledge of the study itself.
- (b) This question part was also quite well answered, with most candidates stating that in this condition the thought bubble was missing. Better answers typically went on to say that the motive had, therefore, to be judged by the boy's facial expression.

Question 10

- (a) This question part was very well answered, with most candidates earning full marks. However, a significant minority of candidates believed that there was a difference in the amount or rapidity of eye movements between the two dreams, or that one had random eye movements and the other did not. This was not the case as both dreams were active. The only dreams with few eye movements were those that were passive, e.g. looking at someone standing still or where the dreamer was 'looking into the distance'. Neither is the case in these examples.
- (b) This question part was also well answered. Candidates who earned full marks in **part (a)**, did not necessarily earn full marks in **part (b)**. This was largely because they did not extend their explanation in a general way, e.g. to include the idea that eye movements are related to dream content.

Question 11

- (a) This question part was well answered, with most candidates earning full marks and many earning at least one mark. The latter group tended to only name the type of scan used whereas full mark answers included a small amount of accurate information about the scanner, such as that PET scanners use radioactivity to detect brain activity. A minority of candidates mistakenly described the EEG, which could not be credited.
- (b) This question part was not quite so well answered as **part (a)**. The most effective answers suggested that the measures taken by brain scanners are objective/do not need interpretation so are likely to be consistent in their recording.

Question 12

Although many candidates were able to give one detailed way in which the study had high ecological validity (typically that the environment was a genuine mental hospital, which was then elaborated, e.g. with the idea that it was staffed with genuine nurses and doctors), few were able to present two elaborated ways. Stronger answers made separate, specific points, such as that they were genuine mental hospitals, which was then elaborated, e.g. with the idea that they represented all different kinds (private/public, etc.) or that the pseudopatients themselves would then be influenced by the same factors affecting real patients and then an additional point about the genuine doctors and nurses, such as that they were unaware of the study so would have been acting normally.

Question 13

This question was not very well answered. Credit was typically gained for the idea that Thigpen and Cleckley concluded that the concept of multiple personalities was real, and this was sometimes supported with the way in which Eve's different personalities could be identified. A second conclusion was less often presented, although some attempts were made, for example with ideas such as the personalities being either aware or unaware of each other, which could be illustrated with Eve Black and Eve White.

Question 14

- (a) This question was not well answered. A common error was to say that all self-report data are automatically qualitative. This is not the case in this particular study, so this point could not be credited. Candidates rarely offered generic answers, which could have earned limited credit, and where they did, these tended to be incorrect.
- (b) This question part produced slightly better answers than **part (a)**, but these could still have been improved. Most candidates gained limited credit, for example identifying self-reports as being subjective or that they may lead to lying. Candidates were typically unable to make the link to how these points might have been problematic in this study.

Question 15

- (a) The strongest responses gained full marks for correct yet simple answers identifying the use of a questionnaire asking what different objects the participants used as mirrors.
- (b) The stronger responses were able to state that BDD participants were more likely to use non-mirrors, and strongest answers suggested examples.

Question 16

This question was fairly well answered, with many candidates gaining over half marks and some producing excellent answers. Each of the three studies was used effectively by some candidates. Many of the best responses to this question included simple observations that answered the question effectively, such as:

Loftus and Pickrell:

- The time between interviews/the way the interviews were conducted (face to face or by telephone) differed between participants, which could have reduced reliability.

Nelson:

- It was not valid because there were no girls throwing the ball or girls being hit by the ball, so the findings might only apply to boys.

Schachter and Singer:

- It would not have been valid if the throwing of paper balls had annoyed the participant rather than them finding it amusing.
- Low ecological validity as it is not usual to be injected, even in the context of an experiment.

Question 17

This question was also fairly well answered, not quite so well as **Question 16**, but there were some excellent answers. Although a few candidates misunderstood the question and simply discussed humans, or animals, the majority tackled the question very well. Again each of the three studies was used effectively by some candidates although the most frequent choice was Demattè et al., which was tackled very successfully, with points similar to those on the markscheme. As with **Question 16**, some of the best responses included simple observations that answered the question effectively, such as discussing:

Bandura:

- The role of basic, deterministic causes for aggression can be investigated in animals – which may be helpful in trying to control aggression in humans.
- The role of smell in aggression/play for animals.
- That the success of the study would depend on the species chosen – lions are more aggressive than rabbits.
- That you cannot get any information about why animals behave in a particular way, whereas in children you could record their comments, e.g. 'it's not for a lady to behave that way'/animals are unable to give justifications for their aggression.
- Animals cannot do 'gun play'.
- There are differences in aggression itself between animals and humans.
- It would be impossible to study the effects of verbal aggression.

Langlois:

- The same methodological procedures, e.g. buzzer, measuring fixation time could all be used.
- The age ranges to use would be difficult to decide.
- It would be hard to compare vision of animals compared to humans.
- It would be difficult to control animals for hair length, facial expression and pose.

General:

- There are safety issues using aggressive animals
- The difficulty of controlling animals/standardising procedures
- The relevance of generalisations.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/21
Core Studies 2

Key messages

Section A

Question 1

Some candidates were unable to give a detailed definition of the participant observation as a research method in **part (a)**. Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in **part (b)** and give clear details of the procedure followed. In addition, candidates need to be aware of the features of each method as many gave a description of a study with a large sample size which is not a case study. Extended evaluative points that make direct reference to the alternative idea are necessary in **part (c)** to achieve full marks.

Question 2

It is important that candidates practice writing these types of questions. Some did not structure their responses appropriately and could not achieve full marks. For example, if the question asks for strengths and weaknesses then four points must be made (two strengths and two weaknesses). In addition, candidates need to be able to address any evaluation issue that is given in the syllabus. Many did not know what was meant by reliability in their responses to **part (d)**. Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

Section B

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

General comments

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

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

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

Section A requires candidates to have a firm understanding of the entire syllabus as there is no choice of question offered. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in the **part (c)** of their **Section B** essays to achieve higher marks. **Question 4** was the more popular choice of question.

Individual questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates could achieve some marks for this question by giving a brief definition of a participant observation and some details of how it was used in the Rosenhan study. Many achieved a mark purely for describing how the data was collected. Very few candidates were able to give any detail of how the participant observation was used in the study.
- (b) Many candidates were able to describe a procedure that did use a case study method and was measuring diagnosis in mental health. Some candidates 'mirrored' ideas from the original study ensuring that the 'how' and 'what' elements of the procedure were covered and often included details of sample. Many candidates did not describe a case study method as they described studies that had large samples of participants and consequently only gained partial credit.

Popular ideas included doing the study with a psychiatrist or nurse and observing them interacting with or diagnosing patients. Some candidates gave unclear responses and instead needed to specify the 'what' and 'how' of the procedure.

A small minority of candidates evaluated their idea in this question and received no credit for this as this is the correct response to **Question 1 part (c)**.

- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points. Most gave both methodological and ethical issues in their response.

Many discussed issues about the ecological validity of their study, practical issues with access to patients and hospitals, lack of generalisability of the small sample group and ethical issues that may be caused by the length and complexity of their study. Most candidates also contextualised their responses, referring directly to their original idea, which has improved compared to previous sessions.

A few gave well developed points that achieved very high marks as they referred directly to their alternative idea. Some continued to only briefly identify issues and did not refer back to the context of their own study.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates achieved full marks for their answer to this question. They referred to the aspects of biology that the physiological approach might investigate and also the assumption that it is our biology that is influencing our behaviour. Candidates who achieved one mark for this question purely focused on the biology that is investigated and did not link this to behaviour.
- (b) Many candidates received marks for this question by identifying that smell was a physiological factor affecting the psychological phenomenon of attraction. It was rare for candidates to then contextualise this further to gain the third available mark.
- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved some marks in this section. Most were able to describe one strength and one weakness of the physiological approach and were able to give an example from Demattè et al. Many referred to controls and the scientific equipment used for the strengths. For the weaknesses, many referred to the lack of ecological validity in physiological approach studies.

There are still many candidates not attempting the 'plural nature' of these types of questions to gain the seven plus marks available. Candidates need to describe two strengths and two weaknesses to achieve the higher marks. Many did attempt to do this but found it difficult to describe an appropriate second weakness (e.g. reductionism and validity).

- (d) Some candidates did answer appropriately for this question and identified points about the extent to which the Demattè et al. study is reliable. These candidates identified the various controls used in the study and linked these to reliability. A minority of candidates were able to extend their answers to include more than one relevant point and many gave general evaluation points that were not only focussed on reliability (such as the lack of generalisability of the study).

Section B

Question 3

- (a) The vast majority of candidates did achieve at least one mark for this question and were aware that a snapshot study requires a short time frame. Many achieved full marks and this was often done by giving a specific example of the time frame (e.g. a few minutes).
- (b) Candidates did achieve at least one mark per study and many attempted to answer the question and wrote about how the data were collected in each study. Some just described the procedure and did get some marks for this description.

Candidates could generally describe the EQ and SQ scales used in the Billington et al. study and many could give one or more of the other measures taken such as the eyes test or the FC-EFT. Most described the waking of the participants in the Dement and Kleitman study and how they were asked to describe their dreams. Some also discussed the EEG and EOG readings as well as the direction of eye movement and length of dreams measured in this study. Finally, for the Veale and Riley study, candidates were often able to give some of the specific aspects of mirror gazing that were investigated such as length of time staring into the mirror and different surfaces used for mirror gazing. Many incorrectly believed that Veale and Riley did an observation but all of the data was collected via self-report.

- (c) Many candidates could identify two or three advantages of carrying out snapshot studies but rarely gave any evidence to back up their points. The most popular advantages included speed of the study, low cost of snapshot, lack of attrition and less bias due to the researcher not building up a close relationship with the participant. Candidates often did not give evidence to support their advantages and if they did they were often very brief or evidence was only given for one of the advantages rather than all three.

Question 4

- (a) There were many good responses to this question and many candidates achieved full marks by identifying two ethical guidelines. These included informed consent, right to withdrawal, debrief and protection of participants.
- (b) Candidates achieved well on this question and were able to describe how one ethical guideline was followed in the three studies. Haney, Banks and Zimbardo was well answered with most candidates focusing on either the informed consent taken at the start of the study or gave details of the debrief of the participants at the end of the study. Thigpen and Cleckley was also fairly well answered and again most focused on the informed consent taken although some gave some good responses considering whether psychological harm had occurred in the study. These responses tended to be brief so often did not achieve full marks. Piliavin et al. was not responded to quite as well and some candidates claimed that a debrief occurred in the study, which was incorrect.
- (c) For this question, candidates need to identify and discuss problems psychologists have when they try to follow to ethical guidelines. Many were able to describe one or two problems such as the lack of ecological validity or the potential for demand characteristics if consent is given. Unfortunately, many did not link their responses to examples from a study and achieved fewer marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22
Core Studies 2

Key messages

Section A

Question 1

Candidates should be aware of the requirements of each question in the exam. For example, if asked to describe they should not include evaluative comments. A few found it difficult to just focus on describing what is meant by the snapshot method and how it was used in the Nelson study and instead gave a number of evaluative points in **part (a)**. Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in **part (b)** and give clear details of the procedure followed. 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 all candidates practice writing their responses to these types of questions. Some did not structure their responses appropriately and could not achieve full marks, although the number doing this has decreased from previous sessions. For example, if the question asks for strengths and weaknesses then four points must be made (two strengths and two weaknesses). In addition, candidates need to be able to address any evaluation issue that is given in the syllabus. A minority did not know what was meant by generalisations in their responses to **parts (a), (b) and (c)**. Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

Section B

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

General comments

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

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

A minority of candidates answered both questions in **Section B** and this had increased from previous sessions. When a candidate did this they were awarded the mark for the best of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually produced weak responses.

Candidates need to have a firm understanding of the entire syllabus so that they can respond to the questions in **Section A** where there is no choice of question. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in the **part (c)** of their **Section B** essays to achieve higher marks. **Question 4** was the more popular choice of question.

Individual questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates were able to achieve some marks on this question. Most candidates could identify the short nature of the snapshot method and give some indication of how it was used in the Nelson study. Some candidates believed that snapshot meant using photographs in a study. A number of candidates included strengths and weaknesses of the snapshot method which was not creditable as this was not a requirement of the question.
- (b) Most candidates were able to describe a procedure that investigated moral reasoning using the longitudinal method. Popular ideas included doing a study very similar to the original but over a long period of time. Some candidates had very creative ideas that included stooges and case studies to assess moral reasoning. The more 'simple' studies worked the best with a straightforward approach to how, what, who and where.

Compared to previous sessions there were a number of fully replicable procedures with all details given. However, for many this was not the case with candidates not referring to the sampling method. Some candidates did not give any indication of the stories told to the participants, nor the way in which the data would be collected (e.g. via a rating scale).

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question, although this was rare compared to previous sessions, and received no credit for this as this is the correct response to **Question 1 part (c)**.

- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points.

Many discussed issues about the generalisability of the sample, the problems of using children in studies in terms of access, fussiness and also meeting ethical guidelines and many addressed the issues surrounding doing longitudinal research.

Many candidates gave well developed points that achieved very high marks as they referred directly to their alternative idea. Some candidates only briefly identified issues and did not refer back to the context of their own study.

Question 2

- (a) Many candidates achieved at least one mark for their response by stating that generalisations involve applying the results of the study to other people and/or other situations. Many did give a full definition and achieved two marks.
- (b) A number of candidates achieved marks for this question by stating a generalisation from the Milgram study. Most described how obedience is due to the presence of an authority figure and a few candidates gave some evidence from the study to back up this generalisation. Many, however, misunderstood this question and instead described how Milgram's study was high in generalisability rather than stating a specific generalisation that could be made from the study.
- (c) The vast majority of candidates did achieve some marks in this section. Most were able to describe one strength and one weakness of making generalisations from the Milgram study. Many referred to the realistic nature of the study and either its usefulness or the fact that the study offers an explanation of obedience. Some candidates did give quite detailed examples. Common ideas for weaknesses included ethnocentric/androcentric sample and the unrealistic nature of many aspects of the Milgram study.

Many candidates did not attempt the 'plural nature' of these types of questions to gain the seven plus marks available. Candidates need to describe two strengths and two weaknesses to achieve the higher marks. Many did attempt to do this, but found it difficult to describe an appropriate second strength or a second weakness. A number of candidates attempted to argue points about the sample more than once but this was only credited as one evaluative point.

- (d) Some candidates answered appropriately for this question and identified points about the extent to which the Milgram study could be applied to everyday life. Common points included linking the extent the study can be applied to everyday life to ecological validity, sample size and demand characteristics.

A significant number of candidates described how the findings of the study are useful and did not attempt a discussion of its application to everyday life with regards to the Milgram study. These candidates gained limited credit.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) Many candidates achieved at least one mark for this question by referring to thinking or thinking processes. A significant number also achieved the second mark by referring to examples of the processes that cognitive psychology investigates such as memory, perception and language.
- (b) Candidates responded well to this question, although many found it difficult to achieve full marks for each of the named studies. Many could give general descriptions of how the cognitive processes were investigated in each of the studies.

Held and Hein was answered the best and many received two or three marks for their description with reference to the visual cliff, paw placement and blink response to an approaching object. For Baron-Cohen et al. the candidates could often name the eyes test and some gave details of this test. A minority of candidates described some of the other ways that cognitive processes were measured in the study such as the AQ test and gender recognition task. Finally, for the Loftus and Pickrell study a number of candidates just described the general procedure of the study and obtained one mark. A few were able to say how the cognitive process of false memory was investigated by asking the participants to recall the events and give a confidence and clarity rating.

- (c) Most candidates could describe two if not three problems faced by psychologists when they investigate cognitive processes. Common issues raised included ethics, difficulty with measuring cognitive processes, ecological validity and generalisability. The candidates often linked at least one of these problems to a piece of evidence but it was noticeable that if the candidate did this for the first problem they would then not link the second and third problem to evidence and therefore achieved lower marks.

Question 4

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to explain what is meant by ecological validity and many gave a detailed definition that achieved full marks.
- (b) Candidates gave very detailed responses for this part of the question but often described the procedures of the studies rather than focusing on discussing how each study had high ecological validity. The best responses described the ecological validity of the Piliavin et al. study and mentioned the realistic nature of the setting (on the subway train). A few even mentioned the realistic actions of the stooges and how seeing someone fall over was an everyday occurrence. The candidates found it difficult to achieve beyond one mark for both the Freud and the Rosenhan study as they found it difficult to explain how both of these studies had high ecological validity. Many candidates just referred to it being in a 'real' hospital or a 'real' home. A few candidates did achieve more marks for both of these studies by going into depth about exactly what was realistic in each of these studies (e.g. receiving medication just like a normal patient or talking about your daydreams with your father).
- (c) For this question most candidates identified a number of problems and some of these were appropriate to the question on the problems psychologists have when they try to make their studies ecologically valid. A significant number of candidates just evaluated the three named studies and did achieve some marks if their points were appropriate to the question. Common responses focused on the issues of ethics and control and some did then link these to not only the named studies but other studies from the syllabus (such as the Haney, Banks and Zimbardo study as an example of ethical issues faced when trying to create a realistic prison environment). Unfortunately, many did not link their responses to a study and achieved fewer marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/23
Core Studies 2

Key messages

Section A

Question 1

Candidates should be aware of the requirements of each question in the exam. For example, if asked to describe they should not include evaluative comments. A few found it difficult to just focus on describing what is meant by quantitative data and how it was collected in the Schachter and Singer study and instead evaluated quantitative data in **part (a)**. Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in **part (b)** and give clear details of the procedure followed. Extended evaluative points that make direct reference to the alternative idea are necessary in **part (c)** to achieve full marks.

Question 2

It is important that candidates practice writing responses to these types of questions. Some did not structure their responses appropriately and could not achieve full marks. For example, if the question asks for strengths and weaknesses then four points must be made (two strengths and two weaknesses). In addition, candidates need to be able to address any evaluation issue that is given in the syllabus. Some did not know what was meant by validity in psychology and consequently this affected the marks they were able to gain in **parts (a), (b) and (c)**. Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

Section B

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

General comments

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

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

A very small minority of candidates answered both questions in **Section B** compared to previous sessions. When a candidate did this they were awarded the mark for the best of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually produced weak responses.

Section A requires candidates to have a firm understanding of the entire syllabus as there is no choice of question offered. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in the **part (c)** of their **Section B** essays to achieve higher marks. **Question 4** was the more popular choice of question.

Individual questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates were able to achieve some marks on this question. They almost all knew what is meant by quantitative data although many just stated it was numerical data and did not obtain the additional mark for elaborating and giving an example of how it is collected or used (e.g. in statistics and/or graphs). Many candidates identified some aspect of the quantitative data gathered in the Schachter and Singer study. Most mentioned the self-report data and a few also mentioned that it was a five point scale that was used to measure emotion. A minority of candidates described the quantitative data collected from the observations.
- (b) Most candidates were able to describe a procedure that collected qualitative data. Popular ideas included doing a study similar to the original but collecting qualitative data either via observation of behaviour of the participants or via a self-report method. Many candidates clearly explained how the qualitative data would be collected (e.g. providing examples of questions asked). Some candidates did also ensure their procedure tested the two-factor theory of emotion, whereas others just tested emotions rather than investigating the effects of both physiology and cognition on the experience of emotion. Some candidates suggested giving injections of adrenaline, whereas others offered caffeine or even large amounts of sugar in order to alter the internal physiology of the participants.

However, it was rare to find a fully replicable procedure. Candidates did not tend to refer to the sampling method. Some candidates did not give any indication of what questions the participants would be asked or when observing the behaviours of participants their description did not include specific details of the behaviour being measured.

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question, although this was rare compared to previous sessions and candidates received no credit for this as this is the correct response to **Question 1 part (c)**.

- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points.

Many candidates discussed issues about the generalisability of the sample they suggested in **part (b)**, ethics, issues around qualitative data and the ecological validity of their idea.

Many candidates gave well developed points that achieved very high marks as they referred directly to their alternative idea. Some candidates only briefly identified issues and did not refer back to the context of their own study.

Question 2

- (a) Many candidates achieved at least one mark for their response by stating that validity is the accuracy of either the study or the data (which was allowed as a partial response). A few candidates did give a full definition but many gave examples of different types of validity which was not required for this question.
- (b) There were a broad variety of responses to this question. Some discussed the face validity of the study and focused on whether the study measured in-group preferences. Some candidates discussed why the study might be valid with reference to the controls or the sample used. Very few candidates achieved full marks for this question as they struggled to clearly explain the way in which the study was valid.
- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved some marks in this section. Most were able to describe one strength and one weakness that psychologists might face when making their research valid and were able to give an example from Tajfel study. Many candidates referred to controls for the strengths. For the weaknesses many referred to the lack of ecological validity and poor ethics in valid studies.

Many candidates not attempting the 'plural nature' of these types of questions to gain the seven plus marks available. Candidates need to describe two strengths and two weaknesses to achieve the higher marks. Many did attempt to do this, but found it difficult to describe an appropriate second strength (e.g. usefulness and low demand characteristics due to deception).

- (d) Some candidates did answer appropriately for this question and identified points about the extent to which the Tajfel study is useful. These candidates identified the controls used in the study as well as the poor sample and linked these to reliability. A minority of candidates were able to include more than one relevant point and many gave general evaluation points that were not focussed on validity (such as the reliability of the study).

A significant number of candidates described how the findings of the study are useful but did not attempt a discussion of usefulness with regards to the Tajfel study. These candidates gained limited credit.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) Many candidates achieved at least one mark for this question. They were able to describe that reliability is about consistency. Some then went on to explain that it is the consistency of the measuring device or the consistency of results if a study is replicated. A significant number of candidates confused reliability with validity or they gave an unclear definition that was not creditworthy.
- (b) Most candidates knew what was meant by a control and were able to outline one used in each of the three named studies. Candidates often achieved just one or two marks per study as they gave a very brief description of the control and could not explain how the control increased the reliability of the study.
- (c) Candidates found this question very challenging and were often awarded one or two marks although many gave quite extended responses. Most just evaluated psychological research using a variety of issues such as ethics, ecological validity and generalisability and did not link their response to reliability in any way. Points of this nature were not given any credit. A few candidates could identify the problems with strictly controlled studies and mentioned issues such as the effect this would have on ecological validity and the potential for demand characteristics in the study. Very few candidates linked appropriate points to specific examples from a study.

Question 4

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to explain what is meant by both nature and nurture but a significant number did not label their definitions so gained limited credit.
- (b) Candidates responded well to this question although found it difficult to achieve full marks for each of the named studies. Many could give general descriptions of how the data was collected in each of the studies.

Held and Hein was answered the best and most candidates received two or three marks for their description with reference to the visual cliff, paw placement and blink response to an approaching object. For Bandura et al. candidates described the observers behind the one-way mirror but then often did not refer to the different behaviour categories that were recorded by the observers. For the Maguire et al. study, all candidates knew that some sort of scanning device for measuring brain activity was used and many mentioned the PET scans. Some then described the various tasks the taxi drivers were asked to do such as the route task, landmarks, film plots, film frames and baseline number repetition task. A small minority of candidates believed that the study was carried out in everyday life and the taxi drivers were timed on their ability to navigate a route which was incorrect.

- (c) Candidates needed to identify and discuss three problems that psychologists might have when they investigate the nature-nurture debate with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many candidates were able to describe two or even three problems and included points related to ethics, issues with studying children and animals, problems with using scientific equipment, ecological validity and the problem with usefulness and being able to distinguish if the behaviour observed is due to nature or nurture. Many did not link their responses to a study and achieved fewer marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

| |
|---|
| <p>Paper 9698/31 Specialist Choices</p> |
|---|

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth two marks should be short and an answer worth eight marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should note that as this is a three-hour examination, it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (**parts (a) and (b)**) should take approximately 45–50 minutes and be at least four sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts of the question can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between describe and suggest for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will not achieve top marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for Papers 1 and 2 (not just from what has been learned for Paper 3) to their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.
- It is essential that each question is correctly labelled. It is beneficial to Examiners for candidates to arrange additional sheets of answer paper in the correct order and number each sheet and for candidates to answer questions for each option in the correct order.

General comments

Candidates need to have a firm understanding of the entire syllabus for their chosen options. A significant number of candidates appeared to be unable to answer some questions. This was particularly evident for **Question 1(b)** and **Question 17**.

Responses must be legible. Many candidates used ink that leaked through onto the other side of the page and sometimes this made answers very difficult to read.

Section A (all options)

Candidates should write an amount appropriate to the marks allocated. If a description of two studies is needed for 4 marks, the allocation of marks is 2 + 2, whereas if a description of one study is required for 4 marks, then the same amount in total should be written as for the 2 + 2 format. Sometimes candidates wrote far too much for 2 marks.

Section B (all options)

Some Centres appear to have instructed candidates to use the same four evaluation issues whatever the question. This strategy is not recommended because it meant that candidates were writing about issues that just did not apply to the question. For example, in the education option a candidate might write 'special educational needs are ecologically valid', are 'reliable' and 'valid', statements which have very little meaning. An attempt to relate these potential evaluation points to a measure of special needs would be more appropriate. There are many issues that can be applied to each topic area and candidates are advised to think carefully about and choose issues appropriate to the topic area of the question.

Many answers would receive significantly higher marks if the difference between 'describe' and 'evaluate' is understood by candidates. **Section B** question part (a) will always be 'describe' and question part (b) will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description. Evaluation is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about the evidence that has been described in part (a). Evaluation requires a candidate to think and apply and not to just reproduce learning.

Those candidates who can evaluate can be divided into two types:

- those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- those who focus exclusively on the one named issue and gain limited marks, because one issue is not a range (as required by the mark scheme), or those candidates who exclude the named issue altogether (and also gain limited marks).

Section C (all options)

In general answers did not always demonstrate sufficient methodological knowledge. This is evident in the ambiguous use of different methods, and in ambiguous comments about sampling and other aspects such as experimental design. Frequently candidates write 'I will use a random sample of participants' but need to include detail about how that sample will be gathered. Sometimes candidates write that their sample will include 50 males and 50 females and be balanced in terms of age range, etc. (describing the sample) but there will be no details about the sampling technique (i.e. how that sample will be gathered).

When a question instructs candidates to use a specific method, then that method must be used. Candidates often start with 'I will conduct an experiment' and write nothing further about the IV or DV or controls or apply a design (repeated measures, for example). These are essential features of an experiment and should be included. Candidates often use the term experiment incorrectly when they are conducting an observation or questionnaire. Candidates are also advised to focus on one method in detail rather than having several superficial sentences about a number of different methods. Candidates should always show their methodological knowledge because application of it scores most marks in this section.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a) Many candidates provided an excellent explanation for the term emotional intelligence. On the other hand, some candidates guessed at the term and others were not able to demonstrate any understanding of it.
- (b) Answers to this question part were poor. The syllabus identifies specific problem-solving strategies 'problem-solving: means-end analysis, planning strategies and backwards searching', but most candidates could not identify any strategy, instead providing incorrect guesses or other uncreditable responses such as 'problem solving helps a person to solve problems'.

Question 2

- (a) This question part required a description of both learning and teaching styles. Many candidates addressed both these components but a sizeable number of candidates did not, often focusing exclusively on learning styles. A number of candidates wrote about the 'Onion model' in detail rather than balancing this with a range of other relevant aspects. A number of candidates included nothing on improving learning effectiveness. The mark scheme always requires a range of information, and so candidates including one or more aspects from each bullet point of the syllabus achieve this with ease.
- (b) Many candidates covered an appropriate number of issues in good detail and scored high marks. However, a sizeable number of candidates did not write about the named issue, or what was written was poor. Questionnaires are taught in the first year of the syllabus, along with the advantages and disadvantages of various types, so the issue of questionnaires should be familiar to candidates, and this is essential, as questionnaire design may appear in Section C on this paper, or and questions relating to questionnaires may appear in any Psychology question paper.

Question 3

- (a) This question part asked candidates how they would investigate different motivational strategies when giving feedback on essays. A small number of responses were limited to brief comments such as 'I would ask them', whereas others designed full and appropriate studies that often scored high marks. The use of an experiment was common, dividing participants into conditions of an independent variable. Other candidates chose to use a questionnaire which was also an appropriate choice. The methodological knowledge shown was what distinguished the marks awarded.
- (b) Candidates were asked to describe the cognitive approach to motivation. The syllabus suggests the work of McClelland be covered, but as the syllabus lists this as an example, the work of any alternative cognitive approach would receive credit. That said, most candidates did write about McClelland and many linked his work on achievement motivation (need to achieve and need to avoid failure) to what they had written in **part (a)**.

Question 4

- (a) Very few candidates chose to answer this question. Those opting for this question either scored very high marks or very low marks. At the top end of the mark range there were interesting suggestions such as correlating levels of testosterone with dyslexia and some candidates suggested a longitudinal study correlating levels of foetal testosterone with the later onset of dyslexia. Methodological knowledge was often very good.
- (b) This question was generally not answered well, with many candidates' knowledge limited to a few typical features of dyslexia such as letter reversal or transposition of letters. A few candidates mentioned the use of different coloured paper to ease the reading of words. Some candidates covered features of dyscalculia and/or dyspraxia, which could not be credited.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

- (a) In order to score full marks on this question part, candidates needed to refer in their answer to the words 'patient', 'practitioner' and 'relationship' to acknowledge who is involved and what the nature of the relationship between them is. Many candidates scored full marks, and those scoring limited marks often required more detail to improve their response.
- (b) Most candidates scored full marks for their answer to this question, in this case many candidates included more detail than was needed for just two marks per description. The study by McKinstry and Wang and the study by McKinlay were most common although the work of Ley was also mentioned occasionally.

Question 6

- (a) Pain appears to be a popular sub-topic, there were more top marks given for answers to this question than any other. Most candidates were very well prepared and provided very strong responses, not only with the range of knowledge evident but also the depth shown about some studies. The top answers considered all three bullet points of the syllabus, often beginning with types of pain and ending their answers with different ways of managing and controlling pain. A small number of candidates were less well prepared and showed little understanding and a few candidates appeared to confuse psychological and alternative techniques for managing pain.
- (b) There were some very strong responses, however, many were not strong and some candidates were not able to evaluate successfully. A few candidates only considered the named issue of psychometrics and some did not consider psychometrics at all. Some candidates were not able to demonstrate any understanding of the term psychometrics, and some candidates suggested that only the McGill pain questionnaire (MPQ) was psychometric when any scale measuring pain can be said to be psychometric.

Question 7

- (a) Here candidates had to suggest a safety campaign which would draw on the sub-topics of health promotion and health and safety. While there were some excellent answers, there were also many at the bottom end of the mark range. Weaker responses did not apply any method (fear arousal or providing information), and suggestions were vague, e.g. 'I would design a poster', without addressing the specifics of raising awareness about the illusion of invulnerability. Stronger responses identified a specific method, identified a target audience, in effect, used the Yale model of communication as the basis for their suggestion.
- (b) Some candidates were unable to demonstrate knowledge of any method for promoting health. Other candidates wrote about appropriate methods in this question part, but had not used them at all in **part (a)** of their answer. Candidates should read all parts of a question before starting to write their answers to each question part. Stronger responses often covered both methods (or techniques) listed on the syllabus: fear arousal and providing information, and often supported their answer with appropriate examples such as the studies by Janis and Feshbach (1953) and by Lewin (1992).

Question 8

- (a) Candidates were given a free choice of method to investigate 'age and accidents'. A range of different methods were chosen by candidates including experiments, correlations, questionnaires, observations and 'official statistics'. Marks were determined by the quality of the methodological knowledge applied. Good advice is for candidates to include four or five essential features of the method they have chosen. For example, for an experiment, the IV, DV, controls and design are essential. Many candidates show confusion with regard to methods, with some answers beginning with 'I will conduct an experiment' followed by description of other methods, instead of beginning 'I will conduct a study'. The distinction between 'study' (any method) and 'experiment' (a specific method) should be known.
- (b) There are many reasons why people have accidents other than because of age. These include: accident prone personality, personality type (introvert/extravert or type A), illusion of invulnerability and cognitive overload. Candidates could also have written about people who are very tired or in an 'altered state' because of drugs, alcohol or medication. Any two of these possibilities could be credited. Some candidates provided very limited descriptions of each reason and scored low marks, whereas other candidates provided detailed and thorough descriptions, occasionally quoting supporting studies or examples of real-life events.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

- (a) Most candidates could not provide more than a basic answer to this question. A simulation is an artificial event that is said to closely replicate a real-life event in as many ways as possible. Examples could include studies that place participants on real aircraft and then shouting 'evacuate!' or it could be a computer simulation such as the studies by Kugihara et al. (2007) or that by Drury et al. who created a simulation of evacuating the London underground.
- (b) The 'classic' laboratory experiment is that conducted by Mintz (1951) where participants were required to pull on strings attached to cones placed in a bottle. Mintz found that everyone pulled at the same time creating a jam at the bottle neck, as often happens in a real-life emergency. Many candidates described this study very well and scored full marks; others with less detail and accuracy scored correspondingly fewer marks, and a few candidates could not demonstrate knowledge of any laboratory experiment. A few candidates wrote about the study by Kelley et al. (1965) and this was a creditable alternative to that by Mintz.

Question 10

- (a) There were some superb answers written in response to this question. Many candidates began with a definition and proceeded to consider a wide range of factors related to noise and hearing, anti-social behaviour and health. Candidates also considered the effects of music on both health and consumer behaviour. Many answers scored full marks. Those scoring fewer marks had less detail, a narrower range of studies and often had errors in descriptions of studies.
- (b) A small number of candidates only considered the named issue which restricted marks. Other candidates provided a wide range of different issues such as: comparing laboratory with field experiments, controls, quantitative and qualitative data, ethics, reductionism, and occasionally the use of physiological data (e.g. when writing about the Chafin et al. study). Answers including a range of issues usually scored high marks. Some responses could have been improved by a better use of examples to support each evaluative issue.

Question 11

- (a) This question required candidates to use a questionnaire, so any alternative method could not be credited. Top answers applied appropriate methodological knowledge and referred to the type of questionnaire (open or closed) and if a closed questionnaire was chosen, mentioned how the answers would be scored (such as using a Likert scale). Such answers also mentioned the type of data to be gathered and how the questionnaire would be administered, whether it be face-to-face, online or by post. Weaker responses lacked coverage of these points, and would have been improved by more detail.
- (b) In answering this question, candidates chose to describe either the study on dropping litter by Bickman et al. (1973) or the study by Dukes and Jorgenson (1976) on returning soiled dishes in a cafeteria. A few candidates described both and in such cases both answers were marked and the best one credited.

Question 12

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify the IV as males and females, but many candidates were unable to clearly explain what to investigate or how to measure it. One major difference between males and females is in errors (mentioned in (b)), one of which is caused by differences in spatial awareness. Another problem experienced by some candidates was how to test such differences. Sometimes creative procedures were suggested but sometimes suggestions were inappropriate and would never be conducted in real life.
- (b) There were many very good answers written in response to this question with many candidates scoring full marks when describing two errors. Other candidates knew two errors but were often unable to include sufficient detail for full marks. Candidates are advised to ensure that they take note of the mark allocation for each question.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) Many candidates were able to score full marks for this question. A small number of candidates suggested that any therapy/treatment with a psychologist or therapist about the mind is 'psychotherapy', for instance giving cognitive-behaviour therapy as an example, which could not be credited. Psychotherapy is specifically associated with the work of Freud and his followers.
- (b) This question part required two examples, and most candidates answering this question correctly wrote about free association, transference, or dream analysis, often writing detailed and accurate descriptions. A few candidates wrote about the case study of little Hans and these answers were only given credit if how Hans was treated was specifically mentioned. Some candidates were unable to demonstrate any knowledge of psychotherapy and wrote about alternatives, which could not be credited.

Question 14

- (a) Many candidates wrote excellent answers with a high level of detail and understanding included. These answers usually began with a definition, typically that by Griffiths (1995), followed by an outline of the different types of addition and impulse control disorders and often a consideration of the different causes, followed with suggestions for coping and reducing need. Some candidates did this less well and had inaccuracies and a lack of detail. A number of candidates knew very little about this topic area often providing anecdotal responses about either alcoholism or pyromania.
- (b) A common error with the named issue of individual differences is that candidates often made general points, or just examples, rather than including advantages and disadvantages with supporting examples. Although this was done by some candidates at the top end of the mark range in some cases it had minimal negative effect because of the quality of the other issues that were included in their answers. If candidates consider at least three evaluative issues, as is recommended, then any ambiguity in one issue is minimised. Many answers did not consider the named issue.

Question 15

- (a) This question stated that the suggestion made by candidates must be ethical, and all answers were ethical. The best answers investigated fear of pain using the cold-pressor test (which involves a person immersing an arm in a water bath of very cold water/ice). As a person can withdraw their arm at any point, using this measure of pain is ethical. Some candidates suggested using an observation to watch what happened when the person with agliophobia was taken to a hospital where patients were in pain and some credit was given to these answers.
- (b) Candidates had to describe a case study of a person with a phobia and most candidates wrote about little Hans or little Albert, from year 1 of the course. A few candidates legitimately wrote about the case study by Saavedra and Silverman (2002), which appears on the revised syllabus, and is about a boy with a fear of buttons. Marks were determined by the quality and detail in the answer.

Question 16

- (a) This question required candidates to investigate whether a person has obsessions. Candidates could choose any method. Most candidates chose to conduct an interview or questionnaire where they could ask the person about their obsessive thoughts. Strong answers showed good methodological understanding, but weaker answers were unable to demonstrate much knowledge of either questionnaire or interview design. A few candidates suggested conducting an observation, incorrectly so because an observation can only be of compulsive behaviour and not obsessive thoughts.
- (b) This question part required a description of both the biomedical and cognitive-behavioural explanations of obsessive-compulsive disorder. This meant that two descriptions, each worth three marks, were required. Many candidates did this quite successfully, but some candidates could only describe one. As was the case for answers to other questions in **Section C** like this, some candidates wrote single sentence answers and again, these brief answers are not sufficient for full marks; some detail is required.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

- (a) Some candidates were unable to demonstrate knowledge of this term, and their responses were limited to common-sense answer showing no psychological knowledge. Other candidates wrote about group conflict, including different types and causes. Candidates needed to address the full term, *managing* group conflict, to gain full marks for this question.
- (b) For this sub-section the syllabus lists 'e.g. Thomas (1976)' and most candidates wrote about two or more of the five conflict resolution strategies Thomas outlines. Most common answers included collaboration (where there is cooperation between the two sides until an agreed solution is reached) and compromise (where both sides agree to find a middle ground on which both can agree). Some candidates wrote about strategies other than those outlined by Thomas and this was creditable where the strategy was about managing conflict and based on psychological knowledge.

Question 18

- (a) There were many very strong answers which covered a good range of different aspects including physical, psychological and temporal aspects of the work environment, and many answers included appropriate detail from the ergonomics sub-topic. There were some weak anecdotal responses about this topic area. General comments about the working environment will gain very limited credit unless candidates are able to support their points with psychological knowledge and understanding.
- (b) Evaluations for this question followed the same pattern as for other **Section B part (b)** answers and answers covered the entire mark range. Some candidates only evaluated the named issue of generalisations, which limited the credit available. Notably, generalisations in this instance, referred to generalising from one organisation to another, rather from a specific experiment. Centres are reminded that **Section B (b)** questions give one named issue which must be included in the *range* of evaluation issues.

Question 19

- (a) Answers to this question were generally weak because most candidates did not address the terms reliability and validity on which the question focuses. It is essential that candidates are familiar with these terms. For example, the reliability of any measure can be tested using test-retest and validity can be assessed by comparing the result with an existing measure.
- (b) A range of other ways to appraise worker performance was considered. Many candidates focused on a structured interview, for example, where closed questions with a rating scale could be asked of all workers and so their scores compared. Answers like this, full of appropriate terminology, nearly always scored full marks. Other candidates suggested simply 'interviews' but needed to provide elaboration to gain higher marks. Some candidates repeated description of rating scales, which could not be credited, as it did not answer the question set.

Question 20

- (a) Answers in response to this question consisted of two types of answer. Firstly, some candidates suggested an experiment with a 'before' and 'after' design where a baseline measure could be taken before attendance at the training course and then a second measure taken after it. Secondly, candidates suggested a design comparing the effectiveness of managers not trained with the effectiveness of managers who had been trained. The quality of the methodological knowledge determined marks. In these examples, the strongest answers included the IV, DV, controls, the design, and the sample amongst other points.
- (b) Most candidates could describe a theory of leadership effectiveness and many candidates gained full marks for this question. The theory by Fiedler was common, although other appropriate answers also received credit. A small number of candidates incorrectly wrote about leadership style, often writing about democratic and autocratic styles.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/32
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates need to have a firm understanding of the entire syllabus.
- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth two marks should be short and an answer worth eight marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should note that as this is a three-hour examination, it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (**parts (a) and (b)**) should take approximately 45–50 minutes and be at least four sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts of the question can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between describe and suggest for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will not achieve top marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for Papers 1 and 2 (not just from what has been learned for Paper 3) to their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.
- It is essential that each question is correctly labelled. It is beneficial to Examiners for candidates to arrange additional sheets of answer paper in the correct order and number each sheet and for candidates to answer questions for each option in the correct order.

General comments

Candidates need to have a firm understanding of the entire syllabus for their chosen options. A significant number of candidates appeared to be unable to answer some questions. This was particularly evident for **Question 1** and **Question 5**.

Responses must be legible. Many candidates used ink that leaked through onto the other side of the page and sometimes this made answers very difficult to read.

Section A (all options)

Candidates should write an amount appropriate to the marks allocated. If a description of two studies is needed for 4 marks, the allocation of marks is 2 + 2, whereas if a description of one study is required for 4 marks, then the same amount in total should be written as for the 2 + 2 format. Sometimes candidates wrote far too much for 2 marks.

Section B (all options)

Some Centres appear to have instructed candidates to use the same four evaluation issues whatever the question. This strategy is not recommended because it meant that candidates were writing about issues that just did not apply to the question. For example, in the education option a candidate might write 'special educational needs are ecologically valid', are 'reliable' and 'valid', statements which have very little meaning. An attempt to relate these potential evaluation points to a measure of special needs would be more appropriate. There are many issues that can be applied to each topic area and candidates are advised to think carefully about and choose issues appropriate to the topic area of the question.

Many answers would receive significantly higher marks if the difference between 'describe' and 'evaluate' is understood by candidates. **Section B** question part (a) will always be 'describe' and question part (b) will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description. Evaluation is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about the evidence that has been described in part (a). Evaluation requires a candidate to think and apply and not to just reproduce learning.

Those candidates who can evaluate can be divided into two types:

- those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- those who focus exclusively on the one named issue and gain limited marks, because one issue is not a range (as required by the mark scheme), or those candidates who exclude the named issue altogether (and also gain limited marks).

Section C (all options)

In general answers did not always demonstrate sufficient methodological knowledge. This is evident in the ambiguous use of different methods, and in ambiguous comments about sampling and other aspects such as experimental design. Frequently candidates write 'I will use a random sample of participants' but need to include detail about how that sample will be gathered. Sometimes candidates write that their sample will include 50 males and 50 females and be balanced in terms of age range, etc. (describing the sample) but there will be no details about the sampling technique (i.e. how that sample will be gathered).

When a question instructs candidates to use a specific method, then that method must be used. Candidates often start with 'I will conduct an experiment' and write nothing further about the IV or DV or controls or apply a design (repeated measures, for example). These are essential features of an experiment and should be included. Candidates often use the term experiment incorrectly when they are conducting an observation or questionnaire. Candidates are also advised to focus on one method in detail rather than having several superficial sentences about a number of different methods. Candidates should always show their methodological knowledge because application of it scores most marks in this section.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a) To score full marks, candidates needed to demonstrate psychological knowledge; that they had studied the topic. A simple example of a problem-solving strategy would have been sufficient. Weak answers to this question were often vague and many candidates answered this question incorrectly or by giving a general or common sense answer.
- (b) A significant number of candidates could not identify any problem-solving strategy at all. Candidates should be familiar with the three problem-solving strategies listed in the syllabus: means-end analysis, planning strategies and backwards searching.

Question 2

- (a) There were some very strong answers from candidates who included information from all three bullet points of the syllabus for this topic. Many answers were of very high quality. Weaker responses tended not to include reference to children who are gifted.
- (b) Candidates are required to include a range of different evaluation issues in their answer. A number of candidates use the same issues to answer every **Section B (b)** question, which is not an effective strategy, and leads to some instances of inappropriate choices of issues. This problem was most evident for this question where the issues of validity and reliability were included. Candidates often wrote 'children who have special educational needs are valid' or '...are reliable', which are not meaningful statements. Candidates should consider issues specific to the question set.

Question 3

- (a) There were many very strong answers in which the questionnaires were appropriately designed, included examples of questions, and crucially, how those questions were to be answered. A few candidates also mentioned the type of data they would gather and some even mentioned that the questionnaire would be given face-to-face rather than online or through the post. Some answers included a few essential features of questionnaires. Some candidates weren't able to demonstrate any knowledge about conducting a study using a questionnaire.
- (b) Stronger responses described children working in teams and sharing resources and responsibilities equally. Often specific techniques were mentioned such as the jigsaw technique, 'think pair share' and the reciprocal technique. Weaker responses often gave incorrect statements, such as 'co-operative learning is where students co-operate with the teacher' and struggled to show any psychological knowledge.

Question 4

- (a) The stem of the question gave candidates two corrective strategies on which to base their answers. Many candidates did just this and designed a field experiment to test which strategy worked best. Other candidates confused the terms, despite the explanation in the stem, resulting in a contradictory design. A few students focussed on how teaching styles could modify behaviour and did not answer the question set.
- (b) Many candidates explained in ample detail how these corrective strategies are based on the behaviourist approach with some writing about the work of Skinner and how positive and negative reinforcement and punishment can modify behaviour. Other candidates wrote about other approaches and some candidates wrote about the value of corrective strategies and rewards and punishments without a mention of the underlying theory.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

- (a) Self reports can be gained from a variety of sources, this question asked about self report questionnaires. In order to score full marks, candidates were required to address what a self report is and link it to a questionnaire. A typical answer was 'where the respondent reports on his personal experiences' (one mark) 'such as when completing the life events questionnaire' (one additional mark). Most candidates scored one mark with many scoring full marks.
- (b) Many candidates were able to describe two self-report questionnaires used to measure stress, and scored full marks, but many candidates described incorrect studies, particularly those measuring stress physiologically. Often the studies by Geer and Maisel (who used GSR – galvanic skin response) and Johnsson (urine sample) were described. The syllabus lists the following self report questionnaires used to measure stress: Holmes and Rahe; Friedman and Rosenman; Lazarus.

Question 6

- (a) Many candidates wrote excellent answers, with many scoring the maximum mark available. Answers were well organised and covered a wide range of appropriate aspects listed on the syllabus: definitions, accident proneness and how accidents can be reduced. However, a number of candidates focussed on the topic of health promotion, instead of the topic of health and safety. While there is some overlap between promoting health and promoting safety behaviours, these are separate topics with different syllabus content to be covered.
- (b) There were many very strong answers, not only because these answers included a range of relevant issues but because they had a depth of argument and appropriate use of supporting examples from the studies described in **part (a)**. However, many other candidates struggled to provide a range of issues or used inappropriate issues, and some candidates were unable to provide any evaluation, instead providing additional description.

Question 7

- (a) Stronger responses suggested a semi-structured interview with closed questions and an open question at the end, and also wrote that the interview would be conducted face-to-face rather than over a telephone. Some candidates designed an experiment which was appropriate, but needed to consider the data that would be gathered using an interview. If the question states 'use an interview' then this must form a significant part of the answer and should not be excluded. A small number of candidates described the McKinstry and Wang study rather than suggest an investigation of their own and then, when reading **part (b)**, realised that they had to describe the McKinstry and Wang study. Candidates are advised to always read both parts of a question before beginning their answer.
- (b) Candidates needed to provide sufficient description of the McKinstry and Wang study to score six marks. While good and accurate detail was provided by many candidates, other answers were far too brief and gained limited marks. A few candidates wrote about alternative studies, as the question permitted, but these were often inappropriate because they were not focused on non-verbal communication as the question required.

Question 8

- (a) Candidates were given a free choice of method to investigate the most effective cognitive pain strategy. Most candidates chose to conduct an experiment applying one strategy to one group and a different strategy to another group, but after that, answers varied in relation to how the study would be conducted and how data would be collected. Some merely asked patients how they felt; others applied an interview or gave a questionnaire; others observed patients over time, often suggesting using the UAB pain observation technique. There were some excellent answers with candidates applying appropriate methodological knowledge.
- (b) Many candidates wrote very strong answers scoring maximum marks. Some candidates provided very little detail and gained limited marks, and there were a few candidates who focussed on other strategies that weren't cognitive, so didn't answer the question set. There are three cognitive pain strategies listed on the syllabus: attention diversion, non-pain imagery and cognitive redefinition.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

- (a) Most candidates scored full marks for this question part. Nearly all candidates could make a general statement about the use of music to influence purchase decisions and many candidates were also able to give either some elaboration or a supporting example.
- (b) The requirement here was to describe one study for four marks, so more detail is needed than when required to describe two studies for four marks. The amount of detail provided by candidates varied. The syllabus lists two studies (both by North), but some candidates referred to a range of other studies, such as the study by Yeoh and North (2012), which was creditable if the study answered the question set, as it did in this instance.

Question 10

- (a) Many candidates wrote excellent answers on environmental cognition. Responses included definitions of terms, measures (e.g. Lynch and sketch maps) and extensive descriptions of a range of animal studies. Candidates often included way-finding and so covered information from all three bullet points of the syllabus. The depth and detail of some answers was very strong and these candidates were able to demonstrate very high quality knowledge and understanding of this topic.
- (b) The named issue here was 'the use of animals' and most candidates provided full and thoughtful evaluations using the range of studies mentioned in **part (a)** to support their advantages and disadvantages. A few candidates only considered animals and no other issues and gained limited credit. Other candidates considered an appropriate range of issues such as 'generalisations', 'experiments (laboratory versus non-laboratory)', individual differences, and evaluations about 'measures' was also common.

Question 11

- (a) There were a few excellent answers to this question, but it was not answered well by most candidates. Responses often demonstrated very little methodological knowledge or knowledge of psychology. All **Section C** questions include the requirement for candidates to 'suggest an investigation' and the generic mark scheme requires methodological knowledge for higher marks.
- (b) To successfully answer this question candidates on evacuation plans, as outlined by Loftus (1972) for example, or the work on 'preparedness' by Sattler et al. could have been used. While a few answers did this and scored good marks, most candidates focussed on what Markus might have said in his evacuation message. Some information provided was correct but most was inappropriate for an evacuation message and did not show knowledge or understanding of this sub-topic.

Question 12

- (a) Most candidates were able to design a field experiment about the occupancy of public territory in a car park and there was often a lot of detail describing how the study would be conducted. The strongest answers included methodological terminology such as the IV, DV, the control of extraneous variables and the design.
- (b) There were many superb answers written in response to this question with many candidates scoring full marks. There were excellent descriptions of the work by Newman (1976) who identified 'zone of territorial influence' and 'opportunities for surveillance' as key features in defending primary territory. However, there were candidates who focussed on defending public territory which did not answer the question set.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) This question was answered correctly by most candidates who were able to explain the term 'measure' by referring to 'the instrument or mechanism', 'how much/intensity', 'record/calculate'. For full marks the explanation of 'measure' needed to be related to obsessions and compulsions. This could be done through an example of an actual measure (e.g. MOCI) or by reference to the different types such as washing or checking.
- (b) Some candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge about the Maudsley or Yale-Brown scales (MOCI and Y-BOCS) and described the measure in ample detail. Others were unable to demonstrate any knowledge about a measure for obsessions and compulsions.

Question 14

- (a) Many candidates wrote very strong answers and scored full marks. However, there were many candidates who were unable to demonstrate any knowledge of abnormal affect. The syllabus content for abnormal affect covers depression and mania, explanations for depression, and treatments for depression, but some candidates focused on definitions of abnormality (such as deviation from statistical norms) and about different models of abnormality, which did not answer the question set.
- (b) Some candidates did not answer the question set. For those candidates who answered correctly, the same comments apply here as they do for all other **Section B (b)** answers: credit gained was limited for candidates only writing about the named issue or who did not evaluate.

Question 15

- (a) Those candidates who knew the term 'systematic desensitisation' wrote some superb answers. Most began with an outline of relaxation techniques followed by the creation of an initial anxiety hierarchy, involving imagination. Further hierarchies were then created leading toward the man to being out in the world and travelling on a bus. There were a few candidates who weren't able to demonstrate any knowledge about systematic desensitisation.
- (b) Cognitive behaviour therapy was most popular choice for candidates and some candidates used appropriate examples to support their answer that do not appear on the syllabus. Applied tension was also frequently described (Ost et al., 1989) to treat blood/injection phobia. A few candidates wrote about flooding which was also appropriate. Some candidates provided further description of systematic desensitisation which did not answer the question set.

Question 16

- (a) This question allowed candidates to choose any mental disorder, the methodology used to determine the effectiveness of a drug compared to others was the key aspect of the question. Most candidates chose to use an experiment, comparing one drug with another. In this instance, it was also possible to have an IV where three or more drugs could be compared. Some candidates also referred to the experimental design, most opting for an independent rather than a related design with the best answers explaining the reason for this choice rather than merely stating the words.
- (b) Those candidates correctly describing a medical or biochemical approach often scored very high marks. A few candidates described models that did not use drug treatments, such as the psychodynamic and behavioural approaches, for instance cognitive-behaviour therapy (CBT), which did not answer the question set.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

- (a) In order to score full marks for this question candidates needed to include a comment about the term extrinsic being external (as opposed to intrinsic being internal) and relate this to an example of an external motivator, such as money. Most candidates could do this successfully, although a few confused extrinsic with intrinsic.
- (b) Stronger responses made an appropriate distinction between 'monetary' and 'non-monetary' rewards with the former including pay, bonuses and other 'fringe benefits' and the latter including recognition, promotion, or even a new office. There were some candidates who were unable to provide detail beyond the word 'money' and needed to provide further elaboration for higher marks.

Question 18

- (a) There were superb answers from candidates who included information from all three syllabus bullet points of job design, measures of job satisfaction and attitudes to work. Many of these answers were of very high quality and gained full marks. Weaker answers tended to focus on motivation, while this is of relevance these responses needed to be broader in order to gain higher marks.
- (b) Evaluations for this question followed the same pattern as for other **Section B part (b)** answers and answers covered the entire mark range. Centres are reminded that questions always state 'Evaluate...and include' and give one named issue which must be included in the range of evaluation issues. Some candidates only focussed on the named issue, or did not consider the named issues and gained limited marks. Some answers appeared to have been pre-prepared which led to some responses that were inappropriate to the question.

Question 19

- (a) Those candidates writing about an experiment sometimes included relevant methodological design features and sometimes did not. Marks are awarded for showing knowledge and understanding of the design of the study and Centres are referred to the mark scheme for further detail. Some candidates did not design an experiment, but suggested the use of observation or a questionnaire, which did not answer the question set. Answers must be based on the method named in the question. A number of candidates described the decision-making models which was required in **part (b)**.
- (b) There are three decision-making models listed in the syllabus: the multiple regression, the multiple hurdle and the multiple cut-off. Some candidates were able to describe two models in appropriate detail and scored full marks. Some candidates could identify decision-making models but were unable to provide any detail, and some candidates could not demonstrate any knowledge about personnel decision-making models.

Question 20

- (a) Some candidates were familiar with the strategies listed by Janis, including holding 'second chance' meetings, breaking into sub-groups, promoting open enquiry, encouraging individual evaluation along with four others, others could not demonstrate any knowledge of strategies to avoid groupthink.
- (b) Those candidates who were familiar with strategies often suggested appropriate methodology, some opting to conduct an experiment and others designing a questionnaire to be completed by members of the group. Stronger answers based their answers on the use of methodological knowledge.

PSYCHOLOGY

| |
|---|
| <p>Paper 9698/33 Specialist Choices</p> |
|---|

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth two marks should be short and an answer worth eight marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should note that as this is a three-hour examination, it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (**parts (a) and (b)**) should take approximately 45–50 minutes and be at least four sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts of the question can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between describe and suggest for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will not achieve top marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for Papers 1 and 2 (not just from what has been learned for Paper 3) to their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.
- It is essential that each question is correctly labelled. It is beneficial to Examiners for candidates to arrange additional sheets of answer paper in the correct order and number each sheet and for candidates to answer questions for each option in the correct order.

General comments

Candidates need to have a firm understanding of the entire syllabus for their chosen options. A significant number of candidates appeared to be unable to answer some questions. This was particularly evident for **Question 1(b)** and **Question 17**.

Responses must be legible. Many candidates used ink that leaked through onto the other side of the page and sometimes this made answers very difficult to read.

Section A (all options)

Candidates should write an amount appropriate to the marks allocated. If a description of two studies is needed for 4 marks, the allocation of marks is 2 + 2, whereas if a description of one study is required for 4 marks, then the same amount in total should be written as for the 2 + 2 format. Sometimes candidates wrote far too much for 2 marks.

Section B (all options)

Some Centres appear to have instructed candidates to use the same four evaluation issues whatever the question. This strategy is not recommended because it meant that candidates were writing about issues that just did not apply to the question. For example, in the education option a candidate might write 'special educational needs are ecologically valid', are 'reliable' and 'valid', statements which have very little meaning. An attempt to relate these potential evaluation points to a measure of special needs would be more appropriate. There are many issues that can be applied to each topic area and candidates are advised to think carefully about and choose issues appropriate to the topic area of the question.

Many answers would receive significantly higher marks if the difference between 'describe' and 'evaluate' is understood by candidates. **Section B** question part (a) will always be 'describe' and question part (b) will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description. Evaluation is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about the evidence that has been described in part (a). Evaluation requires a candidate to think and apply and not to just reproduce learning.

Those candidates who can evaluate can be divided into two types:

- those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- those who focus exclusively on the one named issue and gain limited marks, because one issue is not a range (as required by the mark scheme), or those candidates who exclude the named issue altogether (and also gain limited marks).

Section C (all options)

In general answers did not always demonstrate sufficient methodological knowledge. This is evident in the ambiguous use of different methods, and in ambiguous comments about sampling and other aspects such as experimental design. Frequently candidates write 'I will use a random sample of participants' but need to include detail about how that sample will be gathered. Sometimes candidates write that their sample will include 50 males and 50 females and be balanced in terms of age range, etc. (describing the sample) but there will be no details about the sampling technique (i.e. how that sample will be gathered).

When a question instructs candidates to use a specific method, then that method must be used. Candidates often start with 'I will conduct an experiment' and write nothing further about the IV or DV or controls or apply a design (repeated measures, for example). These are essential features of an experiment and should be included. Candidates often use the term experiment incorrectly when they are conducting an observation or questionnaire. Candidates are also advised to focus on one method in detail rather than having several superficial sentences about a number of different methods. Candidates should always show their methodological knowledge because application of it scores most marks in this section.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a) Many candidates provided an excellent explanation for the term emotional intelligence. On the other hand, some candidates guessed at the term and others were not able to demonstrate any understanding of it.
- (b) Answers to this question part were poor. The syllabus identifies specific problem-solving strategies 'problem-solving: means-end analysis, planning strategies and backwards searching', but most candidates could not identify any strategy, instead providing incorrect guesses or other uncreditable responses such as 'problem solving helps a person to solve problems'.

Question 2

- (a) This question part required a description of both learning and teaching styles. Many candidates addressed both these components but a sizeable number of candidates did not, often focusing exclusively on learning styles. A number of candidates wrote about the 'Onion model' in detail rather than balancing this with a range of other relevant aspects. A number of candidates included nothing on improving learning effectiveness. The mark scheme always requires a range of information, and so candidates including one or more aspects from each bullet point of the syllabus achieve this with ease.
- (b) Many candidates covered an appropriate number of issues in good detail and scored high marks. However, a sizeable number of candidates did not write about the named issue, or what was written was poor. Questionnaires are taught in the first year of the syllabus, along with the advantages and disadvantages of various types, so the issue of questionnaires should be familiar to candidates, and this is essential, as questionnaire design may appear in Section C on this paper, or and questions relating to questionnaires may appear in any Psychology question paper.

Question 3

- (a) This question part asked candidates how they would investigate different motivational strategies when giving feedback on essays. A small number of responses were limited to brief comments such as 'I would ask them', whereas others designed full and appropriate studies that often scored high marks. The use of an experiment was common, dividing participants into conditions of an independent variable. Other candidates chose to use a questionnaire which was also an appropriate choice. The methodological knowledge shown was what distinguished the marks awarded.
- (b) Candidates were asked to describe the cognitive approach to motivation. The syllabus suggests the work of McClelland be covered, but as the syllabus lists this as an example, the work of any alternative cognitive approach would receive credit. That said, most candidates did write about McClelland and many linked his work on achievement motivation (need to achieve and need to avoid failure) to what they had written in **part (a)**.

Question 4

- (a) Very few candidates chose to answer this question. Those opting for this question either scored very high marks or very low marks. At the top end of the mark range there were interesting suggestions such as correlating levels of testosterone with dyslexia and some candidates suggested a longitudinal study correlating levels of foetal testosterone with the later onset of dyslexia. Methodological knowledge was often very good.
- (b) This question was generally not answered well, with many candidates' knowledge limited to a few typical features of dyslexia such as letter reversal or transposition of letters. A few candidates mentioned the use of different coloured paper to ease the reading of words. Some candidates covered features of dyscalculia and/or dyspraxia, which could not be credited.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

- (a) In order to score full marks on this question part, candidates needed to refer in their answer to the words 'patient', 'practitioner' and 'relationship' to acknowledge who is involved and what the nature of the relationship between them is. Many candidates scored full marks, and those scoring limited marks often required more detail to improve their response.
- (b) Most candidates scored full marks for their answer to this question, in this case many candidates included more detail than was needed for just two marks per description. The study by McKinstry and Wang and the study by McKinlay were most common although the work of Ley was also mentioned occasionally.

Question 6

- (a) Pain appears to be a popular sub-topic, there were more top marks given for answers to this question than any other. Most candidates were very well prepared and provided very strong responses, not only with the range of knowledge evident but also the depth shown about some studies. The top answers considered all three bullet points of the syllabus, often beginning with types of pain and ending their answers with different ways of managing and controlling pain. A small number of candidates were less well prepared and showed little understanding and a few candidates appeared to confuse psychological and alternative techniques for managing pain.
- (b) There were some very strong responses, however, many were not strong and some candidates were not able to evaluate successfully. A few candidates only considered the named issue of psychometrics and some did not consider psychometrics at all. Some candidates were not able to demonstrate any understanding of the term psychometrics, and some candidates suggested that only the McGill pain questionnaire (MPQ) was psychometric when any scale measuring pain can be said to be psychometric.

Question 7

- (a) Here candidates had to suggest a safety campaign which would draw on the sub-topics of health promotion and health and safety. While there were some excellent answers, there were also many at the bottom end of the mark range. Weaker responses did not apply any method (fear arousal or providing information), and suggestions were vague, e.g. 'I would design a poster', without addressing the specifics of raising awareness about the illusion of invulnerability. Stronger responses identified a specific method, identified a target audience, in effect, used the Yale model of communication as the basis for their suggestion.
- (b) Some candidates were unable to demonstrate knowledge of any method for promoting health. Other candidates wrote about appropriate methods in this question part, but had not used them at all in **part (a)** of their answer. Candidates should read all parts of a question before starting to write their answers to each question part. Stronger responses often covered both methods (or techniques) listed on the syllabus: fear arousal and providing information, and often supported their answer with appropriate examples such as the studies by Janis and Feshbach (1953) and by Lewin (1992).

Question 8

- (a) Candidates were given a free choice of method to investigate 'age and accidents'. A range of different methods were chosen by candidates including experiments, correlations, questionnaires, observations and 'official statistics'. Marks were determined by the quality of the methodological knowledge applied. Good advice is for candidates to include four or five essential features of the method they have chosen. For example, for an experiment, the IV, DV, controls and design are essential. Many candidates show confusion with regard to methods, with some answers beginning with 'I will conduct an experiment' followed by description of other methods, instead of beginning 'I will conduct a study'. The distinction between 'study' (any method) and 'experiment' (a specific method) should be known.
- (b) There are many reasons why people have accidents other than because of age. These include: accident prone personality, personality type (introvert/extravert or type A), illusion of invulnerability and cognitive overload. Candidates could also have written about people who are very tired or in an 'altered state' because of drugs, alcohol or medication. Any two of these possibilities could be credited. Some candidates provided very limited descriptions of each reason and scored low marks, whereas other candidates provided detailed and thorough descriptions, occasionally quoting supporting studies or examples of real-life events.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

- (a) Most candidates could not provide more than a basic answer to this question. A simulation is an artificial event that is said to closely replicate a real-life event in as many ways as possible. Examples could include studies that place participants on real aircraft and then shouting 'evacuate!' or it could be a computer simulation such as the studies by Kugihara et al. (2007) or that by Drury et al. who created a simulation of evacuating the London underground.
- (b) The 'classic' laboratory experiment is that conducted by Mintz (1951) where participants were required to pull on strings attached to cones placed in a bottle. Mintz found that everyone pulled at the same time creating a jam at the bottle neck, as often happens in a real-life emergency. Many candidates described this study very well and scored full marks; others with less detail and accuracy scored correspondingly fewer marks, and a few candidates could not demonstrate knowledge of any laboratory experiment. A few candidates wrote about the study by Kelley et al. (1965) and this was a creditable alternative to that by Mintz.

Question 10

- (a) There were some superb answers written in response to this question. Many candidates began with a definition and proceeded to consider a wide range of factors related to noise and hearing, anti-social behaviour and health. Candidates also considered the effects of music on both health and consumer behaviour. Many answers scored full marks. Those scoring fewer marks had less detail, a narrower range of studies and often had errors in descriptions of studies.
- (b) A small number of candidates only considered the named issue which restricted marks. Other candidates provided a wide range of different issues such as: comparing laboratory with field experiments, controls, quantitative and qualitative data, ethics, reductionism, and occasionally the use of physiological data (e.g. when writing about the Chafin et al. study). Answers including a range of issues usually scored high marks. Some responses could have been improved by a better use of examples to support each evaluative issue.

Question 11

- (a) This question required candidates to use a questionnaire, so any alternative method could not be credited. Top answers applied appropriate methodological knowledge and referred to the type of questionnaire (open or closed) and if a closed questionnaire was chosen, mentioned how the answers would be scored (such as using a Likert scale). Such answers also mentioned the type of data to be gathered and how the questionnaire would be administered, whether it be face-to-face, online or by post. Weaker responses lacked coverage of these points, and would have been improved by more detail.
- (b) In answering this question, candidates chose to describe either the study on dropping litter by Bickman et al. (1973) or the study by Dukes and Jorgenson (1976) on returning soiled dishes in a cafeteria. A few candidates described both and in such cases both answers were marked and the best one credited.

Question 12

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify the IV as males and females, but many candidates were unable to clearly explain what to investigate or how to measure it. One major difference between males and females is in errors (mentioned in (b)), one of which is caused by differences in spatial awareness. Another problem experienced by some candidates was how to test such differences. Sometimes creative procedures were suggested but sometimes suggestions were inappropriate and would never be conducted in real life.
- (b) There were many very good answers written in response to this question with many candidates scoring full marks when describing two errors. Other candidates knew two errors but were often unable to include sufficient detail for full marks. Candidates are advised to ensure that they take note of the mark allocation for each question.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) Many candidates were able to score full marks for this question. A small number of candidates suggested that any therapy/treatment with a psychologist or therapist about the mind is 'psychotherapy', for instance giving cognitive-behaviour therapy as an example, which could not be credited. Psychotherapy is specifically associated with the work of Freud and his followers.
- (b) This question part required two examples, and most candidates answering this question correctly wrote about free association, transference, or dream analysis, often writing detailed and accurate descriptions. A few candidates wrote about the case study of little Hans and these answers were only given credit if how Hans was treated was specifically mentioned. Some candidates were unable to demonstrate any knowledge of psychotherapy and wrote about alternatives, which could not be credited.

Question 14

- (a) Many candidates wrote excellent answers with a high level of detail and understanding included. These answers usually began with a definition, typically that by Griffiths (1995), followed by an outline of the different types of addition and impulse control disorders and often a consideration of the different causes, followed with suggestions for coping and reducing need. Some candidates did this less well and had inaccuracies and a lack of detail. A number of candidates knew very little about this topic area often providing anecdotal responses about either alcoholism or pyromania.
- (b) A common error with the named issue of individual differences is that candidates often made general points, or just examples, rather than including advantages and disadvantages with supporting examples. Although this was done by some candidates at the top end of the mark range in some cases it had minimal negative effect because of the quality of the other issues that were included in their answers. If candidates consider at least three evaluative issues, as is recommended, then any ambiguity in one issue is minimised. Many answers did not consider the named issue.

Question 15

- (a) This question stated that the suggestion made by candidates must be ethical, and all answers were ethical. The best answers investigated fear of pain using the cold-pressor test (which involves a person immersing an arm in a water bath of very cold water/ice). As a person can withdraw their arm at any point, using this measure of pain is ethical. Some candidates suggested using an observation to watch what happened when the person with agliophobia was taken to a hospital where patients were in pain and some credit was given to these answers.
- (b) Candidates had to describe a case study of a person with a phobia and most candidates wrote about little Hans or little Albert, from year 1 of the course. A few candidates legitimately wrote about the case study by Saavedra and Silverman (2002), which appears on the revised syllabus, and is about a boy with a fear of buttons. Marks were determined by the quality and detail in the answer.

Question 16

- (a) This question required candidates to investigate whether a person has obsessions. Candidates could choose any method. Most candidates chose to conduct an interview or questionnaire where they could ask the person about their obsessive thoughts. Strong answers showed good methodological understanding, but weaker answers were unable to demonstrate much knowledge of either questionnaire or interview design. A few candidates suggested conducting an observation, incorrectly so because an observation can only be of compulsive behaviour and not obsessive thoughts.
- (b) This question part required a description of both the biomedical and cognitive-behavioural explanations of obsessive-compulsive disorder. This meant that two descriptions, each worth three marks, were required. Many candidates did this quite successfully, but some candidates could only describe one. As was the case for answers to other questions in **Section C** like this, some candidates wrote single sentence answers and again, these brief answers are not sufficient for full marks; some detail is required.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

- (a) Some candidates were unable to demonstrate knowledge of this term, and their responses were limited to common-sense answer showing no psychological knowledge. Other candidates wrote about group conflict, including different types and causes. Candidates needed to address the full term, *managing* group conflict, to gain full marks for this question.
- (b) For this sub-section the syllabus lists 'e.g. Thomas (1976)' and most candidates wrote about two or more of the five conflict resolution strategies Thomas outlines. Most common answers included collaboration (where there is cooperation between the two sides until an agreed solution is reached) and compromise (where both sides agree to find a middle ground on which both can agree). Some candidates wrote about strategies other than those outlined by Thomas and this was creditable where the strategy was about managing conflict and based on psychological knowledge.

Question 18

- (a) There were many very strong answers which covered a good range of different aspects including physical, psychological and temporal aspects of the work environment, and many answers included appropriate detail from the ergonomics sub-topic. There were some weak anecdotal responses about this topic area. General comments about the working environment will gain very limited credit unless candidates are able to support their points with psychological knowledge and understanding.
- (b) Evaluations for this question followed the same pattern as for other **Section B part (b)** answers and answers covered the entire mark range. Some candidates only evaluated the named issue of generalisations, which limited the credit available. Notably, generalisations in this instance, referred to generalising from one organisation to another, rather from a specific experiment. Centres are reminded that **Section B (b)** questions give one named issue which must be included in the *range* of evaluation issues.

Question 19

- (a) Answers to this question were generally weak because most candidates did not address the terms reliability and validity on which the question focuses. It is essential that candidates are familiar with these terms. For example, the reliability of any measure can be tested using test-retest and validity can be assessed by comparing the result with an existing measure.
- (b) A range of other ways to appraise worker performance was considered. Many candidates focused on a structured interview, for example, where closed questions with a rating scale could be asked of all workers and so their scores compared. Answers like this, full of appropriate terminology, nearly always scored full marks. Other candidates suggested simply 'interviews' but needed to provide elaboration to gain higher marks. Some candidates repeated description of rating scales, which could not be credited, as it did not answer the question set.

Question 20

- (a) Answers in response to this question consisted of two types of answer. Firstly, some candidates suggested an experiment with a 'before' and 'after' design where a baseline measure could be taken before attendance at the training course and then a second measure taken after it. Secondly, candidates suggested a design comparing the effectiveness of managers not trained with the effectiveness of managers who had been trained. The quality of the methodological knowledge determined marks. In these examples, the strongest answers included the IV, DV, controls, the design, and the sample amongst other points.
- (b) Most candidates could describe a theory of leadership effectiveness and many candidates gained full marks for this question. The theory by Fiedler was common, although other appropriate answers also received credit. A small number of candidates incorrectly wrote about leadership style, often writing about democratic and autocratic styles.