

# PSYCHOLOGY

---

Paper 9698/11

Core Studies 1

## General comments

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as the research method or experimental design used, samples, controls, procedures, results, conclusions and various aspects of evaluation such as ethics and advantages. However, some parts of **Section A** of this paper presented particular challenges to some candidates, notably **Questions 6** and **11(a)**. In **Section A**, the candidates' knowledge of the procedure and results of some, but not all, studies was good but many candidates could have improved their performance by understanding how the studies illustrate specific aspects of methodology, such as the research method and experimental design, and the way that controls were imposed. Although some candidates were aware of such aspects of the studies, in general many candidates could improve by having a better general understanding of methodology in psychology so that they can see how each study illustrates these principles.

Candidates could offer good responses in **Section B**, especially in **Question 16**, writing essays that were relevant and focused on evaluation rather than description, and with appropriate reference to the content of the chosen study.

## Comments on specific questions

### *Section A*

#### Question 1

- (a) Some candidates answered this question well. However, some candidates attempted to describe the DV. Since the question asked for ways that the extraneous variables were controlled, the way the DV was measured is not an appropriate answer so could not earn any marks.
- (b) Similarly, some candidates answered this question well. Again, some candidates described the DV so could not earn any marks. It is important that candidates understand three key elements of any experiment: the IV, the DV and the extraneous variables that were controlled. They should be able to identify these in each of the core studies that are experimental in design.

#### Question 2

- (a) Some candidates were able to draw a reasonable conclusion about the risk of miscarriages of justice if eyewitnesses provide false information and are able to convince a jury that their memory is correct because it feels to real to them, so that there is therefore a need for caution in the judicial system with regard to such testimonies. However, other answers were confused, suggesting that it could be helpful because we could implant a false memory into someone so that they could be a witness and get a criminal found not guilty.
- (b) This question was answered quite well, with many candidates correctly identifying that a jury would be unable to tell which 'facts' are true and which are not.

### Question 3

- (a) Some candidates were able to answer this question well, often by demonstrating a full understanding of reliability in the context of the eyes test, although this was not the only possible way to answer the question. Some candidates also related their answer to participants with autism, observing that they might find a static eyes test less intimidating.
- (b) Many candidates were able to answer this question well, with most describing aspects of increased realism or ecological validity, although there was a tendency for candidates to say it is 'ecologically valid as it is more realistic to life', without saying why, i.e. just providing a brief definition of ecological validity without answering the question. Some other candidates, however, made other plausible suggestions such as that moving eyes might have been better at gaining attention.

### Question 4

- (a) This question was generally well answered, with most candidates offering controls or a specially set up environment and a number were able to offer the role of IVs and DVs.
- (b) Some candidates were able to relate their answer here to the study, so earned marks. Many candidates simply restated their answer to part (a) in part (b), saying that this was an experiment without explicitly linking their response to Held and Hein's study.

### Question 5

- (a) This question was generally well answered, although a few candidates suggested that all participants were told frequently throughout the study that they could leave whenever they wanted, which is not correct.
- (b) This question was generally well answered, although few candidates were able to link their answer to the idea that the participants were unable to withdraw as a result of their dependency or pathological prisoner syndrome.

### Question 6

- (a) This question was not well answered. It is important that candidates have a general understanding of concepts in research methods such as experimental designs. Although some candidates were able to identify that the experimental design was repeated measures, they then typically struggled to explain this in relation to the study.
- (b) The strongest answers related the disadvantages to the study, although weaker answers gave generic disadvantages of a repeated measures design.

### Question 7

- (a) This question was generally very well answered, with many candidates identifying one or more of the key roles of receiving instructions from Freud, observing or questioning Hans, and reporting back to Freud.
- (b) This question was also very well answered. Some of the strongest answers explained that since Freud thought that Hans viewed his father as a rival, he may not have been a good person for little Hans to confide in, so his answers may have been given out of fear rather than the truth.

### Question 8

- (a) Part (a) was generally answered just with 'break', although some candidates gave accurate details about the length of the break. Others gave irrelevant details about the procedure in general. Some candidates offered appropriate alternative explanations relating to the idea that each trial only lasted a very short time.
- (b) Some candidates misinterpreted this question, and instead of explaining ways to overcome the potential risk of infants having a bias towards one side, they gave ways to overcome bias in the mother.

### Question 9

This question was often well answered, with candidates offering sufficient accurate detail about the sample. Occasionally candidates explained how the sample was obtained, i.e. described the sampling method. Other candidates who misunderstood the question explained the 'good motive–bad outcome' aspect of the design.

### Question 10

- (a) This question was generally well answered, although there was some confusion between the misinformed and uninformed conditions. Even when candidates were able to give accurate details of a (real) effect, they missed the opportunity to gain further credit by observing that this information was indeed correct.
- (b) This question was also generally well answered, although again when candidates were able to give accurate details of a misinformed effect, they missed the opportunity to gain further credit by observing that this information was indeed incorrect.

### Question 11

- (a) Although some candidates were able to answer this question, there were few responses gaining full credit. Most candidates simply wrote about seeing eyes moving when people were asleep.
- (b) Many candidates were able to identify appropriate measures of variable in Dement and Kleitman's study, some by giving examples, others by using types of data (qualitative and quantitative), either of which could earn full marks.

### Question 12

- (a) Part (a) was generally answered very well, with many candidates gaining full marks as they were able to describe appropriate details of the sample.
- (b) The answers to part (b) were more varied. There were many excellent answers, some of these arguing for good generalisability (to a limited population), other arguing for poor generalisability (to a wider population). Some good answers based their response on the generalisability of neurological evidence, which showed thorough understanding of the study.

### Question 13

Many candidates gave appropriate answers to this question, identifying the two key reasons, upon which stronger candidates were then able to elaborate. Some candidates incorrectly attempted to justify the choice of females in terms of their preference for males in general, which could not earn any marks.

### Question 14

There were many good answers to this question, covering a range of differences between the parts of the letter. However, quite a few candidates wrote about the differences between Eve White and Eve Black with no reference to the letter.

### Question 15

- (a) Candidates were often able to offer adequate partial answers, observing that the participants were required to do questionnaires, and many were able to offer details of these tasks, earning full marks.
- (b) This question was also answered well, though not so often as part (a). Better answers typically described problems with order effects, although it was not necessary to identify them as such in order to earn full marks here.

**Section B**

**Question 16**

The most popular choice here was Milgram, although Held and Hein and Piliavin et al. were also chosen by some candidates. All studies produced a range of answers in terms of quality but in general this essay was answered well. Responses were often focused on ethics, although the better essays tended to cover both ethical and methodological problems. Unfortunately, some candidates wrote about both strengths and weaknesses, thus spending a lot of time on material that could not earn marks. In addition, some used a lot of time describing the study in detail, which again was not creditworthy. A minority of candidates (using the Held and Hein study) applied human ethical principles to animal studies, which is inappropriate.

**Question 17**

Although this question was not answered quite as well overall as **Question 16**, there were still some very good responses. Each study was chosen by at least some candidates, although many candidates made little reference to the study they had chosen. In weaker responses there was a tendency to introduce irrelevant or descriptive material into the essay that was not focused on either the advantages and disadvantages of collecting qualitative data, or how these strengths and weaknesses were illustrated by the collection of data in the chosen study.

# PSYCHOLOGY

---

Paper 9698/12  
Core Studies 1

## Key messages

- Candidates should write their answers in the order in which they appear on the question paper.
- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 10 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- For 2-mark questions with the command 'describe' in **Section A**, candidates should ensure they provide enough detail to score both marks, rather than a partial, very brief or vague answer. Detail is not required for questions with the command 'identify'.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to write an answer to ensure that the answer to each part is different.
- Candidates should read questions carefully, ensuring their answers address the questions. Some candidates scan the question and make an incorrect assumption about what the question is asking.
- Candidates should quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers can ever achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using the psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates that appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.
- Candidates should ensure they know which author(s) conducted which core studies.

## General comments

Candidates should read each question carefully and ensure they follow the advice given in the key messages above. If this advice is followed it will result in marks being gained because of good examination technique, which can improve an overall grade.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) Most candidates were able to score full marks in response to this question requiring two examples of speech disturbances. A wide range of possible answers was mentioned, including mumbling, saying 'ah' and 'hmm' between words, stuttering, repeating sentences and changing sentences. Mere identification of a correct example was sufficient to gain credit. A number of candidates confused speech disturbances with pauses. Pauses, along with blinking, gaze aversion, etc. are different observational categories from speech disturbances and inclusion of any category that was not a speech disturbance scored no marks.
- (b) This question asked for the results for speech disturbances, and no other observational category, from both truth *and* lies. A few candidates only wrote about the result for one of these and so could not gain full credit. Other candidates opted for a general answer, such as 'truth and deceptive data were about the same', which also could not gain full credit. Yet other candidates gave very precise data, stating that for truths there were 5.22 disturbances per 100 words, whereas for deceptions there were 5.34 disturbances per 100 words. These precise answers gained full credit.

## Question 2

- (a) A small number of candidates did not know what the visual cliff was, confusing it with the carousel, and scored no marks. Other candidates stated that the observers recorded whether the kittens stepped (crossed, walked or descended were also creditworthy) over the deep or shallow side and knowing that the kittens had a choice over which side to use gained candidates full marks. A few candidates chose to draw the visual cliff. Sometimes this supported the answer and sometimes it did not. If candidates are required to draw or sketch, the question will clearly state it.
- (b) It was difficult for the kittens to see the glass firstly because both the shallow and the deep side had patterned surfaces, and secondly because both of them were lit from below. Many candidates included both these features in their answer and scored full marks. Others mentioned patterns or lights but not both, and some believed that only one of the surfaces was patterned or lit. Such answers could not gain full credit. A few candidates incorrectly stated that the kittens could not see anything because they were blind due to their limited exposure.

## Question 3

- (a) This question required two characteristics of the *voice* of the experimenter to be identified. Statements such as 'he was a 31-year-old high school Biology teacher' could not gain credit because this describes the experimenter rather than his voice. Credit was given for 'his voice', i.e. that he was male, that his voice was stern (authoritative, firm, commanding or assertive were equally acceptable) and that it was not impolite. Identification of any two of these characteristics gained full credit.
- (b) Some candidates did not gain any credit here because, as for part (a), they did not read the question carefully. Answers such as 'high school Biology teacher' and 'impassive manner' are not features of his appearance so could not be rewarded. Acceptable answers, written by most candidates, were that he was male, 31 years of age, and wearing a grey technicians' (or lab) coat. Whilst 'lab coat' (or 'white lab coat') was acceptable, use of 'white coat' was not.

## Question 4

- (a) Many candidates provided answers that were too general and often such answers were nothing more than a specific example from the Haney et al. study. The question required an explanation, and one that was based on the results of the Haney et al. study. This means that the perfect answer would refer to the situational hypothesis, where prisoners will develop strategies to help them cope; prisoners find reasons to hate the 'system'. Awareness of this earned candidates full marks, whilst more general reference to the situational hypothesis could only gain limited credit.
- (b) This question required one piece of evidence which supported the situational explanation provided in part (a). Some candidates did this and scored full marks, but many other candidates gave an example from the study which did not support the situational explanation and so did not receive any credit.

## Question 5

- (a) This question required two components: sampling method *and* sample size. Some candidates only answered one of these components and so could not gain full credit. Candidates are always advised to read and answer *all* parts of a question. The sampling method was opportunity sampling. A number of candidates incorrectly stated 'random sampling', making the common error that 'random' means participants who are chosen because they are there, rather than everyone in a population having an equal chance of participating. The sample size was 4450, which most candidates answered without a problem.
- (b) Candidates stated here that this technique isn't representative and the implication of this is that the sample cannot generalise to all people in New York (or further afield), and neither to rush hour or weekend travellers. It was necessary to elaborate on the basic 'is not representative' to gain full credit.

### Question 6

- (a) Many candidates do not know what an attitude is, as shown by the large number of incorrect guesses, with many candidates thinking that an attitude is behaviour. A large number of candidates wrote, for example, 'an attitude is when a person behaves...', and 'an attitude is when a person discriminates...'. An attitude is a thought, belief or opinion and *not* behaviour. Prejudice is a negative attitude and discrimination is behaviour resulting from that negative attitude.
- (b) What indicated intergroup discrimination, as this question required, was when the boys gave more points to members of their group, maximising the difference between the points between their own group and the out-group. The allocation of points was the behaviour (discrimination) which resulted from the negative attitude (prejudice) to maximise the difference.

### Question 7

- (a) In order to gain maximum credit, candidates merely had to identify the two people who observed the pre-study behaviour of the children in the nursery school. The correct answer was 'the experimenter' (which may have been Bandura himself, or Ross) and 'a nursery school teacher'. Two experimenters or two teachers was incorrect and only gained partial credit. A few candidates thought that the model was the observer, confusing the pre-study observation with the test room observation.
- (b) This is another question which required two parts to the answer. Some candidates only answered one part and so could not gain maximum credit. The first part could be answered with a simple 'behind a one-way mirror'. This was not a two-way mirror because the children could not see the observers. Acceptable answers to the second part of the question included 'so that the children did not know they were being observed', or 'to avoid demand characteristics of the children knowing they were being observed'.

### Question 8

- (a) The correct answer to this question is that libido is a normally positive source of motivation or a drive. Candidates who wrote 'sexual energy' needed to elaborate in order to gain maximum credit. Many candidates did not correctly define the term, with some candidates believing that libido referred to Hans' penis, to Dr A, a horse, or even Hans' mother.
- (b) This question was answered poorly by most candidates. Initially Hans' libido was centred on his mother. As time passed the focus changed from motivating this love of his mother (and, as a consequence, masturbation) to an anxiety about her (in the form of anxiety/phobia) before being returned to normal.

### Question 9

- (a) This question also required candidates to address two components within the question to score full marks. Firstly candidates had to describe the stimuli in study 3 and then explain how they differed from those in studies 1 and 2. Most candidates provided correct answers when stating that photographs of infants were used for stimuli in study 3 whereas photographs of adults were used in studies 1 and 2. A few candidates confused study 2 and study 3, thinking that photographs of black adults were used in study 3.
- (b) The conclusion to study 3 was that infants can discriminate between attractive and unattractive babies' faces and prefer attractive ones, even though they have had little experience of seeing babies' faces. Answers then required some elaboration, such as 'suggesting that this is inherited', to gain maximum credit.

### Question 10

- (a) This question required candidates to think and apply methodological knowledge. Candidates had to mention both an experiment and a case study as part of their answer to score full marks. Candidates who stated nothing more than 'an experiment has many participants' could only gain limited credit. Further elaboration, such as 'in contrast with a case study which has just one', was required to gain full marks. Other acceptable answers included the difference in the number of controls that could be applied, or that an experiment typically produces quantitative data and a case study typically produces qualitative data.
- (b) This question required two components to be addressed in order to score full marks. Many candidates only addressed one component and so credit was limited. The question firstly asked *why* it was better to use an experiment. This aspect was addressed with little difficulty, with candidates mentioning the controlling of variables or the ability to obtain a wider sample from which to generalise. Candidates then had to relate the strengths of an experiment to the Nelson study ('in this study'), such as giving an example, rather than writing about a strength of an experiment that could apply to any study. Candidates are advised to read all parts of every question.

### Question 11

- (a) Most candidates were able to list four different controls, thus gaining maximum marks. By far the most popular were the 'no alcohol' and 'no caffeine' instructions. Other possible answers were to eat normally and to arrive at the lab just before their normal bedtime. A few candidates misread the question and gave general controls, such as 'all woken up by a doorbell' and 'all record dreams into a tape recorder'. These answers were not credited because they were not part of the instructions given to participants *prior to the study* as the question requested.

### Question 12

- (a) There were three types of answer provided here: those candidates scoring no marks who thought the questionnaire asked about driving experience or handedness; those candidates who provided two entirely correct pieces of information; and those who provided partially correct answers which gained limited credit. The source of confusion was that many candidates wrote about individual landmarks the taxi drivers had *not* visited, whereas the correct answer was 'individual landmarks (from a list of 20 world-famous ones) they had visited in person and could visualise (in their mind's eyes)'.  
(b) Some candidates wrote ambiguous answers stating that there was *no* medical history, when they probably meant that there was no abnormal medical history. This though was too vague for any credit to be awarded because acknowledgement that they were normal was needed. In relation to the Maguire et al. study, what was important was that the taxi drivers had no previous psychiatric or neurological illness, with both of these needed to gain maximum marks.

### Question 13

- (a) Candidates needed to name the experimental design and then describe it in order to gain maximum marks. Many candidates correctly identified the design as 'repeated measures'. A few incorrectly stated 'independent groups'. It is worth candidates knowing the experimental design of all studies which are experiments. Many candidates went on to describe the repeated measures design correctly by stating that it is where there are the same participants in each condition of the independent variable. Some candidates muddled repeated measures and independent groups and a few described the independent variable.
- (b) Like **Question 10(b)** this question also ended with 'in this study', so candidates not relating their answer to 'this study' could not gain maximum credit. Some candidates scored no marks at all because they confused the type of experimental design. On the other hand many candidates gained maximum credit for giving a disadvantage and making reference to the study.



#### Question 14

- (a) A few candidates could not provide an answer, or made a guess. Many of those that did provide a correct answer often only gained partial credit – for example, ‘to see if psychiatrists can tell the sane from the insane’ – because the crucial word ‘context’ was absent. Rosenhan wanted to look at diagnosis of sane/insane in a hospital context and so candidates including this crucial piece of information gained maximum credit.
- (b) To be able to generalise to other hospitals, Rosenhan went to more than one hospital, and he included 12 different ones in the sample. In addition, the hospitals were in 5 different states on both east and west coasts of the United States; some were old and some were new; some had good staff–patient ratios whilst others had poor ratios. Some were privately funded whilst others were State or university funded. Candidates who stated that ‘there were 12 hospitals’ then needed to *explain* the ‘range’ by, for example, saying what the benefit of 12 different hospitals was in order to gain full marks.

#### Question 15

This question required two goals the BDD patients were encouraged to develop and full and correct answers were required for maximum credit. For example, ‘to use different mirrors’ is correct, but the full answer is ‘to use different mirrors and lights rather than sticking to one which they trust’. There were nine goals mentioned in the study itself, so candidates had ample choice. Some candidates incorrectly wrote about ways in which those with BDD used mirrors as part of their daily activity rather than using mirrors to help reduce their BDD.

#### Section B

#### Question 16

Many answers merely described one of the named studies. Such responses cannot gain any marks, because the question does not ask for a *description* of a study. Candidates are required to *evaluate*, which is to consider strengths and weaknesses of a named issue. In this instance the named issue was validity and, despite this being a very common term in psychology, very few candidates gained maximum credit. Some candidates didn't know the term and guessed; others used validity and reliability interchangeably. The few candidates who knew the term did score good marks, but needed to address other necessary aspects of the question, such as providing two strengths and two weaknesses and relating each to the study itself. Some candidates identified (and described) many different types of validity but did not evaluate (i.e. say whether they were being used as a strength or weakness).

#### Question 17

Many candidates made similar types of error to those answering **Question 16**. Some appeared to have no understanding of the term psychometrics. There were those who merely described the named study, or who did not consider strengths and weaknesses, and there were those who considered either strengths or weaknesses but not both.

It is essential that there is more focus on exactly what is required for both **Questions 16** and **17**. These questions carry 20 marks, which is a significant proportion of the paper, and so a low score on these questions has a significant impact on the overall grade. To be successful, candidates should know all the themes (issues, debates, etc.) as they appear in the syllabus. Candidates should know two strengths and weaknesses of each ‘theme’ and candidates should be able to provide illustrative examples from each of the core studies if they are applicable. Attention to this would not only improve marks for this paper; the skills would also transfer to Paper 2 where whole questions are asked about the same themes (issues, debates, etc.) and indeed to Paper 3 where questions there use these same themes.

# PSYCHOLOGY

---

Paper 9698/13  
Core Studies 1

## General comments

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as procedures, controls, data collection, results, conclusions and various aspects of evaluation such as validity, reliability and applications. However, some parts of **Section A** of this paper presented particular challenges to some candidates, notably **Questions 2** and **15(a)**. In **Section A**, the candidates' knowledge of the procedure and results of some, but not all, studies was good but many candidates could have improved their performance by understanding how the studies illustrated specific aspects of methodology, such as the way that variables were measured. Although some candidates were aware of the contexts of the studies, this is also an area in which many could improve. The reasons for each study being done are described in the introduction to each paper and are important for understanding why each piece of research was conducted.

Candidates could offer good responses in **Section B**, especially in **Question 16**, writing essays that were relevant and focused on evaluation rather than description, and with appropriate reference to the content of the chosen study.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) The instruction 'what is meant by' was asking for a definition. Although many candidates attempted to define reliability, for example by describing comparisons between observers or asking two people to use the same checklist to make observations, weaker answers simply repeated the word 'reliable' from the question.
- (b) Stronger answers to this part of the question related the explanation to the study in specific and detailed ways, such as by saying that samples from every suspect were compared by both coders to see if their observations corresponded.

#### **Question 2**

This question was generally not well answered, although a small number of candidates were able to identify differences beyond those anticipated (i.e. the aim of comparing recall with that of the parents rather than to investigate childhood memories and of hospitalisation versus lost-in-a-mall scenarios) such as that Hyman et al. used a larger sample of participants and used a wider range of scenarios.

#### **Question 3**

- (a) Many candidates gave good answers here, although there was also a tendency for candidates to include irrelevant descriptions about there only being two choices which did not earn marks. Less successful candidates repeated the stem, simply suggesting that there was a 'problem with understanding words', which was not an explanation, so did not enable them to earn marks.
- (b) Those candidates who had misunderstood part (a) and had described the limitation of two choices tended to continue with their misunderstanding in this part also. However, those who had simply restated the question in (a) (earning no marks there), were able to gain marks here if they described how participants could use the glossary or 'look up meanings'.

#### Question 4

- (a) A small number of candidates mistakenly described the carousel apparatus but the majority were able to answer this well, gaining full marks.
- (b) This question was often answered well, with some candidates giving excellent answers, referring to the idea that the kittens would be able to gain experience of visually guided behaviour if they weren't kept in the dark.

#### Question 5

- (a) This question part was typically well answered, with the majority of candidates being aware that it was the teacher who was being observed and that this was done from a separate room/through a one-way mirror. Surprisingly few mentioned instead that photographs were taken.
- (b) Those candidates who reported observation data tended to gain marks easily, although a significant number misunderstood the question and reported the results relating to the voltage reached.

#### Question 6

Although many candidates were able to make a reasonable attempt here, there was a tendency to report the findings of the study rather than answer the question. Those candidates who answered well were able to explain reasons such as the failure to rehabilitate the prisoners and their return to crime upon release.

#### Question 7

- (a) There was a range of answers describing, with varying degrees of success, the problem with one individual 'victim' not being representative and therefore the findings being potentially invalid if they were a function of that individual rather than of their race. However, candidates also gave creditworthy answers relating to the racial split of the participants which, being 45% black, meant that having only one black victim was unrepresentative so the conclusions might be ethnocentric.
- (b) This question elicited answers across the full range of marks. Candidates often earned credit for identifying that helping differed when the victim was drunk, but less often gave an explanation, such as that the passengers thought that the individual was responsible for their own fate when they were drunk, or that they felt more vulnerable when the drunk was of a different race.

#### Question 8

- (a) Many candidates gave only partial answers in part (a), hinting at the idea of biological predisposition, for example by mentioning testosterone, without describing how this could cause the expected difference. Few candidates considered the idea that social learning might cause the difference, for example from children selectively attending to same-sex models who might be more aggressive for boys (i.e. watching their fathers or aggressive men in the media) compared with less aggressive female models for girls. A small number of candidates did not respond to the 'why' aspect of the question at all.
- (b) Some candidates did not read the question carefully enough and gave findings based on quantitative rather than qualitative data.

#### Question 9

Some candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the theoretical background to this study, correctly identifying the explanations as cognitive and evolutionary. Many candidates gained only limited credit for the general idea of an evolutionary explanation.

### Question 10

- (a) This question was well answered, with candidates responding with an appropriate variant of pulse/heart rate and many also gained credit for elaboration.
- (b) A range of inappropriate findings were given. Commonly these included differences in variables *other than* pulse between Epi groups in the euphoria and anger conditions.

### Question 11

- (a) Although many candidates could give an example of an objective measure from the study, fewer could define the concept. It is important that candidates are aware of the goals of laboratory studies, such as in the control of the way that variables are manipulated and the standardisation of the measurement of variables.
- (b) Although few candidates were able to gain full marks here, there were some excellent answers, including ones suggesting being able to monitor sleep and replace long sleep with efficient short naps, or to use an alarm clock that would rouse them at a time when they would feel most awake, i.e. from REM sleep. Other creditworthy ideas included to overcome sleep disruptions, to avoid distressing nightmares, to avoid sleep terrors, to resolve problems with insomnia, to help people with irregular sleep patterns such as people working shifts, to enable doctors to observe brain-damaged patients in comas to see if their sleep patterns are normal, and to help people to escape from sleep paralysis.

### Question 12

- (a) Some candidates were able to attempt a general description of 'making them the same' but few were able to give clear explanations that the dilution would depend on the strength of the original smell, or that it was important to make them all the same strength to the participants.
- (b) Some candidates were unable to state this simple piece of data. Of those candidates who knew the correct answer, many answers were too brief, simply naming 'gravity' or 'male perfume', without indicating whether this answer related to one or other or both aspects of the question. Such answers could only gain limited credit.

### Question 13

- (a) Some candidates appeared to be guessing here, suggesting 'name' and/or 'occupation', two pieces of information which were specifically *not* given. Nevertheless, many candidates were able to make appropriate suggestions of things that the pseudo-patients did not lie about.
- (b) The majority of candidates were able to report the hearing of voices as a lie, and many also identified a further detail for further credit.

### Question 14

- (a) Although many candidates knew that qualitative data provide detailed, in-depth data, fewer were able to expand on this to say why such data are beneficial. Since this is a key distinction, candidates should be able to argue effectively for the collection of qualitative data.
- (b) Some candidates misread the question here, and their answers inappropriately related to why Thigpen and Cleckley needed to collect qualitative data. Many others, however, answered the question effectively, giving details from the study.

### Question 15

- (a) Many candidates were unable to answer part (a) of this question. Given that the role of the short session is central to the paper, this should be a key piece of information.
- (b) In contrast to part (a), many candidates were able to give good answers here, although some made the misassumption that the BDDs would have both longer and more frequent short sessions than controls, when in fact only the latter was the case: the BDDs' short sessions were more frequent but were very slightly shorter (not significantly so).

### Section B

#### Question 16

For many candidates, this question elicited a good answer in which they were able to offer both appropriate evaluation of the laboratory experiment as a method and to illustrate at least some of this argument with examples from their chosen study. The simplistic assumption that all laboratory experiments automatically lack ecological validity was, however, common. Nevertheless, candidates often went on to successfully describe ways in which their chosen study lacked ecological validity, making the point creditworthy. All three studies were used effectively by some candidates.

#### Question 17

This question was answered less well than **Question 16**, with fewer candidates being able to offer relevant evaluation points about the individual differences approach to psychology or being able to illustrate their answer effectively using the study they had chosen. Nevertheless, there were some good responses. Freud was the most common choice, although effective answers were also given using Dement and Kleitman's study. Those who chose Billington et al. gave the most variable answers, some tackling the question quite effectively.

# PSYCHOLOGY

---

Paper 9698/21

Core Studies 2

## Key messages

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

It is important that candidates are made aware of the issues in psychology as some were unable to identify and/or define the various types of validity 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 also important for this part of the exam that candidates are aware of all the issues listed in the syllabus. Many did not know what either ethnocentrism and/or reliability meant and therefore did very poorly in the parts of the question referring to these issues. In addition, it is important that candidates practise answering these types of questions. Many did not structure their responses appropriately and could not achieve full marks. For example, if the question asks for strengths and weaknesses then four points must be made (two strengths and two weaknesses). Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

### **Section B**

Candidates must write more extended responses in both part **(b)** and part **(c)** of the essay as many gave accurate responses that lacked depth. 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 strong 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 significant minority of candidates answered both questions in **Section B**. When a candidate did this they were awarded the mark for the better of the two answers (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

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

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Section A**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) Most candidates achieved some marks for this question. Popular choices included describing ecological validity, internal/external validity and population validity. Some discussed ethical validity, which is not a type of validity in psychology.
- (b) Most candidates were able to describe a procedure that improved the ecological validity of the Tajfel study. Many candidates could identify a way of measuring intergroup categorisation plus how to separate the groups. A minority wrote out results of their study, which did not achieve any marks. Popular ideas included sport-related and classroom activities. Most candidates focused their response on briefly describing how the alternative study would be carried out and what data would be collected. Many did not include the other details required, such as where the study would take place and who the participants would be. In addition, candidates needed to ensure the 'what' and 'how' for the procedure were very clear.

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question but received no credit for this, as this information was required in response to **Question 1(c)**.

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

Many discussed issues about the ethics of studying participants who are under 18 as well as discussing the ecological validity of the alternative idea.

A few gave well-developed points that achieved very high marks, referring directly to their alternative idea. Many only briefly identified issues and did not refer back to the context of their own study.

#### **Question 2**

- (a) The majority of candidates achieved at least partial credit for their response to this question. Most were able to give a very brief definition of ethnocentrism. Some achieved full marks and had a good understanding of the term.
- (b) Most candidates achieved partial credit for their responses. Candidates referred to same-race helping, although many did not mention that this was only seen in the drunk condition. Candidates also referred to men helping more than women. Few were able to achieve full marks as they could not say why the results showed ethnocentrism.
- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved some marks in this section. Most were able to describe one strength and one weakness of conducting research in one culture/country. Many referred to the study being less expensive and also more generalisable to the country the study was conducted within. For the weaknesses some referred to the lack of generalisability to other cultures.

Many candidates still do not attempt the 'plural nature' of these types of questions. Candidates need to describe two strengths and two weaknesses to achieve the higher marks.

- (d) In the main, this question was not answered well by many candidates because they did not understand the issue of reliability. Many assessed the validity or the ethics of the study instead. There were a few who did address reliability and gave good, well-structured responses that referred back to the controls used in the Piliavin et al. study as well as the issues with the study being conducted in the natural environment.

**Section B**

**Question 3**

- (a) The vast majority of candidates achieved full marks for this question. They could identify an ethical issue and give a definition of this issue.
- (b) Candidates seemed well prepared for this question. Most were able to describe an ethical issue raised in each of the studies and gained further credit for giving details of how the guideline was either broken or met in each of the named studies. Popular responses included focusing on the harm and distress caused in the studies as well as the lack of informed consent from the participants. Candidates found it most difficult to discuss an ethical issue with the Loftus and Palmer study. Most raised the issue of informed consent or deception but then needed to mention what the participants were initially told was the purpose of the study.
- (c) Many candidates identified at least one advantage of making studies ethical. Some were able to identify two or three ideas but rarely gave any evidence to back up their points. Popular advantages included the lack of harm to participants, being able to recruit participants more easily in the future and raising the status of psychology.

**Question 4**

- (a) Many who attempted this question achieved credit for stating that a snapshot study is a brief study. Some achieved full marks by giving an example of the timeframe of the study (e.g. one hour).
- (b) Candidates did not perform well on this question. Many gave general descriptions of some of the procedures of the studies but could not describe how the snapshot method was used in each of the named studies. Some understood the requirements of the question really well and gave a focused response that achieved high marks.
- (c) For this question, candidates needed to identify and discuss three problems with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many were able to describe one or two problems, such as the issues with snapshot studies not showing development over time or difficulties with collecting detailed data. Many did not link their responses to a study and so 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. Many found it difficult to describe the features of a laboratory experiment in part **(a)** rather than evaluate a laboratory experiment. 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 practise answering these types of questions. Many did not structure their responses appropriately and could not achieve full marks. For example, if the question asks for strengths and weaknesses then four points must be made (two strengths and two weaknesses). Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

### **Section B**

Candidates must write more extended responses in both part **(b)** and part **(c)** of the essay as many gave accurate responses that lacked depth. 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 strong 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 small minority of candidates answered both questions in **Section B**. When a candidate did this they were awarded the mark for the better of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to the questions in **Section A** where there is no choice of question. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in part **(c)** of their **Section B** essay to achieve higher marks. **Question 3** and **Question 4** were equally popular with candidates.

## Comments on specific questions

### Section A

#### Question 1

- (a) Most candidates achieved some marks for this question. Most knew what is meant by a laboratory experiment. There was a good deal of reference to the concept of controls. However, a significant number of candidates spent time evaluating laboratory experiments rather than describing them.
- (b) Most candidates were able to describe a procedure that was an attempt at a case study that measured aggression. Popular ideas included doing a study over a number of years where either the child's parent or teacher recorded the aggressive behavior of the child in their natural environment.

However, it was rare to find a fully replicable procedure. Candidates tended not to refer to how the sample would be obtained. Many wrote about interviewing participants but did not give any indication of what questions they would be asked, or wrote about observing behaviours but gave few specific details of the types of behaviour being looked for. A significant number of candidates suggested unethical procedures with children being put in somewhat frightening situations. Some candidates outlined a sample that was too large to be used in a case study.

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question but received no credit for this, as this information was required in response to **Question 1(c)**.

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

Many discussed issues about the ethics of studying participants who are under 18 as well as discussing the ecological validity of the alternative idea. Other popular points included generalisability, detailed data and subject attrition.

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

#### Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates achieved at least partial credit for their response to this question. Most were able to give a very brief definition of longitudinal method. Some achieved full marks, often by giving an example of the time period of a longitudinal study.
- (b) Most candidates achieved partial credit for their responses. Candidates were aware that the Freud study went on for a long time and many described how it investigated the development of the Oedipus complex in little Hans. Some described the correct length of the study. Many believed the study continued until Hans was an adult, which is incorrect and not a part of the original study.
- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved some marks in this section. Most were able to describe at least one strength and one weakness of the longitudinal method. Many referred to the study being very detailed and also showing development over time. For the weaknesses, some referred to the lack of generalisability, subject attrition and the time-consuming nature of this method.

Many candidates described two strengths and two weaknesses to achieve the higher marks.

- (d) Many candidates described a good balance of ways in which the Freud study was ethical or unethical, although explicit reference to the study was a little lacking. Many candidates saw the study having aspects of being both ethical and unethical. A significant minority were confused about the difference between ethical and unethical.

**Section B**

**Question 3**

- (a) Many candidates achieved full marks for this question. Brief answers that did not include the interaction of people within or between groups gained only limited credit.
- (b) This question was well answered by many candidates. Some gave descriptions of the procedure in the studies rather than the physical set-up. The Haney, Banks and Zimbardo and Milgram studies tended to be best described with reference to the specific rooms used and in some cases the clothing of the experimenter (Milgram) or the guards/prisoners (Haney, Banks and Zimbardo).
- (c) Most candidates identified many problems with investigating social processes. Popular points included ethics, ecological validity and generalisability. Some candidates referred back to the core studies as evidence to back up their points. However, many did not do this and therefore achieved lower marks.

**Question 4**

- (a) Many who attempted this question achieved partial credit for stating that qualitative data are detailed data or describing how qualitative data can be collected (e.g. via a self report). Many achieved full marks by giving an example of qualitative data or a more extended response giving both a definition and describing how qualitative data can be collected.
- (b) Candidates performed poorly on this question. Many gave general descriptions of some of the procedures of the studies but did not describe the qualitative data in each of the named studies. Some understood the requirements of the question really well and gave a focused response that achieved high marks. These candidates often described the dreams in the Dement and Kleitman study, details of Eve's life experiences for the Thigpen and Cleckley study and specific self-reports made by the participants in the Loftus and Pickrell study.
- (c) For this question, candidates needed to identify and discuss three problems with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many were able to describe one or two problems and included points related to interpreter bias and also difficulties in analysing the data. Many did not link their responses to a study and so 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 describe the features of different types experiment in part **(a)** rather than evaluate the different types of experiments. 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 practise answering these types of questions. Many did not structure their responses appropriately and so could not achieve full marks. For example, if the question asks candidates to compare and contrast, at least one comparison and one contrast must be made. It is also important for this part of the exam that candidates are aware of all the issues listed in the syllabus. Many did not know what reductionism meant and therefore did very poorly in part **(d)**, which referred to this issue.

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)** in order to achieve higher marks.

## General comments

The marks achieved by candidates sitting this examination covered the whole spectrum of the mark scheme. Many provided strong 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**. When a candidate did this they were awarded the mark for the better of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to the questions in **Section A** where there is no choice of question. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in part **(c)** of their **Section B** essay to achieve higher marks. **Question 3** and **Question 4** were equally popular with candidates.

## Comments on specific questions

### Section A

#### Question 1

- (a) Most candidates did well on this question and achieved high marks. Many identified and described different types of experiments, including laboratory experiments, field experiments and quasi/natural experiments. A few confused field and quasi experiments and did not gain marks for the descriptions given. However, a significant number of candidates spent time evaluating the different types of experiments rather than describing them.
- (b) Most candidates were able to describe a procedure using a suitable questionnaire that only had minor omissions. Popular ideas included doing a study in a police station where either the suspect, witness or police officers were asked questions about the crime committed. Lying behavior was either measured by the questionnaire when it was the police being questioned or by observations while the suspect/witness completed the questionnaire.

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

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question but received no credit for this, as this information was required in response to **Question 1(c)**.

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

Many discussed issues about the difficulties in measuring lying via a questionnaire, issues of interpreter bias and also the ecological validity of the study.

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) The majority of candidates achieved at least partial credit for their response to this question. Most were able to give a very brief definition of qualitative data. Many achieved full marks, often by giving a more detailed definition or an example of qualitative data.
- (b) Most candidates scored highly for their responses. Candidates were able to describe the content of one of the dreams reported by the participants in the Dement and Kleitman study (e.g. two people throwing tomatoes at each other). A few were confused about the definition of qualitative data and described a quantitative result from the study, which did not gain any marks.
- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved some marks in this section. Many did not address the requirements of the question and described the qualitative and quantitative data in the study. Some gave very detailed evaluation points for both types of data but, again, did not address the question.

A few were aware of the requirements of the question and provided some comparisons and/or contrasts between the types of data. However, many of these candidates did not refer back to the Dement and Kleitman study, or only did so very occasionally, so achieved fewer marks.

- (d) Some candidates responding to this question were aware of what is meant by reductionism. A few referred back to the study and discussed how it was reductionist and also how it was holistic. Some referred to issues such as the scientific nature of the study and the simplistic conclusions drawn by Dement and Kleitman.

A significant minority of candidates did not attempt any answer to this question or gave a very brief response which did not focus on the issue of reductionism.

## Section B

### Question 3

- (a) Most candidates achieved at least partial credit for this question. They were able to describe a brief or sometimes muddled reason why children are used in psychological research. Some candidates gave more detailed and often very clear responses and achieved full marks. Candidates considered how the study of children shows changes in behaviour over time and also how it can help address the nature–nurture debate. Some stated that children have not been exposed to any nurturing, which is not correct and was not given any credit.
- (b) This question was well answered by many candidates. Candidates were able to describe how the data were collected in each of the named studies. Many did not fully describe the data collection and omitted important details from each description. For example, candidates needed to describe the faces used in the Nelson study, the duration of gaze in the Langlois et al. study and also the exact details of the matrices used in the Tajfel study for full marks to be awarded.
- (c) Most candidates identified many problems with using children in psychological research. Popular points included ethics, practical difficulties (e.g. fussing) and difficulties with access to young children. Some candidates referred back to the core studies as evidence to back up their points. However, many did not do this and therefore achieved lower marks.

### Question 4

- (a) Many who attempted this question achieved partial credit for stating that the application of psychology to everyday life refers to how useful the study is in everyday life. To achieve full marks, they needed to give an example of how a study might be useful, or offer a more extended definition of usefulness. Candidates also achieved marks by referring to ecological validity in their response.
- (b) Candidates responded well to this question, although some found it difficult to achieve full marks for each of the named studies. Many gave general descriptions of some of the procedures of the studies but did not focus on how each of the studies is useful.
- Many understood the requirements of the question really well and gave a focused response that achieved high marks. These candidates often described the use of the Bandura study for parents and teachers in terms of exposing children to aggression, the use of the Loftus and Pickrell study by the courts in terms of discrediting eyewitness testimony because of the fragile nature of memory and, finally, the use of the Freud study for therapy in terms of helping children overcome phobias.
- (c) For this question, candidates needed to identify and discuss three advantages with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many were able to describe one or two advantages and included points related to usefulness, raising the status of psychology and ease of recruitment of participants in the future. Many did not link their responses to a study and achieved fewer marks.

# PSYCHOLOGY

---

Paper 9698/31  
Specialist Choices

## Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to the mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 8 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should appreciate that this is a three-hour examination and so it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (parts **(a)** and **(b)**) should take approximately 45–50 minutes and be at least 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 look to 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 only to studies learned for Paper 3, but also to form the basis of their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

## General comments

### **Section A (all options):**

A number of modifications to examination technique could improve marks:

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

### **Section B (all options):**

Question part **(a)** prompted high quality answers with candidates closely following the content of the syllabus. There were some excellent summaries of content that covered an appropriate range of studies.

Question part **(b)**: Candidates need to ensure they know the difference between ‘describe’ and ‘evaluate’. **Section B** question part **(a)** is ‘describe’ and question part **(b)** is ‘evaluate’. Evaluation is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about the evidence that has been described in part **(a)**, rather than an additional description. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and apply and rather than reproduce learning.

Evaluation by candidates can often be divided into three types:

- those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (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), and those who exclude the named issue altogether (who also gain limited marks);
- those who do not evaluate at all (and score no marks) merely describing more information.

For many candidates of the first type, answers could be improved further by clarifying what they write. For example, a candidate might write ‘disruptive behaviour is reliable’ and ‘disruptive behaviour is valid’, both of which have very little meaning. Explanation demonstrates understanding and that a candidate has taken time to think about what is written. This is preferable to reproduction of descriptive detail.

### Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe knowledge/information and the other question part asks a candidate to suggest. Candidates must know the difference between the two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding of what has been learned. A suggestion is to go beyond description and to *think* about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. A suggestion is not something that can be learned beforehand. It is requiring each candidate to think for themselves during the examination.

When a question asks 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 should know five essential features of each method (which are transferrable from Paper 2). Candidates should show their methodological knowledge because many marks can be gained for application of this knowledge in this section.

### Comments on specific questions

#### PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

##### Question 1

- (a) A small number of candidates misinterpreted this question and wrote about teaching styles (what is done by the teacher) rather than learning styles (the way in which a person learns) as the question requested. Most other candidates answered the question in relation to learning styles and often provided good explanations, scoring full marks as a result.
- (b) Some answers were nothing more than guesses which could not be credited. Some candidates described layers without identifying what the layers were and scored limited marks. Most candidates provided some description, with those describing each layer (instructional, informational and cognitive) in brief detail scoring full marks.

##### Question 2

- (a) A wide range of answers were seen with marks covering the entire mark range. Some candidates wrote about Maslow's hierarchy of needs (even drawing Maslow's pyramid) without making a reference to education, despite the question emphasising 'educational performance'. Better answers looked at the different types of motivation, such as intrinsic and extrinsic. These answers also considered various perspectives such as the behaviourist, humanist and cognitivist. Strong answers also considered 'motivation issues' and mentioned work on attribution theory and learned helplessness. Many answers were clearly based on psychological knowledge, evident by the names (and dates) quoted and as a result many answers were awarded full marks.
- (b) The named evaluation issue here was 'humanistic explanations of motivation' and candidates should have included this as one of their range of evaluation issues. To exclude this issue, like any other part (b) answer, restricted marks. A few candidates *described* more information about motivation in this question part rather than *evaluate*, and need to ensure that they know the difference between description and evaluation. At the top end of the mark range candidates considered a range of issues (including the named one) and included all the features that would allow them access to the maximum available marks.

##### Question 3

- (a) This question part asked candidates how they would investigate which co-operative learning technique was most effective. A number of candidates *described* co-operative learning, but needed to suggest an investigation to be credited. Other candidates outlined the basics of some form of study but these answers lacked important methodological knowledge. Strong answers included appropriate methodological knowledge, and drew a conclusion as to which strategy was most effective.



- (b) Some candidates who had described co-operative learning in part (a) rewrote their part (a) answer here. Candidates are always advised to read all question parts before starting to write their answers. Many candidates provided strong answers when describing the main features of co-operative learning and included features such as positive interdependence, face-to-face interaction, social skills and both individual and group accountability.

#### Question 4

- (a) This question part was not a 'suggest an investigation' type, instead it was an 'application' question which is appropriate given the applied nature of the Education option. Strong answers demonstrated a significant amount of knowledge about dyslexia and included a range of its features in the check-list, such as transposing letters. Some candidates did not demonstrate knowledge about dyslexia, focussing instead on the features of attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder and/or other deficits or disabilities. Some candidates knew a little about dyslexia but also referred to dyscalculia and dysgraphia too. **Section C** has a choice of question and so candidates should opt to answer the question that will gain them most marks.
- (b) Strong answers quoted appropriate psychological strategies, the most common being the Alpha-to-Omega strategy. Some candidates showed a lack of understanding and suggested a range of strategies that were inappropriate for a dyslexic child.

### PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

#### Question 5

- (a) The health promotion technique of fear arousal involves a message being presented which scares or creates fear in the audience with the aim of changing some behaviour for the better. Whilst most candidates provided explanations based on this, a few did not and confused fear arousal with that of 'providing information' which does not attempt to create any fear in the audience.
- (b) This question required a description of two studies, so candidates providing only one were could not gain full marks. Most candidates opted to describe the studies by Janis and Feshbach (1953) and Leventhal et al. (1967) and many outlined these two studies clearly and unambiguously, scoring full marks. A few candidates wrote very brief answers and a few muddled detail of each study. A few candidates opted to describe studies other than the two listed above, which was legitimate if they were examples of fear arousal. The most common alternative was the study by Cowpe about chip pan fires which used both fear arousal and providing information.

#### Question 6

- (a) There was a significant number of strong answers which received full marks. Most answers followed the structure of the syllabus, considering firstly verbal and non-verbal communication; secondly different styles and diagnoses; followed at the end of the answer with a consideration of misuse of health services. These answers were often full of appropriate evidence, considering the studies by McKinstry and Wang, McKinlay, Byrne and Long, Robinson and West, and Aleem and Ajarim. These studies are typical examples and if an alternative study is included which is appropriate then equivalent marks are awarded. The mark scheme states 'any appropriate evidence to receive credit'. Weaker answers referred to very few or no appropriate studies, and were largely anecdotal.
- (b) Answers are likely to be stronger if they evaluate by 'evaluation issue' rather than being presented in any other way. Some candidates in response to this question wrote the former type of answer with many scoring full marks. Some candidates covered the named issue only and others did not include it at all. A few candidates did not evaluate at all, instead describing the patient-practitioner relationship.

#### Question 7

- (a) Many candidates took the word 'experiment' to mean 'conduct a study using any method' and a range of incorrect methods were used. Those choosing to design an experiment often failed to include essential methodology, writing only a procedure which is just one component of an experiment. Candidates needed to draw a conclusion at the end of their designed study to make it clear whether sending a reminder is effective or not.

- (b) Candidates should know the term psychological perspective from the syllabus, and they should also know what is meant by 'behavioural techniques' because it is listed under the 'improving adherence' bullet point of the syllabus. Very few candidates answered the question that was set, instead writing answers about improving adherence in general or writing about measures of adherence. To score marks, candidates needed to show that behavioural techniques, based on operant conditioning, such as reinforcers and punishments, can help improve adherence.

#### Question 8

- (a) This application type question required two aspects to be included: a visual rating scale (so anything *verbal* would be inappropriate) and that the scale be applicable to a young child. Most candidates answered this question very well, with most scoring high marks. Many suggested the use of colour with green being no pain and red being most pain, and many candidates suggested the use of smiley, neutral and crying faces to indicate the extent of pain. A few candidates suggested conducting an observation of a child using a 'visual' rating scale. This type of answer was acceptable.
- (b) Acceptable answers included descriptions of (i) a visual analogue scale which has a 10 cm line with the descriptor 'no pain' at one end to 'pain as bad as it could be' at the other; (ii) the box scale which is the same as the visual analogue but with numbers; and (iii) the category (verbal) scale which uses a line with written descriptors. Any answers suggesting a clinical interview or the use of a questionnaire were not able to gain credit.

### PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

#### Question 9

- (a) Candidates who had studied the 'urban renewal and housing design' component of the syllabus were able to explain what was meant by the term 'housing design'. A small number of candidates guessed, often describing an actual house, with rooms for living, cooking and sleeping, showing no psychological knowledge and were not able to gain credit for this.
- (b) This question required a description of a successful housing design project (2 marks) and an unsuccessful housing design project (2 marks). The work of Newman featured prominently for the 'successful' part of the question with answers including description of projects such as Clason Point and Five Oaks. Design features such as opportunities for surveillance were appropriately included. The unsuccessful large-scale Pruitt-Igoe project featured as the unsuccessful example.

#### Question 10

- (a) There were some excellent answers on density and crowding and many answers full marks. The strongest answers included a range of information from the different bullet points of this topic area of the syllabus, including definitions and animal studies, in addition to the effects of crowding on humans. Some strong candidates made the distinction between preventing and coping with the effects of crowding. There were a number of anecdotal answers in response to this question with some candidates writing about their own experiences when in a large crowd. These answers scored very few or no marks.
- (b) The named issue in the evaluation section here was the issue of physiological measures. This is a relevant issue as it is an essential feature in a number of the studies identified on the syllabus. Some candidates didn't consider this named issue, some considered just this issue and some included it as part of a range of issues as the question requested. The strongest answers considered a range of issues, included the advantages and disadvantages of each and supported each with appropriate examples from the studies, and information they had described in part (a).

#### Question 11

- (a) This question was generally not answered well by many candidates, although there were a few superb answers which not only considered the studies by North et al. (as listed on the syllabus) but went beyond these by writing about a few other appropriate studies. The study by North et al. (2003) for example shows that playing classical music in a restaurant led to more money being spent by customers when compared with pop music or no music at all.

- (b) This question part required candidates to design a field experiment. In addition two other components also needed to be addressed: different types of music and how they might affect consumer behaviour. All these requirements should have led candidates to have an independent variable of two or more types of music and a dependent variable of some aspect of consumer behaviour such as amount of money spent on product(s). A small number of candidates used appropriate methodological terminology, but most answers were insufficient in this regard, and were included assertions that could not be tested. Candidates should apply their knowledge of the features of experiments learned for core studies in both Paper 1 and Paper 2 examination questions.

#### Question 12

- (a) This question was not answered well by many candidates. The question required candidates to link their knowledge about systemisers (from the studies by Baron-Cohen and by Billington) to their knowledge of ability to read maps (a key feature of systemisers) from the environmental cognition topic area. Although no specific method was stated in the question, candidates could give a systemising questionnaire to participants and then compare map reading ability (the DV) with those who scored at the top end compared with those who scored at the bottom end (the IV) of the systemising scale.
- (b) Better answers quoted the features outlined by Levine (1982) which included structure mapping and orientation. Many candidates performed better on part (b) than part (a).

### PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

#### Question 13

- (a) For this question part candidates had to describe what is meant by unipolar abnormal affect and then in question part (b) describe bipolar abnormal affect. A few candidates confused the two terms, for which they could not gain credit. Candidates who correctly understood the difference between the two affects were able to clearly describe unipolar disorder (considering 'one side' only) and well understood the characteristics of depression.
- (b) This question part required description of bipolar disorder and so two aspects were required, the extremes of mania and depression. Candidates usually began their answers by distinguishing bipolar from unipolar, then providing a description of the characteristics of depression followed by those of mania. Marks were allocated according to the quality of the description of each aspect. A few candidates considered causes of this disorder which was appropriate and added to the overall quality of the answer.

#### Question 14

- (a) Strong answers were very well prepared and included a wide range of information and detail in their answers, achieving full marks. These answers were very well organised and candidates were able to effectively summarise information to fit into the 20 minutes' time allocation for this question part. Some candidates made occasional errors in the accuracy of knowledge, covered a limited range of information, and showed less understanding.
- (b) Answers for this part (b) question were typical of those for other options with the three main types of answer being evident. More marks will be gained if answers are evaluated by 'evaluation issue' rather than presented in any other way. A number of candidates at the lower end of the mark range merely described the psychoanalytic explanation of phobias and scored no marks, whilst others only evaluated psychoanalytic explanations (rather than considering a range of issues) for limited credit. The best answers considered a range of evaluation issues and for each included appropriate advantages and disadvantages along with relevant examples of studies to support the advantage or disadvantage.

### Question 15

- (a) Candidates here were required to use a questionnaire to investigate knowledge of models of abnormality. Answers varied from those who knew very little about questionnaires to those which included a full range of appropriate features of questionnaires. Strong answers included the type of questionnaire (open or closed), examples of questions (e.g. have you heard of the medical model of abnormality?), how the questions were to be answered (yes/no), how the answers were coded and scored and some wrote about the type of data gathered (quantitative or qualitative). Some candidates seemed unsure about what models of abnormality actually were, whilst the strongest answers showed a good understanding of models as evident in the questions they planned to ask their participants.
- (b) This question part required both the assumptions (3 marks) and treatments (3 marks) of the medical/biological model of abnormality. Most candidates scored full marks, including both parts in their answers and demonstrating both excellent knowledge and very good understanding. A few candidates included assumptions but no treatments and vice versa and scored limited marks.

### Question 16

- (a) Candidates had to suggest an experimental study to investigate which type of schizophrenia is best treated with cognitive-behaviour therapy (CBT). As is often the case with **Section C** questions methodological knowledge (about experiments in this case) was poor. For example if patients have different types of schizophrenia then only an independent experimental design could be used; repeated measures would be impossible, yet very few candidates appreciated this important facet. On the positive side many candidates appreciated that a longitudinal study would be needed, the appropriateness of CBT being determined by the improvement (or recovery) of the patient.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe two types of schizophrenia. Nearly all candidates could do this, marks only being distinguished by the detail and quality of what was written. Please note that this examination paper is based on the 2014 syllabus, which includes types of schizophrenia, as do the 2015 and 2016 syllabuses. DSM-V has now removed the classification of schizophrenia into types, and reference to types will be removed from the 2017 syllabus.

## PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

### Question 17

- (a) Some candidates were unable to distinguish between psychological and physical work conditions, and should ensure that they are clear on the difference between them. Those scoring full marks made a distinction between the two and showed good understanding that psychological work conditions are just as important in the life of a worker as physical work conditions.
- (b) Candidates needed to describe two psychological work conditions, those candidates offering only one scored limited marks. Some candidates gave incorrect answers, such as 'temperature/noise/lighting'. Marks were given when a candidate considered how physical conditions affected the psychological well-being of a worker, but such answers were rare. Typical psychological features can include lack of privacy, crowding, workspace, social interaction with other workers, sense of status (worth) and level of responsibility.

### Question 18

- (a) There were three types of answer written in response to this question. There were those candidates who knew very little about motivation, writing anecdotally and scoring very low or no marks. There were those who knew the relevant aspects to include and wrote very good answers, but failed to use relevant terms or quote relevant psychological research, writing generalised answers instead. There were candidates who scored very high marks, making a distinction between the different types of motivation, different theories and different motivators whilst at work, such as different reward systems.

- (b) Answers for this part (b) question were typical of those for other options with the three main types of answer being evident. Many more marks will be gained if answers are evaluated by 'evaluation issue' rather than presented in any other way. In relation to this question some candidates considered a range of evaluation issues and fulfilled all the criteria that gained them very high marks. Others did not consider the named issue at all or included only the named issue of comparisons and contrasts between need theories and rational/cognitive theories. At the bottom end of the range were those who did not evaluate, instead *describing* need theories and rational/cognitive theories.

#### Question 19

- (a) Candidates need to demonstrate clear understanding of what validity is, but some candidates were not able to do this, or confused validity and reliability. Some candidates chose to focus on just one type, often concurrent validity, but found that they couldn't write a sufficient amount on this. Other candidates wrote detailed answers and considered a range of different types of validity such as criterion and predictive in addition to face and concurrent validity, for example.
- (b) This was answered well by most candidates. A number of candidates wrote about ability tests, some about personality tests, others about IQ tests and even some work specific tests were mentioned. IQ tests are acceptable because they give a measure of a general level of intellectual ability. Some answers were quite brief and as 3 marks were allocated to the description of each test, some candidates needed to write more than just a sentence in order to score full marks.

#### Question 20

- (a) Whilst there were some weak answers, there were also some very strong ones which scored full marks. Some candidates suggested observing the workers who had been in conflict to see if they were working together more happily, but often these answers lacked methodological knowledge about observations. Some candidates suggested giving the workers a questionnaire and many of these answers focussed more on the essential features that are involved in questionnaire design.
- (b) Strong answers described the strategies outlined by Thomas (1976) which include: competition, accommodation, compromise, collaboration and avoidance. Some candidates wrote anecdotal answers and a number wrote about strategies to avoid groupthink, which could not be credited.

# PSYCHOLOGY

---

Paper 9698/32  
Specialist Choices

## Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to the mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 8 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should appreciate that this is a three-hour examination and so it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (parts **(a)** and **(b)**) should take approximately 45–50 minutes and be at least 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 look to 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 only to studies learned for Paper 3, but also to form the basis of their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

## General comments

### **Section A (all options):**

A number of modifications to examination technique could improve marks:

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

### **Section B (all options):**

Question part **(a)** prompted high quality answers with candidates closely following the content of the syllabus. There were some excellent summaries of content that covered an appropriate range of studies.

Question part **(b)**: Candidates need to ensure they know the difference between ‘describe’ and ‘evaluate’. **Section B** question part **(a)** is ‘describe’ and question part **(b)** is ‘evaluate’. Evaluation is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about the evidence that has been described in part **(a)**, rather than an additional description. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and apply and rather than reproduce learning.

Evaluation by candidates can often be divided into three types:

- those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (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), and those who exclude the named issue altogether (who also gain limited marks);
- those who do not evaluate at all (and score no marks) merely describing more information.

For many candidates of the first type, answers could be improved further by clarifying what they write. For example, a candidate might write ‘disruptive behaviour is reliable’ and ‘disruptive behaviour is valid’, both of which have very little meaning. Explanation demonstrates understanding and that a candidate has taken time to think about what is written. This is preferable to reproduction of descriptive detail.

### Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe knowledge/information and the other question part asks a candidate to suggest. Candidates must know the difference between the two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding of what has been learned. A suggestion is to go beyond description and to *think* about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. A suggestion is not something that can be learned beforehand. It is requiring each candidate to think for themselves during the examination.

When a question asks 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 should know five essential features of each method (which are transferrable from Paper 2). Candidates should show their methodological knowledge because many marks can be gained for application of this knowledge in this section.

### Comments on specific questions

#### PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

##### Question 1

- (a) A small number of candidates misinterpreted this question and wrote about teaching styles (what is done by the teacher) rather than learning styles (the way in which a person learns) as the question requested. Most other candidates answered the question in relation to learning styles and often provided good explanations, scoring full marks as a result.
- (b) Some answers were nothing more than guesses which could not be credited. Some candidates described layers without identifying what the layers were and scored limited marks. Most candidates provided some description, with those describing each layer (instructional, informational and cognitive) in brief detail scoring full marks.

##### Question 2

- (a) A wide range of answers were seen with marks covering the entire mark range. Some candidates wrote about Maslow's hierarchy of needs (even drawing Maslow's pyramid) without making a reference to education, despite the question emphasising 'educational performance'. Better answers looked at the different types of motivation, such as intrinsic and extrinsic. These answers also considered various perspectives such as the behaviourist, humanist and cognitivist. Strong answers also considered 'motivation issues' and mentioned work on attribution theory and learned helplessness. Many answers were clearly based on psychological knowledge, evident by the names (and dates) quoted and as a result many answers were awarded full marks.
- (b) The named evaluation issue here was 'humanistic explanations of motivation' and candidates should have included this as one of their range of evaluation issues. To exclude this issue, like any other part (b) answer, restricted marks. A few candidates *described* more information about motivation in this question part rather than *evaluate*, and need to ensure that they know the difference between description and evaluation. At the top end of the mark range candidates considered a range of issues (including the named one) and included all the features that would allow them access to the maximum available marks.

##### Question 3

- (a) This question part asked candidates how they would investigate which co-operative learning technique was most effective. A number of candidates *described* co-operative learning, but needed to suggest an investigation to be credited. Other candidates outlined the basics of some form of study but these answers lacked important methodological knowledge. Strong answers included appropriate methodological knowledge, and drew a conclusion as to which strategy was most effective.

- (b) Some candidates who had described co-operative learning in part (a) rewrote their part (a) answer here. Candidates are always advised to read all question parts before starting to write their answers. Many candidates provided strong answers when describing the main features of co-operative learning and included features such as positive interdependence, face-to-face interaction, social skills and both individual and group accountability.

#### Question 4

- (a) This question part was not a 'suggest an investigation' type, instead it was an 'application' question which is appropriate given the applied nature of the Education option. Strong answers demonstrated a significant amount of knowledge about dyslexia and included a range of its features in the check-list, such as transposing letters. Some candidates did not demonstrate knowledge about dyslexia, focussing instead on the features of attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder and/or other deficits or disabilities. Some candidates knew a little about dyslexia but also referred to dyscalculia and dysgraphia too. **Section C** has a choice of question and so candidates should opt to answer the question that will gain them most marks.
- (b) Strong answers quoted appropriate psychological strategies, the most common being the Alpha-to-Omega strategy. Some candidates showed a lack of understanding and suggested a range of strategies that were inappropriate for a dyslexic child.

### PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

#### Question 5

- (a) The health promotion technique of fear arousal involves a message being presented which scares or creates fear in the audience with the aim of changing some behaviour for the better. Whilst most candidates provided explanations based on this, a few did not and confused fear arousal with that of 'providing information' which does not attempt to create any fear in the audience.
- (b) This question required a description of two studies, so candidates providing only one were could not gain full marks. Most candidates opted to describe the studies by Janis and Feshbach (1953) and Leventhal et al. (1967) and many outlined these two studies clearly and unambiguously, scoring full marks. A few candidates wrote very brief answers and a few muddled detail of each study. A few candidates opted to describe studies other than the two listed above, which was legitimate if they were examples of fear arousal. The most common alternative was the study by Cowpe about chip pan fires which used both fear arousal and providing information.

#### Question 6

- (a) There was a significant number of strong answers which received full marks. Most answers followed the structure of the syllabus, considering firstly verbal and non-verbal communication; secondly different styles and diagnoses; followed at the end of the answer with a consideration of misuse of health services. These answers were often full of appropriate evidence, considering the studies by McKinstry and Wang, McKinlay, Byrne and Long, Robinson and West, and Aleem and Ajarim. These studies are typical examples and if an alternative study is included which is appropriate then equivalent marks are awarded. The mark scheme states 'any appropriate evidence to receive credit'. Weaker answers referred to very few or no appropriate studies, and were largely anecdotal.
- (b) Answers are likely to be stronger if they evaluate by 'evaluation issue' rather than being presented in any other way. Some candidates in response to this question wrote the former type of answer with many scoring full marks. Some candidates covered the named issue only and others did not include it at all. A few candidates did not evaluate at all, instead describing the patient-practitioner relationship.

#### Question 7

- (a) Many candidates took the word 'experiment' to mean 'conduct a study using any method' and a range of incorrect methods were used. Those choosing to design an experiment often failed to include essential methodology, writing only a procedure which is just one component of an experiment. Candidates needed to draw a conclusion at the end of their designed study to make it clear whether sending a reminder is effective or not.



- (b) Candidates should know the term psychological perspective from the syllabus, and they should also know what is meant by 'behavioural techniques' because it is listed under the 'improving adherence' bullet point of the syllabus. Very few candidates answered the question that was set, instead writing answers about improving adherence in general or writing about measures of adherence. To score marks, candidates needed to show that behavioural techniques, based on operant conditioning, such as reinforcers and punishments, can help improve adherence.

#### Question 8

- (a) This application type question required two aspects to be included: a visual rating scale (so anything *verbal* would be inappropriate) and that the scale be applicable to a young child. Most candidates answered this question very well, with most scoring high marks. Many suggested the use of colour with green being no pain and red being most pain, and many candidates suggested the use of smiley, neutral and crying faces to indicate the extent of pain. A few candidates suggested conducting an observation of a child using a 'visual' rating scale. This type of answer was acceptable.
- (b) Acceptable answers included descriptions of (i) a visual analogue scale which has a 10 cm line with the descriptor 'no pain' at one end to 'pain as bad as it could be' at the other; (ii) the box scale which is the same as the visual analogue but with numbers; and (iii) the category (verbal) scale which uses a line with written descriptors. Any answers suggesting a clinical interview or the use of a questionnaire were not able to gain credit.

### PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

#### Question 9

- (a) Candidates who had studied the 'urban renewal and housing design' component of the syllabus were able to explain what was meant by the term 'housing design'. A small number of candidates guessed, often describing an actual house, with rooms for living, cooking and sleeping, showing no psychological knowledge and were not able to gain credit for this.
- (b) This question required a description of a successful housing design project (2 marks) and an unsuccessful housing design project (2 marks). The work of Newman featured prominently for the 'successful' part of the question with answers including description of projects such as Clason Point and Five Oaks. Design features such as opportunities for surveillance were appropriately included. The unsuccessful large-scale Pruitt-Igoe project featured as the unsuccessful example.

#### Question 10

- (a) There were some excellent answers on density and crowding and many answers full marks. The strongest answers included a range of information from the different bullet points of this topic area of the syllabus, including definitions and animal studies, in addition to the effects of crowding on humans. Some strong candidates made the distinction between preventing and coping with the effects of crowding. There were a number of anecdotal answers in response to this question with some candidates writing about their own experiences when in a large crowd. These answers scored very few or no marks.
- (b) The named issue in the evaluation section here was the issue of physiological measures. This is a relevant issue as it is an essential feature in a number of the studies identified on the syllabus. Some candidates didn't consider this named issue, some considered just this issue and some included it as part of a range of issues as the question requested. The strongest answers considered a range of issues, included the advantages and disadvantages of each and supported each with appropriate examples from the studies, and information they had described in part (a).

#### Question 11

- (a) This question was generally not answered well by many candidates, although there were a few superb answers which not only considered the studies by North et al. (as listed on the syllabus) but went beyond these by writing about a few other appropriate studies. The study by North et al. (2003) for example shows that playing classical music in a restaurant led to more money being spent by customers when compared with pop music or no music at all.

- (b) This question part required candidates to design a field experiment. In addition two other components also needed to be addressed: different types of music and how they might affect consumer behaviour. All these requirements should have led candidates to have an independent variable of two or more types of music and a dependent variable of some aspect of consumer behaviour such as amount of money spent on product(s). A small number of candidates used appropriate methodological terminology, but most answers were insufficient in this regard, and were included assertions that could not be tested. Candidates should apply their knowledge of the features of experiments learned for core studies in both Paper 1 and Paper 2 examination questions.

#### Question 12

- (a) This question was not answered well by many candidates. The question required candidates to link their knowledge about systemisers (from the studies by Baron-Cohen and by Billington) to their knowledge of ability to read maps (a key feature of systemisers) from the environmental cognition topic area. Although no specific method was stated in the question, candidates could give a systemising questionnaire to participants and then compare map reading ability (the DV) with those who scored at the top end compared with those who scored at the bottom end (the IV) of the systemising scale.
- (b) Better answers quoted the features outlined by Levine (1982) which included structure mapping and orientation. Many candidates performed better on part (b) than part (a).

### PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

#### Question 13

- (a) For this question part candidates had to describe what is meant by unipolar abnormal affect and then in question part (b) describe bipolar abnormal affect. A few candidates confused the two terms, for which they could not gain credit. Candidates who correctly understood the difference between the two affects were able to clearly describe unipolar disorder (considering 'one side' only) and well understood the characteristics of depression.
- (b) This question part required description of bipolar disorder and so two aspects were required, the extremes of mania and depression. Candidates usually began their answers by distinguishing bipolar from unipolar, then providing a description of the characteristics of depression followed by those of mania. Marks were allocated according to the quality of the description of each aspect. A few candidates considered causes of this disorder which was appropriate and added to the overall quality of the answer.

#### Question 14

- (a) Strong answers were very well prepared and included a wide range of information and detail in their answers, achieving full marks. These answers were very well organised and candidates were able to effectively summarise information to fit into the 20 minutes' time allocation for this question part. Some candidates made occasional errors in the accuracy of knowledge, covered a limited range of information, and showed less understanding.
- (b) Answers for this part (b) question were typical of those for other options with the three main types of answer being evident. More marks will be gained if answers are evaluated by 'evaluation issue' rather than presented in any other way. A number of candidates at the lower end of the mark range merely described the psychoanalytic explanation of phobias and scored no marks, whilst others only evaluated psychoanalytic explanations (rather than considering a range of issues) for limited credit. The best answers considered a range of evaluation issues and for each included appropriate advantages and disadvantages along with relevant examples of studies to support the advantage or disadvantage.

### Question 15

- (a) Candidates here were required to use a questionnaire to investigate knowledge of models of abnormality. Answers varied from those who knew very little about questionnaires to those which included a full range of appropriate features of questionnaires. Strong answers included the type of questionnaire (open or closed), examples of questions (e.g. have you heard of the medical model of abnormality?), how the questions were to be answered (yes/no), how the answers were coded and scored and some wrote about the type of data gathered (quantitative or qualitative). Some candidates seemed unsure about what models of abnormality actually were, whilst the strongest answers showed a good understanding of models as evident in the questions they planned to ask their participants.
- (b) This question part required both the assumptions (3 marks) and treatments (3 marks) of the medical/biological model of abnormality. Most candidates scored full marks, including both parts in their answers and demonstrating both excellent knowledge and very good understanding. A few candidates included assumptions but no treatments and vice versa and scored limited marks.

### Question 16

- (a) Candidates had to suggest an experimental study to investigate which type of schizophrenia is best treated with cognitive-behaviour therapy (CBT). As is often the case with **Section C** questions methodological knowledge (about experiments in this case) was poor. For example if patients have different types of schizophrenia then only an independent experimental design could be used; repeated measures would be impossible, yet very few candidates appreciated this important facet. On the positive side many candidates appreciated that a longitudinal study would be needed, the appropriateness of CBT being determined by the improvement (or recovery) of the patient.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe two types of schizophrenia. Nearly all candidates could do this, marks only being distinguished by the detail and quality of what was written. Please note that this examination paper is based on the 2014 syllabus, which includes types of schizophrenia, as do the 2015 and 2016 syllabuses. DSM-V has now removed the classification of schizophrenia into types, and reference to types will be removed from the 2017 syllabus.

## PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

### Question 17

- (a) Some candidates were unable to distinguish between psychological and physical work conditions, and should ensure that they are clear on the difference between them. Those scoring full marks made a distinction between the two and showed good understanding that psychological work conditions are just as important in the life of a worker as physical work conditions.
- (b) Candidates needed to describe two psychological work conditions, those candidates offering only one scored limited marks. Some candidates gave incorrect answers, such as 'temperature/noise/lighting'. Marks were given when a candidate considered how physical conditions affected the psychological well-being of a worker, but such answers were rare. Typical psychological features can include lack of privacy, crowding, workspace, social interaction with other workers, sense of status (worth) and level of responsibility.

### Question 18

- (a) There were three types of answer written in response to this question. There were those candidates who knew very little about motivation, writing anecdotally and scoring very low or no marks. There were those who knew the relevant aspects to include and wrote very good answers, but failed to use relevant terms or quote relevant psychological research, writing generalised answers instead. There were candidates who scored very high marks, making a distinction between the different types of motivation, different theories and different motivators whilst at work, such as different reward systems.

- (b) Answers for this part (b) question were typical of those for other options with the three main types of answer being evident. Many more marks will be gained if answers are evaluated by 'evaluation issue' rather than presented in any other way. In relation to this question some candidates considered a range of evaluation issues and fulfilled all the criteria that gained them very high marks. Others did not consider the named issue at all or included only the named issue of comparisons and contrasts between need theories and rational/cognitive theories. At the bottom end of the range were those who did not evaluate, instead *describing* need theories and rational/cognitive theories.

#### Question 19

- (a) Candidates need to demonstrate clear understanding of what validity is, but some candidates were not able to do this, or confused validity and reliability. Some candidates chose to focus on just one type, often concurrent validity, but found that they couldn't write a sufficient amount on this. Other candidates wrote detailed answers and considered a range of different types of validity such as criterion and predictive in addition to face and concurrent validity, for example.
- (b) This was answered well by most candidates. A number of candidates wrote about ability tests, some about personality tests, others about IQ tests and even some work specific tests were mentioned. IQ tests are acceptable because they give a measure of a general level of intellectual ability. Some answers were quite brief and as 3 marks were allocated to the description of each test, some candidates needed to write more than just a sentence in order to score full marks.

#### Question 20

- (a) Whilst there were some weak answers, there were also some very strong ones which scored full marks. Some candidates suggested observing the workers who had been in conflict to see if they were working together more happily, but often these answers lacked methodological knowledge about observations. Some candidates suggested giving the workers a questionnaire and many of these answers focussed more on the essential features that are involved in questionnaire design.
- (b) Strong answers described the strategies outlined by Thomas (1976) which include: competition, accommodation, compromise, collaboration and avoidance. Some candidates wrote anecdotal answers and a number wrote about strategies to avoid groupthink, which could not be credited.

# PSYCHOLOGY

---

Paper 9698/33  
Specialist Choices

## Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 8 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should appreciate that this is a three hour examination and so it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay parts (a) and (b) should take approximately 45–50 minutes and be at least 4 sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts 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 look to 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 only to studies learned for paper 3, but also to form the basis of their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

## General comments

### **Section A (all options)**

A number of modifications to examination technique could improve marks:

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

### **Section B (all options)**

Question part (a) prompted high quality answers with candidates closely following the content of the syllabus. There were some excellent summaries of content that covered an appropriate range of studies.

Question part (b): Candidates need to ensure they know the difference between ‘describe’ and ‘evaluate’. **Section B** question part (a) is ‘describe’ and question part (b) is ‘evaluate’. Evaluation is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about the evidence that has been described in part (a), rather than an additional description. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and apply and rather than reproduce learning.

Evaluation by candidates can often be divided into three types:

- those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (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), and those who exclude the named issue altogether (who also gain limited marks);
- those who do not evaluate at all (and score no marks) merely describing more information.

For many candidates of the first type, answers could be improved further by clarifying what they write. For example, a candidate might write ‘disruptive behaviour is reliable’ and ‘disruptive behaviour is valid’, both of which have very little meaning. Explanation demonstrates understanding and that a candidate has taken time to think about what is written. This is preferable to reproduction of descriptive detail.

### **Section C (all options)**

One question part asks a candidate to describe knowledge/information and the other question part asks a candidate to suggest. Candidates must know the difference between the two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding of what has been learned. A suggestion is to go beyond description and to *think* about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. A suggestion is not something that can be learned beforehand. It is requiring each candidate to think for themselves during the examination.

When a question asks 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 should know five essential features of each method (which are transferrable from Paper 2). Candidates should show their methodological knowledge because many marks can be gained for application of this knowledge in this section.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION**

No candidates answered questions from this option.

#### **PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH**

##### **Question 5**

- (a) Nearly all candidates scored full marks in response to this question. All candidates knew what was meant by promoting health. Some candidates scored partial credit only because they made no reference to worksites.
- (b) There were some excellent answers in response to this question with candidates writing in detail and showing both depth of knowledge and good understanding in their answers. Most chose to write about the Johnson and Johnson Company and their 'Live for Life' programme. A few candidates were unsure about the term 'worksite' and wrote about either community programmes or about those conducted in schools. These answers received no marks.

##### **Question 6**

- (a) There were significant numbers of very strong answers written in response to this question with many candidates scoring full marks. There was often a good range of different aspects from the bullet points of the syllabus including definitions, types, theories, measurement, and management of pain. Strong candidates were able to use terminology and quote appropriate psychological research. A small number of candidates had timing issues and a small number had minor accuracy errors.
- (b) A small number of candidates only considered the named issue. Other candidates mentioned issues but did not identify what these issues were, and needed to give advantages or disadvantages of these issues or debate them. Many candidates took an 'evaluation by study' approach to this question. The most effective approach is to organise the answer by evaluation issue. This would allow debate about each issue, based on advantages and disadvantages with the use of studies as examples to illustrate.

### Question 7

- (a) There were many candidates who did not answer the question set, instead *describing* practitioner styles. Candidates must make a suggestion as to how **they** would *investigate* practitioner styles and not provide a description quoting knowledge of a study already published. In this instance, a questionnaire would be the most logical method to choose to investigate *why* a particular practitioner style is preferred. Whilst many candidates did choose to use a questionnaire, these answers needed to include the basic features of a questionnaire, such as the type (open or closed), examples of questions that could be asked, and how questions would be scored, for example.
- (b) Most candidates chose to describe the Byrne and Long study, and a few the Savage and Armstrong study and some of these answers were done in excellent depth and detail and scored high marks. A few were vague and scored correspondingly lower marks. A small number of candidates interpreted practitioner 'style' as the way in which a practitioner dresses and so described the McKinstry and Wang study. Although this was not strictly correct, the benefit of doubt was given to these candidates and their answers credited.

### Question 8

- (a) This question allowed candidates to choose whatever method they wished to obtain information on the cause of an accident. Some candidates chose to conduct interviews, but were often lacking in knowledge about how to conduct an interview. Other candidates suggested using a questionnaire, but again in many cases there was little knowledge about the basic features of a questionnaire. Candidates are advised to know five essential features of each of the methods covered on the syllabus. These features should be transferrable from Paper 2. There were some candidates who chose not to make a suggestion, instead writing a mini essay describing individual and system errors, for which they could not be credited.
- (b) A number of candidates described an appropriate individual error and an appropriate system error. Examples were typically 'the Three Mile Island incident' and the sinking of the Titanic because of the Captain's illusion of invulnerability. However, a number of candidates confused the two, but if the argument for the alternative type of error was appropriate, marks could be awarded. For example, whereas cognitive overload must be attributed to an individual, some accidents occur because the 'system' expects too much of an individual who as a consequence cannot cope.

## PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

No candidates answered questions from this option.

## PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

### Question 13

- (a) There were some very strong answers in response to this question, with most candidates scoring full marks with accurate answers which showed excellent understanding of the psychodynamic model of abnormality. A few answers lacked the quality of others, but even these answers were good enough to be awarded full marks.
- (b) Any two mental illnesses explained by the psychodynamic model could be used to answer this question part and the more able candidates showed good understanding and used the same principles of the model to explain both illnesses. Most commonly, phobias were used as one illustrator with little Hans being referred to frequently. The other example was often depression but obsessive-compulsive disorder also featured. Nearly all candidates referred to the interaction between the id, ego and superego and explained how illnesses occurred as a result of their interactions.

#### Question 14

- (a) There were some strong answers by well-prepared and very able candidates. The strongest answers began with a definition, most candidates using that by Griffiths, followed by the inclusion of a range of appropriate disorders such as alcoholism, kleptomania and pyromania, for example. Explanations were also considered, and a good range of information was evident, including genetic, biochemical and behavioural. Strong answers also included ways in which addictions and impulse control disorders could be managed. All of this was often supported with relevant psychological evidence such as the work by Peters and Preedy on genetic causes.
- (b) This part of the essay question required candidates to discuss what psychologists have discovered about addiction and impulse control disorders and to include a discussion about cognitive and behavioural strategies. A number of candidates only considered the named issue of 'cognitive and behavioural strategies'. Some candidates provided 'general evaluation' considering each study on its individual strengths and weaknesses without relating this evaluation to 'issues'. Other candidates kept repeating the same points because they took a 'study-by-study' approach. The best approach is 'issue-by-issue' with studies only being used to support evaluation issues.

#### Question 15

- (a) This question asked candidates how they would treat agoraphobia. Most candidates understood the severity of this phobia and would treat the person in their own home. Competent knowledge was also shown when outlining relaxation techniques and the creation of an anxiety hierarchy. Candidates appreciated that any treatment would take months or even years. A few candidates suggested the technique of flooding, which is not appropriate for agoraphobia (or most other phobias).
- (b) There was a range of different answers here with some candidates focusing on strictly behavioural factors, going back to classical and operant conditioning. Other candidates placed some emphasis on the cognitive features. Yet others looked more specifically at the assumptions of the treatment, considering how anxiety can be reduced through a combination of relaxation techniques and imaginal desensitisation. Some candidates mentioned the work of Wolpe (1958) who first coined the term systematic desensitisation. The quality of some answers was very high, but there were also some that were basic and needed much more detail to take their marks into the higher ranges.

#### Question 16

- (a) This question part was not answered well by the few candidates attempting it. There was an awareness that questionnaires were used, but other than a few basic guesses as to what these might include, nearly all answers were lacking in knowledge and detail about appropriate questionnaires. Candidates are advised to consider the Maudsley obsessive-compulsive inventory for example, or the Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale (BDD-YBOCS) is an appropriate alternative.
- (b) Suggesting how testing both reliability and validity of a questionnaire caused problems for most candidates. Some candidates did not know what the terms meant. Others could define them, but could not say how they could be tested. There were a few candidates who knew the terms and how they could be tested. The reliability of a questionnaire is commonly tested using test-retest. There are many different types of validity and the ones applicable here are concurrent validity, criterion validity or predictive validity.

#### PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

No candidates answered questions from this option.