

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/11
Core Studies 1

General comments

Whilst there were many excellent answers, as usual there were many answers that could have been better if a little attention were paid to examination technique. The following four points are noteworthy from this examination.

In relation to **Section A**, candidates should write more detail in most cases. For most questions just a few words will not be sufficient to score full marks. If the available marks are 0, 1 and 2 then candidates should ask themselves whether their answer would score 1 or 2 marks. Very few answers score 2 out of 2 for answers of three or four words. What is not required is a very detailed answer, just sufficient to show a little understanding, to show that the candidate knows more than a superficial knowledge. A candidate will often write "it is unethical" (and will score 1 mark) but writing "it is unethical because..." and completing the sentence would score both marks. There are ample examples in this paper, such as **Question 13**, to illustrate.

A second point is that many candidates often do not read the question set, instead 'half reading' what is there and then assuming what the question is asking. Often this assumption is false and the candidate thinks that they have written a very good answer when in fact they have misinterpreted the question and scored no marks at all. A few seconds spent reading the question fully will be of benefit.

In relation to **Section B**, candidates should choose **Question 16** or **17** and the specific study more carefully. Often candidates can write an answer to question parts (a) and (b) but then struggle to answer parts (c) and (d). It may be a better strategy to choose a question/study where parts (c) and (d) can be answered even if parts (a) and (b) are weaker. To score some marks is better than scoring no marks. This is always true of candidates choosing the Freud study and on this paper was also true of the Hodges and Tizard study.

A second point in relation to **Section B** is that candidates do not answer question part (d) fully. The first part requires consideration of an alternative and in most cases this causes few problems for candidates. However, a large number of candidates do not go on to consider the effect the change has on the results. Instead many candidates consider the *implication* the change would have for the method, such as making it more ecologically valid, but that is not a consideration of the actual *results*. In relation to the Milgram study for example, if the sample were to be made up entirely of female participants then the effect on the results might be that 100% obeyed the authority figure rather than just 65% of male participants!

One other issue worth mentioning concerns ethics and in this instance it concerns the nature of de-briefing. A de-brief happens at the end of the study and is an explanation to the participant about what they have just been doing. It should happen without question at the end of every psychology study. Many candidates appear to think that a de-brief is the same as a briefing which happens at the start of the study. Other candidates think that a de-brief is only necessary if there has been harm. This is not the case. A de-brief should be given to any and all participants. If it is not then the study can be said to be breaking ethical guidelines. For **Question 5(b)** on this examination paper, as the participants were children it is unlikely that they would have understood a full de-brief and that is the main reason why it was not given.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

For question part (a) on the Loftus and Palmer study, most candidates were able to provide an appropriate answer although many did not provide sufficient detail to score both available marks. Many candidates



stated simply "it was on videotape" which is correct and scores 1 mark, but elaboration is needed in order to score both marks. Other commonly written answers included that the crash was expected by participants whereas in real life it would not be; and that a crash on videotape has very little emotional involvement whereas a real car crash may well have high emotional involvement. For question part **(b)** many candidates provided a brief answer such as "do a real crash". A little elaboration is needed for two marks to be awarded.

Question 2

This question asked candidates to describe one piece of anecdotal and one piece of empirical evidence. For question part **(a)** most candidates could correctly describe one piece of anecdotal evidence. The three possible answers are: the Robert Laws story where a picture of ox or dog were presented and participants could not identify either; secondly the 'Mrs Fraser' story where a lady is looking for the other eye in a profile of a face; finally there is the 'other reports', the story of where an image was presented and participants fled. The brave chief looked behind the screen for the elephant. For question part **(b)** most candidates were able to describe one piece of empirical evidence, namely one of the studies done by Hudson. The most commonly quoted was the man/antelope/elephant study.

Question 3

Question part **(a)** on the Baron-Cohen et al study asked what the Down's Syndrome and 'normal' children are *able* to do in the Sally-Anne test. The simple answer is that they can answer all four questions correctly i.e. the naming, memory and reality questions and the 'test' question, the belief question. Question part **(b)** had two parts: the first part asked candidates what autistic children were *unable* to do, which was to answer the belief question correctly. Nearly all candidates answered this correctly. The second part asked for a reason why they were unable to this. Most candidates answered that it was because the children did not have a theory of mind.

Question 4

This question is a perfect illustration of the need to provide a little elaboration to an answer in order to gain full marks. This question asked for two pieces of evidence to suggest that Washoe learned language. A typical one mark answer was "Washoe could differentiate" or "Washoe showed sentence combinations". To score the second mark there needed to be either an explanation of what 'differentiation' or 'combinations' means or an example provided to illustrate the term. Whilst these were typical examples, any appropriate suggestion would receive credit.

Question 5

Question part **(a)** asked for two features of the sample of children in the Samuel and Bryant study and as two marks are available, brief description is acceptable without elaboration. The most commonly quoted features were: the participants were boys and girls, they were aged 5-8 years, there were 252 children and they were from schools in Crediton, Devon (which is in the UK). Question part **(b)** asked why the children were not debriefed. There are several possible answers to this question: as the children probably thought it was part of a classroom test they did not expect a de-brief. A teacher does not de-brief after every class! A second reason would be that the children would not understand a de-brief if it was given to them, so there was no point in trying. See the general comments above for more detail regarding this question and ethics.

Question 6

Many candidates were unable to describe how participants were matched for pre-existing levels of aggression in the Bandura et al study. The answer is that they were matched on four five-point rating scales by the experimenter and a nursery school teacher. The scales rated physical and verbal aggression. Question part **(b)** asked *why* the children were matched for pre-existing levels of aggression. Again many candidates struggled to provide a good answer to this question. A matched pairs design was applied as a control so each group of children had the same level of aggression at the start of the study. If the matching had not been done then the result may be confounded: not due to Bandura's predictions but due to levels of aggression that existed before the study started.



Question 7

This question concerned the Schachter and Singer study on emotion. Question part (a) asked for one way in which the stooge behaved angrily and one way in which the stooge behaved euphorically. As two components were required for two marks, brief identification was all that was required. Most candidates scored both available marks. The most common answers for anger condition included the stooge's responses to Questions 17 and 18 of the questionnaire and the most common answers for euphoric behaviour included doodling a fish, playing a basketball game and twirling a hula hoop. Question part (b) asked for the identification of the two groups whose behaviour did not copy the stooge. The two groups were the EPI INF (epinephrine informed) group and the control or placebo group. Surprisingly, because this is the main point of the study, many candidates answered this incorrectly, often appearing to simply name any two groups.

Question 8

Question part (a) asked for an example of qualitative data that was gathered in the Dement and Kleitman study. In this case qualitative data included any self report that might have been made by a participant, so an example may have been whether participants were dreaming or not or what they had been dreaming about. Giving an example of dream content, such as throwing tomatoes, would have been a perfect answer. Question part (b) asked for an example of quantitative data that was gathered. Most common answers here included the EEG print-out of whether the participant was in REM or NREM, or whether actual eye movements were vertical or horizontal. Many candidates answered both these question parts correctly and scored full marks but others did not know the difference between qualitative and quantitative data.

Question 9

This was the 'Sperry' question and it tested whether candidates understood the study in a slightly different way from usual. For many candidates this was an easy four marks, but for others it appeared to be the most confusing question ever. Most candidates knew that naming an object was due to the left hemisphere and that an inability to name an object was because the information was sent to the right hemisphere. However, many candidates were confused because they were unsure of which visual field fed which hemisphere. The correct answer for part (a) was right visual field and left hemisphere and for question part (b) the correct answer was left visual field and right hemisphere.

Question 10

This question wanted two features of the Milgram study that explained the high amounts of obedience observed. Many answers were far too brief, being nothing more than "they were paid" and "the lab" when a little elaboration would have led to more marks being awarded. There are quite a few answers that could gain credit here and reference to the mark scheme will reveal the most common nine.

Question 11

This question concerned the subway Samaritan study by Piliavin et al. Question part (a) wanted one weakness with the way in which the observational data was collected. Typical answers were that there was no inter-rater reliability (there were two observers but they recorded different things), that the view of an observer may have been obscured, or that events may have happened too quickly for everything to be recorded. Question part (b) wanted a suggestion of how the collection of data could be improved. The most common suggestion was that everything could be recorded on videotape and then analysed later and another suggestion was to have two observers on the actual train observing the same things.

Question 12

The nature of the question on the Tajfel study allowed for two marks to be gained from a 1 in 3 guess. Many candidates went for an answer that included the word 'profit', which was the wrong answer. Those giving the wrong answer to part (a) then also gave the wrong explanation in question part (b) showing that they did not understand the main point of the study. The correct answers were: maximum difference; showing that they would prefer to maximise a difference between the groups rather than go for more profit.



Question 13

This question concerned the Rosenhan study in relation to ethics but asked in part **(a)** why the study should have been done, and in part **(b)** why the study should *not* have been done. There were many 'obvious' answers, such as "because it is unethical" which is true, but there needs to be a comment as to why it is unethical to gain full marks. For part **(a)** many answers suggested that the knowledge gained from the study outweighed any ethical problems. Some candidates pointed out that the doctors and nurses were simply doing their job and so if they were doing anything inappropriate then it was quite correct of Rosenhan to make this known. For question part **(b)** answers such as "it was unethical" were common, but many candidates did go on to say why it was so.

Question 14

This question looked at the Gould study from a slightly different angle. Part **(a)** asked why the famous scientist Albert Einstein would have performed poorly on the tests. The correct answer was that Einstein was an immigrant and knew nothing about the United States culture on which the test was based. Despite Einstein's undoubted intelligence he would still have performed very poorly on the test designed by Yerkes et al. For any candidate giving the correct answer to part **(a)**, question part **(b)** followed on logically by asking what this would tell us about the real nature of intelligence. What it tells us is that it is false to assume that everyone of a particular cultural group is the same. In relation to the study itself, it is false to assume that people from a particular cultural group are all genetically inferior. Although the question did not require this, it also provides insight into the design of intelligence tests; that they should be free from any cultural bias if they are to test inherited intelligence.

Question 15

Question part **(a)** asked simply what multiple personality disorder is. Many candidates seemed to be thrown by this. The 'official' version, that of DSM IV-TR is that it is "a condition in which a single person displays multiple distinct identities or personalities, each with its own pattern of perceiving and interacting with the environment." Whilst candidates will never be expected to quote a definition such as this, answers which showed any acknowledgement of this sentiment received credit. Question part **(b)** asked candidates why people may have different sides to their personality whilst not actually having a multiple personality. Many candidates were unable to provide an answer. The answer is that the person with multiple personality disorder tends not to recall what the other personality is thinking or doing, whereas a person with different sides to their personality always knows what the other 'personality' is thinking and doing.

Section B

Question 16

The concern of **Question 16** was the use of restricted samples in psychological research. Question part **(a)** required a description of the sample and the way it was selected in the chosen study. Many candidates provided excellent descriptions, commenting on both the sample and the way in which participants were selected. Other candidates opted to describe the procedure, such as describing the induction procedure in the Haney et al study. Such answers received no credit because by this point the participants had already been selected. Question part **(b)** required a description of the main findings of the chosen study and as for part **(a)**, answers covered the whole range of available marks. Question part **(c)** required a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of using restricted samples of participants. Many candidates found this easy when considering disadvantages but often struggled to think of any advantages. Reference to the mark scheme will reveal a number of suggestions. Question part **(d)** required consideration of an alternative sample from that used in the chosen study. Many candidates simply suggested using female participants, or for the Haney et al study using actual prisoners. The latter answer would receive no marks because using real prisoners would not allow Haney et al to test the dispositional - situational hypothesis.

Question 17

This question was on self report measures with the studies of Hrabka, Freud and Hodges being available for selection. For **Question 16** or **Question 17** candidates have ample choice as they have six studies to choose from, and it is important to choose carefully which answers to write about. Many candidates wrote very good parts **(a)** and **(b)** but struggled with parts **(c)** and **(d)**. It is worth ensuring that an answer can be provided for all question parts before beginning to answer. Question part **(a)** was straightforward for most candidates as was part **(b)**. Question part **(c)** caused a few problems, particularly for those choosing the Freud study because answers often became 'what Freud did' or 'what Freud did not do' rather than a



discussion of the general advantages and disadvantages of self report measures. Question part **(d)** looked for a different method which would be a different way of gathering data rather than through a self report measure. Some candidates suggested doing a laboratory experiment, but could not suggest what this would actually include. As question part **(d)**s appear on every examination paper it would be logical for candidates to think about this well in advance of the examination.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/12

Core Studies 1

General comments

Whilst there were many excellent answers, as usual there were many answers that could have been better if a little attention were paid to examination technique. The following four points are noteworthy from this examination.

In relation to **Section A**, candidates should write more detail in most cases. For most questions just a few words will not be sufficient to score full marks. If the available marks are 0, 1 and 2 then candidates should ask themselves whether their answer would score 1 or 2 marks. Very few answers score 2 out of 2 for answers of three or four words. What is not required is a very detailed answer, just sufficient to show a little understanding, to show that the candidate knows more than a superficial knowledge. A candidate will often write "it is unethical" (and will score 1 mark) but writing "it is unethical because..." and completing the sentence would score both marks. There are ample examples in this paper, such as **Question 12**, to illustrate.

A second point is that many candidates often do not read the question set, instead 'half reading' what is there and then assuming what the question is asking. Often this assumption is false and the candidate thinks that they have written a very good answer when in fact they have misinterpreted the question and scored no marks at all. A few seconds spent reading the question fully will be of benefit. **Question 7** is a good example of this.

In relation to **Section B**, candidates should choose **Question 16** or **17** and the specific study more carefully. Often candidates can write an answer to question parts (a) and (b) but then struggle to answer parts (c) and (d). It may be a better strategy to choose a question/study where parts (c) and (d) can be answered even if parts (a) and (b) are weaker. To score some marks is better than scoring no marks. This is always true of candidates choosing the Freud study and on this paper was also true of the Thigpen and Cleckley study.

A second point in relation to **Section B** is that candidates do not answer question part (d) fully. The first part requires consideration of an alternative and in most cases this causes few problems for candidates. However, a large number of candidates do not go on to consider the effect the change has on the results. Instead many candidates consider the *implication* the change would have for the method, such as making it more ecologically valid, but that is not a consideration of the actual *results*.

One other issue worth mentioning concerns ethics and in this instance it concerns the nature of de-briefing. A de-brief happens at the end of the study and is an explanation to the participant about what they have just been doing. It should happen without question at the end of every psychology study. Many candidates appear to think that a de-brief is the same as a briefing which happens at the start of the study. Other candidates think that a de-brief is only necessary if there has been harm. This is not the case. A de-brief should be given to any and all participants. If it is not then the study can be said to be breaking ethical guidelines. For **Question 14(b)** on this examination paper, as the participants were children it is unlikely that they would have understood a full de-brief and that is the main reason why it was not given.



Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This question combined the Deregowski study with the issue of 'generalisations'. Question part **(a)** thus wanted something from the Deregowski study that applies to most people most of the time. One example might be that the perception of pictures is learned; another might be that pictures cannot be used as a 'lingua franca'. Some candidates did not know what a generalisation was and so they struggled to answer part **(a)** and could not answer part **(b)** at all. A generalisation is something which applies to most people most of the time.

Question 2

This question wanted any two problems with the Baron-Cohen et al Sally-Anne test for autism. Nearly all candidates were able to give correct answers, the three most common being: they used dolls rather than real people and the use of real people may have given a different result; that the test was conducted in a laboratory with a stranger (i.e. Baron-Cohen himself is a stranger to the children); and that the Sally-Anne test only applies to younger children with autism, it does not apply to older children or adults. Some candidates stated that boys do not play with dolls, which also received credit.

Question 3

This question required candidates to identify two ways in which it was decided that Washoe had learned a new sign. Identification of two things for two marks means that brief answers are acceptable. The most commonly quoted ways were that a new sign must be reported by three different observers; that the sign must be appropriate and spontaneous and that the sign must be observed at least once per day for fifteen consecutive days. Most candidates gave a correct answer to this question part. Question part **(b)** wanted identification of two of the four signs that Washoe learned during the first seven months of training. The full list appears in the original article itself. The first four signs were: 'come-gimme'; 'more'; 'up' and 'sweet'. Most candidates gave a wrong answer with tickle and flower appearing most often.

Question 4

This question concerned the conservation study by Samuel and Bryant. Question part **(a)** asked for the independent variables and question part **(b)** asked for the dependent variable. Most candidates were able to score 1 mark, but many could not identify either the independent variable or the dependent variable clearly enough to score full marks. The answer to **(a)** for 1 mark was: age, conditions or material. To gain the second mark the specifics of the independent variable had to be given, which were: material i.e. volume, mass and number; age: 5, 6, 7 and 8 years of age; and conditions: the standard two question (Piaget) or the one judgement condition. The dependent variable for question part **(b)** was often given as "performance on the task" or "the answers given" both of which were too vague. Precisely the dependent variable was the number of errors out of four on the conservation task.

Question 5

Bandura, Ross and Ross observed the children through a one way mirror. Candidates stating this scored 1 mark, but elaboration or a second aspect was needed for the full mark allocation to be awarded. A second appropriate aspect would be the use of time sampling where a behaviour was recorded at 5 second intervals, or that there were two observers. Question part **(b)** wanted one advantage of the way in which the children were observed. Most candidates stated that using a one way mirror meant that the child would not respond to demand characteristics and so behave naturally. Also acceptable would be that the use of two observers and the use of inter-rater reliability allowed a check of the accuracy of the observations.

Question 6

This question looked at the 'ex-institutional syndrome' suggested by Hodges and Tizard. According to Hodges and Tizard this syndrome is made up of five features, and this formed the basis of question part **(a)**. Whilst many candidates gave two features of the syndrome with little difficulty (features such as being adult oriented and having no special friend), many candidates could not answer the question at all. Question part **(b)** asked for a suggestion as to what is weak about proposing this syndrome. Many candidates suggested correctly that it would be a false generalisation because the sample size was too small, or that some but not



all features would be applicable.

Question 7

This question concerned development and the question clearly required one advantage and one disadvantage of studying *development*. Many candidates went straight into a “one advantage of the Freud study was...” and provided a very good answer to a different question from the one set. Other candidates do not seem to know what development is, which is surprising as ‘development’ could appear on Paper 2 as a full essay question. Simply, candidates must answer the question set rather than answer a question they think or hope is there.

Question 8

Question part **(a)** asked candidates to describe the procedure in the anger condition of the Schachter and Singer study. Some candidates wrote answers that were far too long, attempting to describe the whole study. The best answers focused on the specific detail that distinguishes the anger condition from the euphoric condition, namely the questionnaires which became increasingly personal and insulting. Question part **(b)** asked a general question about why it is important to standardise a procedure and most candidates correctly stated that this was an important control to make a study replicable.

Question 9

Question part **(a)** asked candidates for two ways in which the stooge was used to deceive participants in the Milgram study. Whilst many candidates provided excellent answers and scored full marks, there were many who did not answer the question and instead gave features that led to the high levels of obedience. For example some candidates referred to the prods given by the experimenter, but the experimenter was not a stooge. Others referred to the shock generator giving false shocks, and neither is the generator a stooge! Correct answers would include, amongst others, the drawing of lots to determine who was teacher and who was learner and the screams of the fake shocks. Question part **(b)** wanted one advantage of using a stooge and most candidates answered this with little difficulty.

Question 10

This question focused on the use of newspaper advertisements to recruit participants, as was the case in the Haney et al study. Question part **(a)** wanted one advantage and question part **(b)** wanted a disadvantage. As many candidates stated, the biggest advantage is the potentially wider range of participants the newspaper reaches whilst the biggest disadvantage is the exclusion of those who do not purchase the paper, who do not read the advert and who decide not to reply.

Question 11

This question concerned the subway Samaritan study by Piliavin et al. Question part **(a)** wanted a description of the setting in which the study was conducted. Any two features would score two marks. Most candidates were able to describe the train and many even included a brief drawing of the carriage. Others mentioned the length of the journey, the pole, adjacent and critical areas and other features of the *setting*. Some candidates described the participants, which are not a feature of the setting. Question part **(b)** wanted one advantage and one disadvantage of the setting. Appropriate advantages would include control of the journey time, that the setting of the train is high in ecological validity; it would also include the sample size because the setting of a subway train would lead to a large sample size. For disadvantages many candidates stated that the use of the victim was unethical and that the participants were deceived. Deception is not an appropriate answer because it is a feature of the behaviour of the stooge/victim rather than a feature of the *setting*.

Question 12

Question part **(a)** asked what makes the Tajfel study a snapshot study. Candidates who answered “because it is done in a few hours” scored 1 mark, whereas those candidates who added some detail to show they understood why this study was a snapshot study scored the full 2 marks. For example, one candidate wrote “after being put into groups all they had to do was fill in matrices and then they could leave. This took a very short period of time.” Question part **(b)** wanted one disadvantage of a snapshot study and most candidates correctly stated that it does not allow change in behaviour over time to be observed.



Question 13

This question asked for two advantages of psychometric tests. Any two advantages would receive credit and the advantages did not have to be related to the Gould study in order to receive credit. Whilst most candidates provided two advantages with ease, answers including their objectivity, ease of comparison and standardisation, other candidates provided no answer at all, which is surprising given that psychometric testing could appear as a whole essay question on Paper 2.

Question 14

Question part **(a)** wanted any two features of the sample of children in the Hrabka and Grant study. Most candidates provided two without any problem, most commonly mentioned was their age, their colour and where they were from. Question part **(b)** wanted a reason why the children were not debriefed. Many candidates answered this question incorrectly because they do not understand what a de-brief is. See general comments above. In any study involving children a de-brief is often not given simply because the children may well be too young to understand what they are being told by the experimenters.

Question 15

This question asked about how nurses responded to requests for information in the Rosenhan study. Question part **(a)** focused on how the nurses responded. Most candidates answered this correctly, many giving precise percentages and scoring full marks in so doing. Question part **(b)** wanted a reason for the behaviour of the nurses and again most candidates answered correctly when stating that the nurses believed the pseudo-patients were insane, that they were non-people and so there was no point in talking to them.

Section B

Question 16

The concern of **Question 16** was the use of specialised apparatus and complex recording devices. Question part **(a)** required a description of the way in which the equipment was used to collect data, and many candidates provided excellent descriptions, particularly of the Dement and Kleitman study. Some candidates wrote far too much whilst others wrote too little, which is usually the case. Question part **(b)** required a description of the main findings of the chosen study. Those candidates choosing the Raine et al study often provided very detailed and precise answers. Those choosing the Dement and Kleitman study organised their answers according to the aims of the study. Question part **(c)** required strengths and weaknesses of using such equipment. The most commonly mentioned strength was that the data is objective and scientific, whilst the most common weakness was that the equipment may not work or that it cannot tell us why a particular behaviour occurred. Question part **(d)** as always required consideration of an alternative way of gathering data and, in this case, without such equipment. Some creative answers were written but most did not go on to state how the change would affect the results.

Question 17

The concern of **Question 17** was the quantitative approach. Question part **(a)** required a description of the procedure of the chosen study and many candidates provided excellent descriptions, particularly of the Loftus and Palmer study. Some candidates wrote far too much whilst others wrote too little, which is usually the case. Candidates choosing the Thigpen and Cleckley study often just described everything, telling the whole story, rather than breaking it down to answer the questions set. Question part **(b)** required a description of the quantitative results of the chosen study. Some candidates did not distinguish between qualitative and quantitative results, particularly for the Thigpen and Cleckley study, whilst for others, and those choosing either of the other studies, this was not a problem. For example, for the Thigpen and Cleckley study quantitative results were those from IQ test, memory test and EEG. Qualitative data was gathered from interviews and the Rorschach test. Question part **(c)** required strengths and weaknesses of the quantitative approach. The most common strength quoted was that quantitative data allows statistical analysis and can therefore allow comparisons. The most commonly quoted weakness is that such data often does not involve the view of the participant who can explain why he or she behaved in a particular way. Question part **(d)** as always required consideration of an alternative way of gathering data. Logically candidates would have chosen a qualitative approach, and this is exactly what many candidates suggested, particularly those choosing the Piliavin and Loftus studies.



PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/13

Core Studies 1

General comments

Whilst there were many excellent answers, as usual there were many answers that could have been better if a little attention were paid to examination technique. The following four points are noteworthy from this examination.

In relation to **Section A**, candidates should write more detail in most cases. For most questions just a few words will not be sufficient to score full marks. If the available marks are 0, 1 and 2 then candidates should ask themselves whether their answer would score 1 or 2 marks. Very few answers score 2 out of 2 for answers of three or four words. What is not required is a very detailed answer, just sufficient to show a little understanding, to show that the candidate knows more than a superficial knowledge. A candidate will often write "it is unethical" (and will score 1 mark) but writing "it is unethical because..." and completing the sentence would score both marks. There are ample examples in this paper, such as **Question 12**, to illustrate.

A second point is that many candidates often do not read the question set, instead 'half reading' what is there and then assuming what the question is asking. Often this assumption is false and the candidate thinks that they have written a very good answer when in fact they have misinterpreted the question and scored no marks at all. A few seconds spent reading the question fully will be of benefit. **Question 7** is a good example of this.

In relation to **Section B**, candidates should choose **Question 16** or **17** and the specific study more carefully. Often candidates can write an answer to question parts (a) and (b) but then struggle to answer parts (c) and (d). It may be a better strategy to choose a question/study where parts (c) and (d) can be answered even if parts (a) and (b) are weaker. To score some marks is better than scoring no marks. This is always true of candidates choosing the Freud study and on this paper was also true of the Thigpen and Cleckley study.

A second point in relation to **Section B** is that candidates do not answer question part (d) fully. The first part requires consideration of an alternative and in most cases this causes few problems for candidates. However, a large number of candidates do not go on to consider the effect the change has on the results. Instead many candidates consider the *implication* the change would have for the method, such as making it more ecologically valid, but that is not a consideration of the actual *results*.

One other issue worth mentioning concerns ethics and in this instance it concerns the nature of de-briefing. A de-brief happens at the end of the study and is an explanation to the participant about what they have just been doing. It should happen without question at the end of every psychology study. Many candidates appear to think that a de-brief is the same as a briefing which happens at the start of the study. Other candidates think that a de-brief is only necessary if there has been harm. This is not the case. A de-brief should be given to any and all participants. If it is not then the study can be said to be breaking ethical guidelines. For **Question 14(b)** on this examination paper, as the participants were children it is unlikely that they would have understood a full de-brief and that is the main reason why it was not given.



Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This question combined the Deregowski study with the issue of 'generalisations'. Question part **(a)** thus wanted something from the Deregowski study that applies to most people most of the time. One example might be that the perception of pictures is learned; another might be that pictures cannot be used as a 'lingua franca'. Some candidates did not know what a generalisation was and so they struggled to answer part **(a)** and could not answer part **(b)** at all. A generalisation is something which applies to most people most of the time.

Question 2

This question wanted any two problems with the Baron-Cohen et al Sally-Anne test for autism. Nearly all candidates were able to give correct answers, the three most common being: they used dolls rather than real people and the use of real people may have given a different result; that the test was conducted in a laboratory with a stranger (i.e. Baron-Cohen himself is a stranger to the children); and that the Sally-Anne test only applies to younger children with autism, it does not apply to older children or adults. Some candidates stated that boys do not play with dolls, which also received credit.

Question 3

This question required candidates to identify two ways in which it was decided that Washoe had learned a new sign. Identification of two things for two marks means that brief answers are acceptable. The most commonly quoted ways were that a new sign must be reported by three different observers; that the sign must be appropriate and spontaneous and that the sign must be observed at least once per day for fifteen consecutive days. Most candidates gave a correct answer to this question part. Question part **(b)** wanted identification of two of the four signs that Washoe learned during the first seven months of training. The full list appears in the original article itself. The first four signs were: 'come-gimme'; 'more'; 'up' and 'sweet'. Most candidates gave a wrong answer with tickle and flower appearing most often.

Question 4

This question concerned the conservation study by Samuel and Bryant. Question part **(a)** asked for the independent variables and question part **(b)** asked for the dependent variable. Most candidates were able to score 1 mark, but many could not identify either the independent variable or the dependent variable clearly enough to score full marks. The answer to **(a)** for 1 mark was: age, conditions or material. To gain the second mark the specifics of the independent variable had to be given, which were: material i.e. volume, mass and number; age: 5, 6, 7 and 8 years of age; and conditions: the standard two question (Piaget) or the one judgement condition. The dependent variable for question part **(b)** was often given as "performance on the task" or "the answers given" both of which were too vague. Precisely the dependent variable was the number of errors out of four on the conservation task.

Question 5

Bandura, Ross and Ross observed the children through a one way mirror. Candidates stating this scored 1 mark, but elaboration or a second aspect was needed for the full mark allocation to be awarded. A second appropriate aspect would be the use of time sampling where a behaviour was recorded at 5 second intervals, or that there were two observers. Question part **(b)** wanted one advantage of the way in which the children were observed. Most candidates stated that using a one way mirror meant that the child would not respond to demand characteristics and so behave naturally. Also acceptable would be that the use of two observers and the use of inter-rater reliability allowed a check of the accuracy of the observations.

Question 6

This question looked at the 'ex-institutional syndrome' suggested by Hodges and Tizard. According to Hodges and Tizard this syndrome is made up of five features, and this formed the basis of question part **(a)**. Whilst many candidates gave two features of the syndrome with little difficulty (features such as being adult oriented and having no special friend), many candidates could not answer the question at all. Question part **(b)** asked for a suggestion as to what is weak about proposing this syndrome. Many candidates suggested correctly that it would be a false generalisation because the sample size was too small, or that some but not



all features would be applicable.

Question 7

This question concerned development and the question clearly required one advantage and one disadvantage of studying *development*. Many candidates went straight into a “one advantage of the Freud study was...” and provided a very good answer to a different question from the one set. Other candidates do not seem to know what development is, which is surprising as ‘development’ could appear on Paper 2 as a full essay question. Simply, candidates must answer the question set rather than answer a question they think or hope is there.

Question 8

Question part **(a)** asked candidates to describe the procedure in the anger condition of the Schachter and Singer study. Some candidates wrote answers that were far too long, attempting to describe the whole study. The best answers focused on the specific detail that distinguishes the anger condition from the euphoric condition, namely the questionnaires which became increasingly personal and insulting. Question part **(b)** asked a general question about why it is important to standardise a procedure and most candidates correctly stated that this was an important control to make a study replicable.

Question 9

Question part **(a)** asked candidates for two ways in which the stooge was used to deceive participants in the Milgram study. Whilst many candidates provided excellent answers and scored full marks, there were many who did not answer the question and instead gave features that led to the high levels of obedience. For example some candidates referred to the prods given by the experimenter, but the experimenter was not a stooge. Others referred to the shock generator giving false shocks, and neither is the generator a stooge! Correct answers would include, amongst others, the drawing of lots to determine who was teacher and who was learner and the screams of the fake shocks. Question part **(b)** wanted one advantage of using a stooge and most candidates answered this with little difficulty.

Question 10

This question focused on the use of newspaper advertisements to recruit participants, as was the case in the Haney et al study. Question part **(a)** wanted one advantage and question part **(b)** wanted a disadvantage. As many candidates stated, the biggest advantage is the potentially wider range of participants the newspaper reaches whilst the biggest disadvantage is the exclusion of those who do not purchase the paper, who do not read the advert and who decide not to reply.

Question 11

This question concerned the subway Samaritan study by Piliavin et al. Question part **(a)** wanted a description of the setting in which the study was conducted. Any two features would score two marks. Most candidates were able to describe the train and many even included a brief drawing of the carriage. Others mentioned the length of the journey, the pole, adjacent and critical areas and other features of the *setting*. Some candidates described the participants, which are not a feature of the setting. Question part **(b)** wanted one advantage and one disadvantage of the setting. Appropriate advantages would include control of the journey time, that the setting of the train is high in ecological validity; it would also include the sample size because the setting of a subway train would lead to a large sample size. For disadvantages many candidates stated that the use of the victim was unethical and that the participants were deceived. Deception is not an appropriate answer because it is a feature of the behaviour of the stooge/victim rather than a feature of the *setting*.

Question 12

Question part **(a)** asked what makes the Tajfel study a snapshot study. Candidates who answered “because it is done in a few hours” scored 1 mark, whereas those candidates who added some detail to show they understood why this study was a snapshot study scored the full 2 marks. For example, one candidate wrote “after being put into groups all they had to do was fill in matrices and then they could leave. This took a very short period of time.” Question part **(b)** wanted one disadvantage of a snapshot study and most candidates correctly stated that it does not allow change in behaviour over time to be observed.



Question 13

This question asked for two advantages of psychometric tests. Any two advantages would receive credit and the advantages did not have to be related to the Gould study in order to receive credit. Whilst most candidates provided two advantages with ease, answers including their objectivity, ease of comparison and standardisation, other candidates provided no answer at all, which is surprising given that psychometric testing could appear as a whole essay question on Paper 2.

Question 14

Question part **(a)** wanted any two features of the sample of children in the Hradek and Grant study. Most candidates provided two without any problem, most commonly mentioned was their age, their colour and where they were from. Question part **(b)** wanted a reason why the children were not debriefed. Many candidates answered this question incorrectly because they do not understand what a de-brief is. See general comments above. In any study involving children a de-brief is often not given simply because the children may well be too young to understand what they are being told by the experimenters.

Question 15

This question asked about how nurses responded to requests for information in the Rosenhan study. Question part **(a)** focused on how the nurses responded. Most candidates answered this correctly, many giving precise percentages and scoring full marks in so doing. Question part **(b)** wanted a reason for the behaviour of the nurses and again most candidates answered correctly when stating that the nurses believed the pseudo-patients were insane, that they were non-people and so there was no point in talking to them.

Section B

Question 16

The concern of **Question 16** was the use of specialised apparatus and complex recording devices. Question part **(a)** required a description of the way in which the equipment was used to collect data, and many candidates provided excellent descriptions, particularly of the Dement and Kleitman study. Some candidates wrote far too much whilst others wrote too little, which is usually the case. Question part **(b)** required a description of the main findings of the chosen study. Those candidates choosing the Raine et al study often provided very detailed and precise answers. Those choosing the Dement and Kleitman study organised their answers according to the aims of the study. Question part **(c)** required strengths and weaknesses of using such equipment. The most commonly mentioned strength was that the data is objective and scientific, whilst the most common weakness was that the equipment may not work or that it cannot tell us why a particular behaviour occurred. Question part **(d)** as always required consideration of an alternative way of gathering data and, in this case, without such equipment. Some creative answers were written but most did not go on to state how the change would affect the results.

Question 17

The concern of **Question 17** was the quantitative approach. Question part **(a)** required a description of the procedure of the chosen study and many candidates provided excellent descriptions, particularly of the Loftus and Palmer study. Some candidates wrote far too much whilst others wrote too little, which is usually the case. Candidates choosing the Thigpen and Cleckley study often just described everything, telling the whole story, rather than breaking it down to answer the questions set. Question part **(b)** required a description of the quantitative results of the chosen study. Some candidates did not distinguish between qualitative and quantitative results, particularly for the Thigpen and Cleckley study, whilst for others, and those choosing either of the other studies, this was not a problem. For example, for the Thigpen and Cleckley study quantitative results were those from IQ test, memory test and EEG. Qualitative data was gathered from interviews and the Rorschach test. Question part **(c)** required strengths and weaknesses of the quantitative approach. The most common strength quoted was that quantitative data allows statistical analysis and can therefore allow comparisons. The most commonly quoted weakness is that such data often does not involve the view of the participant who can explain why he or she behaved in a particular way. Question part **(d)** as always required consideration of an alternative way of gathering data. Logically candidates would have chosen a qualitative approach, and this is exactly what many candidates suggested, particularly those choosing the Piliavin and Loftus studies.



PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/21
Core Studies 2

General comments

As in previous years, the marks achieved by candidates sitting this examination covered the entire range of the mark spectrum. Some candidates provided excellent answers which showed that they were very well prepared and a few could extend their answers beyond the core studies themselves.

Time management for this paper has improved from previous sessions. Many candidates spent an appropriate amount of time on each section and fewer candidates 'over-wrote' for part (a) of the **Section B** essay. This left more time for parts (b) and (c) which enabled the candidates to achieve higher marks overall. Some candidates continued to show poor time management and achieved less well overall in **Section B**. Candidates should aim to spend half an hour on **Section A** and an hour on **Section B** as this is worth more marks. It is pleasing to see that the majority of candidates did write something for every question on the paper. Very few candidates attempted all three essays. When this did happen the candidate was awarded the mark for the best of the three questions (**Question 6, Question 7 or Question 8**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

Compared to previous years, candidates were well prepared for the content required in the exam. Some candidates did include evidence in part (c) of the **Section C** essay and were able to achieve well. However, many candidates included no evidence and could not achieve further than the 3-4 mark band. **Question 6** was the most popular question. After this, **Question 7** was chosen by a number of candidates. Very few candidates answered **Question 8**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) This question wanted the candidate to describe one finding from the Deregowski study. The majority of candidates were able to achieve at least one mark on this question by giving a conclusion from the review article. Some candidates achieved two marks by giving a specific finding from the study.
- (b) The vast majority of candidates were able to give a brief explanation of how the finding supports the nurture debate. A number of candidates could explain this clearly and achieved full marks. A few candidates tried to justify how the findings support nature and achieved no marks.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to achieve at least one mark for this question as the candidates explained briefly why Samuel and Bryant used a snapshot study. A few candidates could explain this clearly and some did link this to the Samuel and Bryant study and were able to achieve full marks. Some candidates did not know the terminology and could not answer either part (a) or part (b) of this question.
- (b) Candidates that achieved marks in (a) were able to achieve at least one mark for this question. Few candidates linked their answer to the study itself to achieve full marks for this question.

Question 3

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to achieve full marks by giving two behavioural categories from the study.
- (b) This was a more challenging question for the majority of candidates with many achieving no marks. Those that did achieve the correct answer often wrote about having two observers and achieved one mark. Some candidates did give some really impressive answers about inter-rater reliability showing they really knew this study. Those who faltered on (b) wrote about comparing classroom and bobo-based behaviours to check reliability.

Question 4

- (a) Many candidates achieved one mark for this question and they were able to give an unclear reason why diffusion of responsibility occurred in the lab experiment but not in the field experiment. Many candidates got confused and believed diffusion of responsibility occurred in the field and not in the lab experiment. There were a few candidates who did achieve full marks and gave very impressive and insightful answers about the differences between the lab experiment and the field experiment.
- (b) There were many good answers that focused on the lack of ecological validity in lab experiments. A number of candidates only achieved one mark as their answers were very brief. Some candidates did make a clear suggestion that achieved full marks.

Question 5

- (a) Many very good answers were seen here. It was impressive to see that so many candidates had a good understanding of type two errors and were able to explain this. Some candidates achieved one mark as they believed that the symptoms of the pseudo-patients were the same as schizophrenia rather than being similar to schizophrenia.
- (b) A nice variety of responses were given for this question. Many candidates raised the issue of the danger to patients of being allowed to remain outside the hospital. Some candidates explained about the reputation of the psychiatrist.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) There were some very good answers from candidates. Candidates had a good knowledge of the core studies and were able to explain how each study differed from everyday life. Some candidates gave very detailed and insightful answers. Many achieved full marks for this section. A few candidates just described the studies and did not explain how the study was different to everyday life. These candidates achieved much lower marks.
- (b) This was well answered by many candidates. Some were able to clearly discuss four problems and give some evidence to back up their points. Many candidates failed to focus on problems and gave an evaluation of each study in turn. This meant there were many repetitions of points and the candidate achieved fewer marks overall as each separate problem can only receive a maximum of three marks.
- (c) There were some insightful answers and many did bring in evidence to back up their points. Few candidates were able to achieve in the top band as their answer did not extend beyond the core studies and contained many points similar to part (b) of this essay. Some candidates did not use evidence and were restricted to 3 or 4 marks.

Question 7

- (a) There were some excellent answers. Candidates often achieved full marks in this question and were able to describe the psychometric tests used in each study as well as how the tests were used. Some candidates just described the psychometric tests and achieved lower marks for each study. A few candidates described the Sally Anne task in depth for the Baron-Cohen study and only achieved one mark for this study. Many candidates incorrectly believed the Rorschach ink blot test is a psychometric test.



- (b) The vast majority of candidates did focus on the problems with psychometric tests and they were able to give evidence to back up their answers. Most found it difficult to think of four problems. Candidates mainly focused on ethnocentrism and bias in their responses.
- (c) There were a few insightful answers and most did bring in evidence to back up their points. The majority of candidates just described how the psychometric tests in each study could be used and did not discuss the usefulness of the tests. These candidates achieved in the 5-6 mark band.

Question 8

- (a) This was well answered by many with candidates describing the results and conclusions of the studies. Some candidates were confused about the focus of the Sperry study and discussed the importance of the commissurotomy operation rather than lateralisation of function.
- (b) Most candidates focused on the strengths and weaknesses appropriately and were able to bring in evidence to back up their points. Some candidates just gave an evaluation of the four studies and were only credited with appropriate strengths and weaknesses. This meant some of their evaluation received no credit.
- (c) There were some good answers to this part question from some well-prepared candidates. Similar to the other part (c) answers in this exam, evidence again was often lacking resulting in the mark being limited to 3 or 4 marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22
Core Studies 2

General comments

As in previous years, the marks achieved by candidates sitting this examination covered the entire range of the mark spectrum. Some candidates provided excellent answers which showed that they were very well prepared and a few could extend their answers beyond the core studies themselves.

As in previous sessions, time management was an issue for many candidates. A lot of time was spent on the part (a) of the **Section B** essay and therefore fewer marks were achieved overall in **Section B**. Candidates should aim to spend half an hour on **Section A** and an hour on **Section B** as this is worth more marks. It was pleasing to see that some candidates had good time management and this appeared to be Centre specific. These candidates spent an appropriate amount of time on each section and fewer candidates 'over-wrote' for part (a) of the **Section B** essay. This left more time for parts (b) and (c) which enabled the candidates to achieve higher marks overall. Compared to previous sessions, the number of candidates attempting all three essays has decreased which is pleasing. When this did happen the candidate was awarded the mark for the best of the three questions (**Question 6, Question 7 or Question 8**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

Many candidates were well prepared for the content required in the exam. Some candidates did include evidence in part (c) of the **Section C** essay and were able to achieve well. However, many candidates included no evidence and could not achieve further than the 3-4 mark band. **Question 6** was the most popular question. After this, **Question 7** and **Question 8** were chosen by a number of candidates.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) This question wanted the candidate to explain how the boys awarded points to the in-group and out-group in the Tajfel study. Candidates who were able to answer this question usually achieved full marks. Those who achieved no marks often focused on the arbitrary formation of the groups.
- (b) The vast majority of candidates were able to give a brief explanation of how the measure lacked ecological validity and achieved one mark. Fewer candidates could link this explanation to the dependent variable explained in part (a).

Question 2

This question was a four mark question where candidates could achieve two marks for each ethical issue described. Many candidates accurately named and described two ethical issues with an example from the study. The most popular responses focused on deception and harm. Some candidates gave two descriptions of deception and were credited with two marks. Weaker candidates described ethical issues that were not broken and achieved no marks for these descriptions.



Question 3

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to achieve full marks by giving one example of qualitative data and one example of quantitative data from the Milgram study. It was pleasing to see that very few candidates mixed up these terms.
- (b) The majority of candidates achieved one mark for this question as they were able to explain briefly why qualitative data was gathered. Most candidates focused on the data being more in depth and/or providing an explanation for behaviour. Some candidates did link their response to the Milgram study and achieved full marks for this question.

Question 4

- (a) Many candidates achieved full marks for this question by describing how the children's mental ages were matched across the three groups of participants. A few candidates believed the matching was done by chronological age or gender and achieved no marks.
- (b) Many very good answers were seen here. It was impressive to see that candidates understood the connection between the matching of the participants and removing the participant variable of intelligence from the study. Some candidates gave very brief or somewhat muddled answers and received one mark. If candidates achieved no marks in part (a) they usually failed to receive any marks in part (b).

Question 5

- (a) A nice variety of responses were given for this question and many candidates achieved full marks. Many different areas of the brain were mentioned and candidates could correctly identify the difference in activity between the murderers and non-murderers. Some candidates did get these differences mixed up and identified them the wrong way round. A few candidates just suggested there was a difference in brain activity and achieved no marks.
- (b) The majority of candidates achieved some marks for this question. Most focused on either treatment for criminals or identifying potential criminals. Some gave very brief answers and achieved one mark.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) There were some very good answers from candidates. Candidates had a good knowledge of the core studies and were able to describe how behaviour and experience was measured in each study. Some candidates gave very detailed and insightful answers. Many achieved full marks for this section. A few candidates just described the studies and achieved fewer marks. Some gave very detailed descriptions of the studies which were not necessary rather than focusing on the measurement used in the study.
- (b) Some good answers were seen here where the candidates focused on problems with carrying out studies high in ecological validity and examples were given from studies. The majority of candidates struggled to discuss four problems. The most popular problems were practical issues and ethics. Some candidates failed to focus on problems and gave an evaluation of each study in turn. This meant there were many repetitions of points and candidates achieved fewer marks overall as each separate problem can only receive a maximum of three marks.
- (c) There were some insightful answers and many did bring in evidence to back up their points. Few candidates were able to achieve in the top band as their answer did not extend beyond the core studies and contained many points similar to the part (b) of this essay. Some candidates did not use evidence and were restricted to 3 or 4 marks.



Question 7

- (a) There were some excellent answers to this part. Candidates often achieved full marks in this question and were able to describe how each study supported the nature or nurture view. Most were able to explain how some of the studies supported both views. Many candidates struggled to achieve three marks for the Samuel and Bryant study and gave more muddled answers compared to the other three studies in the question.
- (b) Candidates struggled to keep their answers focused on the nature/nurture debate. Most candidates did attempt to describe problems with examples from the studies. Problems directly linked to the nature/nurture debate did achieve full marks if there was evidence to back up the point. In some cases, the candidate's point did not link to the debate and they achieved lower marks.
- (c) There were a few insightful answers and most did bring in evidence to back up their points. The majority of candidates just described how each study supported the nature/nurture debate without creating much of a discussion. These candidates were unable to get into the top mark band.

Question 8

- (a) Many candidates failed to focus on the method used in each study. Candidates wrote in great detail about the four studies and often did achieve marks by referring to the method as part of their description. However, this did mean much of what was written did not achieve any marks. Some did mention the time frame of each study and achieved high marks overall for this part of the question.
- (b) Most candidates focused on the problems with the longitudinal method appropriately and some were able to bring in evidence to back up their points. Candidates did struggle to raise four points although many achieved full marks on each of the three points raised as they brought in appropriate evidence to back up their points. Candidates raised the problems of attrition, time, cost and bias.
- (c) There were some good answers to this part question. However, some candidates struggled to get above 5-6 marks as they failed to consider the other methods that could give insight into human behaviour such as the snapshot method. Similar to other the other part (c) answers in this exam, evidence was often lacking resulting in the mark being limited to 3 or 4 marks.



PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/23

Core Studies 2

General comments

As in previous years, the marks achieved by candidates sitting this examination covered the entire range of the mark spectrum. Some candidates provided excellent answers which showed that they were very well prepared and a few could extend their answers beyond the core studies themselves.

As in previous sessions, time management was an issue for many candidates. A lot of time was spent on the part (a) of the **Section B** essay and therefore fewer marks were achieved overall in **Section B**. Candidates should aim to spend half an hour on **Section A** and an hour on **Section B** as this is worth more marks. It was pleasing to see that some candidates had good time management and this appeared to be Centre specific. These candidates spent an appropriate amount of time on each section and fewer candidates 'over-wrote' for part (a) of the **Section B** essay. This left more time for parts (b) and (c) which enabled the candidates to achieve higher marks overall. Compared to previous sessions, the number of candidates attempting all three essays has decreased which is pleasing. When this did happen the candidate was awarded the mark for the best of the three questions (**Question 6, Question 7 or Question 8**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

Many candidates were well prepared for the content required in the exam. Some candidates did include evidence in part (c) of the **Section C** essay and were able to achieve well. However, many candidates included no evidence and could not achieve further than the 3-4 mark band. **Question 6** was the most popular question. After this, **Question 7** and **Question 8** were chosen by a number of candidates.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) This question wanted the candidate to explain how the boys awarded points to the in-group and out-group in the Tajfel study. Candidates who were able to answer this question usually achieved full marks. Those who achieved no marks often focused on the arbitrary formation of the groups.
- (b) The vast majority of candidates were able to give a brief explanation of how the measure lacked ecological validity and achieved one mark. Fewer candidates could link this explanation to the dependent variable explained in part (a).

Question 2

This question was a four mark question where candidates could achieve two marks for each ethical issue described. Many candidates accurately named and described two ethical issues with an example from the study. The most popular responses focused on deception and harm. Some candidates gave two descriptions of deception and were credited with two marks. Weaker candidates described ethical issues that were not broken and achieved no marks for these descriptions.



Question 3

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to achieve full marks by giving one example of qualitative data and one example of quantitative data from the Milgram study. It was pleasing to see that very few candidates mixed up these terms.
- (b) The majority of candidates achieved one mark for this question as they were able to explain briefly why qualitative data was gathered. Most candidates focused on the data being more in depth and/or providing an explanation for behaviour. Some candidates did link their response to the Milgram study and achieved full marks for this question.

Question 4

- (a) Many candidates achieved full marks for this question by describing how the children's mental ages were matched across the three groups of participants. A few candidates believed the matching was done by chronological age or gender and achieved no marks.
- (b) Many very good answers were seen here. It was impressive to see that candidates understood the connection between the matching of the participants and removing the participant variable of intelligence from the study. Some candidates gave very brief or somewhat muddled answers and received one mark. If candidates achieved no marks in part (a) they usually failed to receive any marks in part (b).

Question 5

- (a) A nice variety of responses were given for this question and many candidates achieved full marks. Many different areas of the brain were mentioned and candidates could correctly identify the difference in activity between the murderers and non-murderers. Some candidates did get these differences mixed up and identified them the wrong way round. A few candidates just suggested there was a difference in brain activity and achieved no marks.
- (b) The majority of candidates achieved some marks for this question. Most focused on either treatment for criminals or identifying potential criminals. Some gave very brief answers and achieved one mark.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) There were some very good answers from candidates. Candidates had a good knowledge of the core studies and were able to describe how behaviour and experience was measured in each study. Some candidates gave very detailed and insightful answers. Many achieved full marks for this section. A few candidates just described the studies and achieved fewer marks. Some gave very detailed descriptions of the studies which were not necessary rather than focusing on the measurement used in the study.
- (b) Some good answers were seen here where the candidates focused on problems with carrying out studies high in ecological validity and examples were given from studies. The majority of candidates struggled to discuss four problems. The most popular problems were practical issues and ethics. Some candidates failed to focus on problems and gave an evaluation of each study in turn. This meant there were many repetitions of points and candidates achieved fewer marks overall as each separate problem can only receive a maximum of three marks.
- (c) There were some insightful answers and many did bring in evidence to back up their points. Few candidates were able to achieve in the top band as their answer did not extend beyond the core studies and contained many points similar to the part (b) of this essay. Some candidates did not use evidence and were restricted to 3 or 4 marks.



Question 7

- (a) There were some excellent answers to this part. Candidates often achieved full marks in this question and were able to describe how each study supported the nature or nurture view. Most were able to explain how some of the studies supported both views. Many candidates struggled to achieve three marks for the Samuel and Bryant study and gave more muddled answers compared to the other three studies in the question.
- (b) Candidates struggled to keep their answers focused on the nature/nurture debate. Most candidates did attempt to describe problems with examples from the studies. Problems directly linked to the nature/nurture debate did achieve full marks if there was evidence to back up the point. In some cases, the candidate's point did not link to the debate and they achieved lower marks.
- (c) There were a few insightful answers and most did bring in evidence to back up their points. The majority of candidates just described how each study supported the nature/nurture debate without creating much of a discussion. These candidates were unable to get into the top mark band.

Question 8

- (a) Many candidates failed to focus on the method used in each study. Candidates wrote in great detail about the four studies and often did achieve marks by referring to the method as part of their description. However, this did mean much of what was written did not achieve any marks. Some did mention the time frame of each study and achieved high marks overall for this part of the question.
- (b) Most candidates focused on the problems with the longitudinal method appropriately and some were able to bring in evidence to back up their points. Candidates did struggle to raise four points although many achieved full marks on each of the three points raised as they brought in appropriate evidence to back up their points. Candidates raised the problems of attrition, time, cost and bias.
- (c) There were some good answers to this part question. However, some candidates struggled to get above 5-6 marks as they failed to consider the other methods that could give insight into human behaviour such as the snapshot method. Similar to other the other part (c) answers in this exam, evidence was often lacking resulting in the mark being limited to 3 or 4 marks.



PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/31
Specialist Choices

General comments

As for any Paper 3, the usual range of examination technique weaknesses was evident. There are generally three types of candidate.

Firstly, there are many candidates who do not appear to have studied any psychology at all. This type of candidate attempts questions which relate to their own personal life and they assume that because they have spent quite a few years in school they are competent to answer the psychology and education questions, or because they have been to a doctor they think they know all about psychology and health. These assumptions are false and this type of candidate often scores very few marks overall because they do not appear to have studied any psychology at all. Sometimes this type of candidate attempts all twenty questions in the hope that they will score some marks.

The second type of candidate is the candidate who has studied quite a lot of psychology, is very able but does not do very well because of poor examination technique. The main problem for this type of candidate is that they do not know how to evaluate in **Section B** question part (b). This type of candidate will provide an introduction to a topic area in question part (a) and then go on to provide more detail in part (b) of what they described in part (a). As there are no marks for description in part (b) very few and often no marks are awarded for answers like this. Examiners work hard for candidates by transferring marks for description from part (b) to part (a), but if there is no evaluation in an answer then Examiners cannot give any marks for it. Evaluation consists, at a basic level, of commenting positively or negatively on what has been described.

A third type of candidate has a good psychological knowledge, is well prepared for the examination and can answer each question part as it should be answered. For these candidates evaluation is all about presenting a number of psychological issues, presenting evidence to support the issues and cross referencing each. Such candidates are obviously familiar with the mark scheme and know exactly what to do in order to score high marks.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

For question part (a) candidates had to explain what was meant by the term 'teaching style'. Typically this is the way in which a teacher teaches. Most candidates scored one mark because they simply stated what their own teacher did without knowing anything about the style or the underlying psychology. For part (b) candidates had to describe one teaching style and one learning style. This confused many candidates because they think they are the same process. They are not! The way in which a teacher teaches and the way in which a learner learns can be, and often are, very different. Question part (c) required one way in which a learning style can be measured and many candidates suggested this could be done through examination results rather than writing about tests, such as that by Kolb, specifically designed to measure learning styles.



Question 2

For question part **(a)** candidates had to explain what was meant by the term ‘improving motivation’. This was a little more tricky than asking simply about motivation, but most candidates managed an extra sentence to address the ‘improving’ component. There were two extremes of answer for question part **(b)**. There were those candidates who knew both learned helplessness and attribution theory and could describe both and give relevant examples and as a consequence, scored full marks. At the other extreme were those candidates who did not know what these terms were, despite them appearing on the syllabus, and who scored no marks at all. For question part **(c)** many answers correctly suggested a way in which motivation could be improved, many candidates making a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

Question 3

This question was on disruptive behaviour in schools which gave candidates an opportunity to write freely on this topic area. Many did just that and wrote excellent answers showing detailed knowledge and understanding. Other candidates wrote very anecdotal answers based on their own school experience. Question part **(b)** answers covered the whole mark range. Question part **(c)** asked how a teacher may prevent disruptive behaviour from happening. As always many candidates confused prevention techniques (before behaviour happens) with corrective (after behaviour happens) and scored no marks. Other candidates focused on preventing and wrote excellent answers with good understanding.

Question 4

Part **(a)** required candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about the design and layout of educational environments. Many candidates described their own classroom and others ran through a list including lighting, heating and seating arrangements. Such answers scored some marks as these factors are pertinent, but often were limited because of no mention at all of any psychological evidence. Some part **(b)** answers were excellent but others disappointed with the obvious lack of issues. For part **(c)**, the typical question related to improving learning conditions in classrooms and many candidates simply extended what they had written about in part **(a)**. This is legitimate but answers must be related to the requirements of the mark scheme in order to score full marks.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 5

Part **(a)** asked: What is meant by the term ‘noise’? Nearly all candidates scored maximum marks by stating that noise is unwanted sound, or by writing equally appropriate answers. Many answers to part **(b)** were disappointing because a significant number of candidates could not describe even one appropriate study and many did not appear to realise what social behaviour was. That said, many others provided excellent answers often referring to the studies by Geen and O’Neal (1969) and Mathews and Canon (1975). Question part **(c)** focused on the negative effects of noise on health and although there were some “it can be bad for you” answers, others referred to appropriate evidence with ‘airport’ studies being most prominent.

Question 6

Question part **(a)** asked about climatological determinism, which is one of the few actual issues to appear on the syllabus. As usual there were those who had no clue as to what the term meant, whereas others did and a few impressively mentioned climatological probabilism and possibilism. Question part **(b)** wanted two effects of climate and weather on performance. Some appropriate work was quoted here, such as the studies by Pepler (1972) and Adam (1976). Question part **(c)** asked for a description of the effects of seasonal affective disorder on health and many candidates wrote really good answers showing good understanding of sufferers in countries who have little daylight (6 or 7 hours) at certain times of the year.



Question 7

This was on density and crowding and not, as some candidates thought, on crowds (and collective behaviour). For this answer the more able candidates looked at distinctions between density (physical) and crowding (psychological), methods (laboratory and naturalistic) and considered both human and animal studies. For human studies some candidates looked at performance, social behaviour and health. For animal studies the work of Calhoun was frequently mentioned. Often relevant issues were considered in part **(b)** but this was not always the case. Question part **(c)** looked at ways in which the negative feelings of crowding could be prevented. Some anecdotal answers merely stated “do not go there” whereas the more able quoted appropriate psychological research.

Question 8

This question focused on natural disaster and technological catastrophe. In part **(a)** some candidates defined these terms and then considered a number of instances of such events. More able candidates included theories to explain how people behave during such events. Answers like this scored very high marks, whilst those candidates who were unable to mention such studies, or indeed failed to mention any studies at all, scored no more marks than those in the bottom band. Question part **(c)** asked about how psychologists can help *before* a catastrophic or disastrous event. The main way in which help can be given is to understand how people behave in such situations and then to help devise evacuation plans and messages.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 9

Question part **(a)** asking about acute pain was answered fully and correctly by nearly all candidates. Question part **(b)** wanted a description of two theories of pain. Most candidates chose the specificity theory and the gate control theory and some very clear and detailed answers were written. Question part **(c)** wanted one study which has measured acute pain. Any of the common measures could be used such as self report/interview, rating scales or some form of behavioural assessment. What is unlikely to be used is a questionnaire such as the McGill pain questionnaire or the UAB scale which measure pain over a period of time.

Question 10

Without a doubt the question on pain was preferred to this question on accident proneness which was often chosen by the weaker candidate who largely suggested that it is “accidents that people have” with nothing more. In question part **(b)** most candidates could mention a personality characteristic although some candidates wrote about *any* personality characteristic, whether it related to accident proneness or not. For the non-personality cause of accidents candidates could refer to any factor that was due to the system or ‘theory B’ and whilst there were answers which scored full marks for this there were also answers which scored no marks at all. Part **(c)** wanted a description of a study which promoted safety behaviour. For the more able candidates the Fox et al study was frequently mentioned where workers were given tokens (rewards) for behaving safely.

Question 11

This question on health promotion attracted good candidates who wrote some excellent answers. Most made a distinction between the main methods and referred to studies done in schools, worksites and communities, following the guidelines in the specification. Question part **(b)** answers were varied. At the top end were those who evaluated a number of issues. Those in the middle mentioned a number of general issues and as always there were candidates at the bottom end who do not know how to evaluate. Question part **(c)** wanted candidates to suggest a programme that could be done in schools on any health aspect of their choice. Those suggesting a ‘providing information’ approach scored better marks than those suggesting ‘fear arousal’ approach.



Question 12

Answers on substances are often disappointing because too many candidates who know very little about psychology and substances think that they can score marks by writing about their own experience of substances. This is not to suggest they are addicted to anything, but they write about a 'street knowledge' of why people misuse and abuse substances. This strategy never works. Candidates must quote psychological knowledge in order to score marks. If question part (a) was lacking for many candidates, so was question part (b). For part (c) candidates had to focus on quitting a substance rather than preventing it from being used in the first place. Many candidates suggest the "go to 'alcoholics anonymous'" approach but do not know anything about its underlying principles or how this organisation works. Other candidates choose smoking as their substance and refer to many of the psychological techniques for quitting such as rapid smoking or a behavioural management strategy.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

Question part (a) wanted an explanation of the term 'historical model of abnormality'. Candidates could say what a historical model was, but they often could go no further than to say "it is a model from history". Part (b) wanted a description of one historical model and one contemporary model. Most candidates were able to provide some description for a historical model here with witchcraft being most evident. Descriptions of contemporary models were often clear and detailed with the medical, psychoanalytic and medical models being described. Question part (c) wanted a description of a historical treatment that is ineffective. Some candidates suggested dunking witches in water and others suggested electroconvulsive therapy. Although ECT was first suggested in the early 1920s many people would argue that it is not ineffective because it is used in many countries today.

Question 14

This question focused on somatoform disorders. Candidates who know nothing about this topic area do not choose it because they have no 'common-sense' knowledge of it, so those choosing to answer this question often write very good answers. This examination was no different with the majority of candidates writing very good part (a) answers. The general approach was to include a range of disorders such as hypochondriasis, conversion disorder, somatisation, psychogenic pain and body dysmorphic disorder. Although there was a good deal of ability shown in part (a) it was lacking in question part (b). As always there are those who can evaluate and those who cannot. Question part (c) wanted one way in which somatoform disorders can be treated, and the most common and most appropriate technique is cognitive-behaviour therapy, which most candidates referred to in their answers.

Question 15

The first **Section B** abnormality question concerned abnormal affect due to trauma. As always a few candidates focused only on the words abnormal affect excluding the others and so writing an inappropriate answer on abnormal affect. For many other candidates the focus was correctly on amnesia, fugue and post traumatic stress disorder. The more able candidates provided good evaluations in part (b) whilst weaker candidates just extended their part (a) answers, often covering the same information again. Question part (c) asked how abnormal affect due to trauma could be reduced and, as for **Question 14**, the most common technique is cognitive-behaviour therapy, which most candidates correctly referred to in their answers.

Question 16

This question focused on anxiety disorders and question part (a) wanted to know what psychologists have found out about anxiety disorders. As always candidates do not need to state specifically what has been *found out*, rather just describe anything they wish, related to this topic area as defined by the bullet points of the syllabus. Question part (b) required evaluation and answers here were the same as those in any other **Section B** essay question. Question part (c) focused on treatments for anxiety disorders. Some candidates suggested the use of drugs, others family support but by far the most common answer was the use of cognitive behaviour therapy.



PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

This question was on team building and team roles. Most candidates were able to answer part **(a)** successfully, although some failed to address the 'building' component and just defined a 'team'. Question part **(b)** required a description of one theory of team roles, and many candidates struggled to do this. Weaker candidates could provide anecdotal answers but could not provide any psychological evidence of team roles. The work of Belbin was cited most often by more able candidates. Question part **(c)** asked for two ways in which team building can be achieved. Answers ranged from those suggesting nothing more than "give a pep-talk" to those who knew relevant psychological theory and could describe two ways clearly and in detail.

Question 18

Part **(a)** of this question required an explanation of the term 'management style'. Candidates are often confused between leaders and managers and they are advised to find a good distinction between the two. For question part **(b)** two leadership styles were required and as usual candidates reverted to the 1920s Lewin et al styles whether they apply or not, and quote this work as if nothing has been devised since. Clearly modern day organisations are very different from the 1920s, and a study involving boys does not necessarily mean that such styles are used in organisations. For question part **(c)** the focus was on leader-worker interaction and this too needs a specific piece of psychological evidence. The work of Dansereau is the most quoted study by those knowledgeable of this area.

Question 19

This question allowed candidates to write all they knew about motivation to work. Candidates wrote about a wide range of theories but most prominent was that of Maslow. This is not incorrect, but so many others have been proposed that could have been included as well. In part **(b)** evaluations covered the whole mark range from those who had been very well prepared to those who provided no evaluation at all. In part **(c)** the focus was on how performance could be improved through motivation. As usual there were those candidates who simply stated "pay them more" to those who provided excellent answers and distinguished between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for example or those who considered rewards other than those involving money.

Question 20

This question was on organisational work conditions. There were those who merely described what they *imagine* such work conditions to involve and there were those who provided an appropriate list of factors but could not elaborate on any of them. The best answers came from candidates who provided a list of factors and then described relevant psychological evidence to match with some of the factors they had listed. Answers to question part **(b)** as usual ranged from 0 marks to 10 marks. In question part **(c)** candidates were asked to suggest how physical (rather than psychological) conditions could be improved. Some candidates used the evidence described in part **(a)** whilst others made suggestions that were inappropriate to the real world conditions in which some people have to work.



PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/32
Specialist Choices

General comments

As for any Paper 3, the usual range of examination technique weaknesses was evident. There are generally three types of candidate.

Firstly, there are many candidates who do not appear to have studied any psychology at all. This type of candidate attempts questions which relate to their own personal life and they assume that because they have spent quite a few years in school they are competent to answer the psychology and education questions, or because they have been to a doctor they think they know all about psychology and health. These assumptions are false and this type of candidate often scores very few marks overall because they do not appear to have studied any psychology at all. Sometimes this type of candidate attempts all twenty questions in the hope that they will score some marks.

The second type of candidate is the candidate who has studied quite a lot of psychology, is very able but does not do very well because of poor examination technique. The main problem for this type of candidate is that they do not know how to evaluate in **Section B** question part (b). This type of candidate will provide an introduction to a topic area in question part (a) and then go on to provide more detail in part (b) of what they described in part (a). As there are no marks for description in part (b) very few and often no marks are awarded for answers like this. Examiners work hard for candidates by transferring marks for description from part (b) to part (a), but if there is no evaluation in an answer then Examiners cannot give any marks for it. Evaluation consists, at a basic level, of commenting positively or negatively on what has been described.

A third type of candidate has a good psychological knowledge, is well prepared for the examination and can answer each question part as it should be answered. For these candidates evaluation is all about presenting a number of psychological issues, presenting evidence to support the issues and cross referencing each. Such candidates are obviously familiar with the mark scheme and know exactly what to do in order to score high marks.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

Candidates choosing this question answered it very well. For question part (a) candidates had to explain what was meant by the Humanistic approach to education and most answered this question part with little difficulty, nearly all scoring full marks. For part (b) candidates could describe two ways in which the Humanistic approach has been applied to education, with most candidates mentioning student-centred learning, the 'open' classroom or that each candidate should be educated according to their own individual learning style. Question part (c) caused a few problems because candidates often described another approach rather than describing the difference.

Question 2

For question part **(a)** candidates had to explain what was meant by the term 'disruptive behaviour'. Weaker candidates could provide a basic answer, with more able candidates often providing a concise explanation. Question part **(b)** again allowed weaker candidates to score some marks because all that was required was a description of one type of disruptive behaviour. However, there is a difference between answers receiving one mark and answers receiving three marks and those achieving full marks added some detail to their answer, rather than just a basic "talking too much in class" answer. For question part **(c)** many candidates could not distinguish between preventing and correcting and so marks were not scored. Candidates who knew the difference between the two were also able to give an appropriate way to modify the behaviour of the disruptive child.

Question 3

This question was on special educational needs which gave candidates an opportunity to write freely on this topic area. Many did just that and wrote excellent answers showing detailed knowledge and understanding. Some looked at difficulty and disability, such as dyslexia and partial blindness, whilst others looked at giftedness. Some candidates looked at both these aspects. Question part **(b)** answers covered the whole mark range with some candidates providing excellent evaluative answers. Question part **(c)** asked overcoming a learning difficulty or disability, and so excluded giftedness. Some candidates provided specific answers for overcoming dyslexia whilst others went for a more general approach considering segregating to give more individualized attention.

Question 4

Question part **(a)** required candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about teaching and learning styles. Many candidates do not know the difference between these and so wrote answers which were rather confused. Other candidates focused on just learning styles. Some candidates simply described what they did in class, describing no psychological evidence at all. Some part **(b)** answers were excellent but others disappointed with the obvious lack of issues. For part **(c)** most candidates either gave random suggestions or provided answers without thinking them through as to whether they would actually work in a classroom. A simple "teach everyone according to individual learning style" simply does not work for a single teacher with a class full of candidates with different styles.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 5

Part **(a)** asked what is meant by density and crowding. Nearly all candidates could describe density accurately but many then confused crowding, which is the same syllabus topic area as density, with crowds, a totally different syllabus topic area. Syllabus topic areas will never be mixed in **Section A** or **Section B** questions. Answers to part **(b)** reflected part **(a)** with answers to density being good (better answers referring to social and spatial density) with many candidates struggling to work out how crowds can be measured. Simply, they cannot! Question part **(c)** focused on an animal study, and nearly all candidates providing an answer correctly described the 'behavioural sink' study on rats by Calhoun.

Question 6

Question part **(a)** asked about cognitive maps and it was pleasing to see that many candidates answered very precisely with the Kitchen (1994) definition which is: "a pictorial and semantic image in our head of how places are arranged". Question part **(b)** asked for one way in which cognitive maps can be measured. Most candidates chose to describe the work of Lynch who identified five common elements of what he called sketch maps. Question part **(c)** wanted two common errors made when drawing cognitive/sketch maps and whereas many candidates guessed and gave anecdotal answers, many others gave perfectly correct answers when referring to segmentation bias, augmentation and Euclidian bias.



Question 7

This was on personal space. There were some excellent answers with candidates including a range of aspects. Most common were: types of space, such as those outlined by Hall (1966); ways in which space can be measured, including simulation and stop-distance; theories explaining why we have personal space; and even a consideration of studies which have investigated personal space through invasion. For this latter aspect the studies by Felipe and Sommer and Middlemist et al were most common. For part (b) for some candidates ethics was an obvious issue to include but as always there were those candidates who could not provide any evaluation at all. Question part (c) looked at ways in which people can defend their primary territory. Some candidates did not know what this was, so suggested ways in which a seat in a café or library could be defended when these two situations involve secondary (or semi public territory) rather than primary territory. Primary territory is usually one's home or property.

Question 8

This question focused on architecture and behaviour. In part (a) some candidates looked at urban renewal whilst others looked at specific studies of how architecture affects social behaviour (both pro- and anti-) and health. Either of these strategies is acceptable. Some candidates opted for a combination of both of these strategies. Answers to part (b) were varied. Even if issues are not mentioned to score some marks candidates should at least provide some comment about what they have described in part (a). Question part (c) asked about architectural features that might reduce crime. There were some excellent answers here which used the work of Newman (1976) who identified opportunities for surveillance and zones of territorial influence.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 9

Question part (a) required a mention of both 'stress' and 'measuring'. Surprisingly some candidates could not address both these components. Question part (b) wanted a description of one cause of stress and whilst most candidates could do this, many could not elaborate beyond a basic one mark answer. Question part (c) wanted two ways in which the cause of stress mentioned in question part (b) could be measured. A simple answer would consider a physiological measure (such as blood pressure) and a psychological measure (such as a questionnaire). Any cause of stress could be measured using these two general techniques. Some candidates became more precise, and scored good marks, by suggesting that the cause is a life event and that the Holmes and Rahe SRRS questionnaire could be used. However, many candidates struggled to provide two measures of any type.

Question 10

In question part (a) many candidates correctly focused on *methods* for promoting health and some very good answers were written. Question part (b) caused problems for most candidates. Candidates either focused on methods such as appeals to fear or providing information but failed to relate these to worksites. Alternatively candidates focused on worksites without mentioning the method on which their suggestion was based. Part (c) wanted candidates to suggest any problem that could be encountered when trying to promote health in worksites. Poor answers simply stated that "workers may not want it" whereas top answers mentioned changing habitual behaviour or brought in other concepts relevant to changing lifestyle and health behaviour.

Question 11

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



Question 12

Quite a large number of answers for this question on pain had been well prepared and were a delight to read. Candidates often considered a range of relevant components including types, theories, measures and ways in which pain can be managed. The quality of part **(b)** answers often did not match the quality of part **(a)** because of the usual weak evaluation, but there were some candidates who can evaluate and who scored full marks. For part **(c)** candidates had to focus on measuring the pain of a person in a hospital bed. Answers ranged from the basic “you could ask them” type answer, to those who considered techniques such as the UAB scale whereby the pain behaviour of a patient is observed by medical staff over a period of time.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

Question part **(a)** required a mention of both ‘treatments’ and ‘schizophrenia’. Surprisingly whereas some candidates could not address both components in **Question 9**, there was no problem answering both the components here. Part **(b)** wanted a description of one type of schizophrenia. Many candidates had no difficulty at all, most choosing to describe the symptoms of paranoid schizophrenia. Some candidates described positive (or negative) symptoms, but by definition these are symptoms rather than types. Question part **(c)** wanted one explanation and one treatment for the type of schizophrenia described in part **(b)**. A range of explanations were provided with medical/biological, particularly genetic explanations, being most prominent. Many candidates referred to the dopamine hypothesis and then sensibly linked this to appropriate drug treatments. Some candidates used the psychoanalytic explanation and then a drug treatment and this approach was also legitimate.

Question 14

This question focused on obsessive-compulsive disorder and for part **(a)** most candidates referred to the obsessions component and the compulsions component. There are a number of explanations for obsessive compulsive disorder and question part **(b)** wanted one of these. Most candidates chose the behavioural explanation, but some candidates opted to describe the psychoanalytic version. Question part **(c)** focused on treatments of two disorders and candidates were able to opt either for a different treatment for each disorder or the same treatment for each, provided that the treatment was specifically related to the disorder. For example, cognitive behaviour therapy could be used for both but to score full marks each needed to be related specifically rather than merely mentioning the same term twice.

Question 15

This question was on abnormal affect, a syllabus topic area which appears to be a favourite amongst candidates. Many answers were well prepared and covered a wide range of theories/explanations and types such as unipolar and bipolar. Many candidates included seasonal affective disorder as part of their part **(a)** answer. Many candidates used the different explanations as a basis for evaluations in part **(b)** whilst weaker candidates just extended their part **(a)** answers. Question part **(c)** asked for ways in which abnormal affect can be treated and some excellent and very thorough answers were written covering a wide range of approaches including drugs, electro-convulsive and behaviour therapies.

Question 16

This question focused on abnormal avoidance and need. This topic area includes the *needs* of kleptomania, pyromania and gambling. The main *avoidance* is a phobia. Most candidates included some appropriate psychology although many simply did a basic outline of each of the topic components. Often if there is little research and theory in part **(a)** then there is very little or no evaluation in part **(b)** and this was the case for this question. Question part **(c)** focused on ways in which abnormal need can be treated. Many candidates suggested some drug treatment but this is not appropriate for an abnormal need where cognitive behaviour therapy is apposite.



PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

Question part **(a)** asked about personnel screening. This is the process of reviewing information about job applicants to select workers and most candidates provided an answer that gained marks. Question part **(b)** required a description of one psychometric test used in personnel screening. A number of candidates guessed and simply stated “an intelligence test” whereas others were much more precise and referred to tests of cognitive or mechanical ability. Question part **(c)** asked for two problems with psychometric testing. Interestingly some candidates gave advantages, perhaps because of their Paper 1 or 2 knowledge, and others gave a general comment such as “there are individual differences”. Only a small minority related the answer to the problems of psychometric tests used in personnel screening/organizations.

Question 18

Part **(a)** of this question required an explanation of the term ‘communication process’. There were a number of impressive answers here, the best referring to the process of sender, channel and receiver. For question part **(b)** the question wanted two types of communication channel. Again there were some really good answers with many candidates looking at face-to-face ‘interviews’, use of email and other varieties of communication. A number of candidates incorrectly looked at communication networks. For question part **(c)** the focus was on how communication flow could be improved and although there were some anecdotal answers there were also a number of answers that showed good understanding of appropriate psychological knowledge.

Question 19

This question allowed candidates to write all they knew about human resource practices. In part **(a)** candidates wrote about a wide range of theories and concepts, with many candidates focusing on job analysis techniques rather than performance appraisal or reward systems. Candidates often mentioned only the job analysis acronym with FJA, PAQ and CIT dominating. In part **(b)** evaluations covered the whole mark range. In part **(c)** the focus was on the job analysis technique used by a new human resource manager. Those mentioning FJA, PAQ and CIT in part **(a)** often focused on one of these and pleasingly modified their answer to match the requirements of the mark scheme for question part **(c)**.

Question 20

This question was on human factors in work design. This was not a popular question and those candidates opting for it showed little understanding of the psychology underlying it. The main focus of this area is operator-machine systems, but in the general sense it includes workplace design which could, for any candidate, be the desk at which they work and the chair on which they sit. This does not suggest that anecdotal answers are appropriate but that the topic area can involve such aspects. This topic area can also include errors in the operator-machine interaction. As part **(a)** was often weak then so was part **(b)**. In question part **(c)** candidates were asked to suggest how the safety of operator machine systems could be improved and although there were some answers specifically related, candidates also received credit for bringing in general safety strategies such as appeals to fear and providing information.

