
PSYCHOLOGY

9698/31

Paper 3 Specialist Choices

May/June 2018

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 80

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

IGCSE™ is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **27** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Each option has three questions:

Section A: A short answer question: (a) = 2 marks, (b) = 4 marks

Section B: An essay question: (a) = 8 marks, (b) = 12 marks

Section C: An applications question (a) = 6 marks, (b) = 8 marks [choice of questions]

In order to achieve the same standard across all options, the same mark schemes are used for each option. These mark schemes are as follows.

| Section A: Short answer question: (a) = 2 marks | |
|---|---|
| No answer or incorrect answer. | 0 |
| Basic or muddled explanation. Some understanding but brief and lacks clarity. | 1 |
| Clear and accurate and explicit explanation of term. | 2 |

| Section A: Short answer question: (b) = 4 marks | |
|---|---|
| No answer or incorrect answer. | 0 |
| Anecdotal answer with little understanding of question area and no specific reference to study | 1 |
| Basic answer with some understanding. Reference to named study/area only. Minimal detail. | 2 |
| Good answer with good understanding. Study/area included with good description. | 3 |
| Very good answer with clear understanding of study/area with detailed and accurate description. | 4 |

| Section C: Application question = 6 marks | |
|---|-----|
| No answer or incorrect answer. | 0 |
| Vague attempt to relate anecdotal evidence to question. Understanding limited. | 1–2 |
| Brief description of range of appropriate evidence with some understanding. | 3–4 |
| Appropriate description of good range of appropriate evidence with clear understanding. | 5–6 |

| Section C: Application question = 8 marks | |
|--|-----|
| Suggestion is wrong. | 0 |
| Suggestion is largely appropriate to the question and is vaguely based on psychological knowledge. Answer is mainly inaccurate, often incoherent and lacks detail. Understanding is lacking. If applicable, methodological knowledge is basic or absent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For methodology question description of a study/other authors' work 2 marks max if related to question. Different method from that named, but related to question max 2 marks. Method correct, but not answering question max 2 marks. | 1–2 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <p>Suggestion is appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge. Answer has some accuracy, some coherence and some detail. Understanding is limited. If applicable, methodological knowledge is adequate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range of different methods, including named method, but lacks coherence. | 3–4 |
| <p>Suggestion is appropriate to the question and is based on psychological knowledge. Answer is accurate, largely coherent and detailed. Understanding is good. If applicable, methodological knowledge is good.</p> <p>Note: main/named method plus method to gather data is coherent.</p> | 5–6 |
| <p>Suggestion is appropriate to the question and is clearly based on psychological knowledge. Answer is accurate, is coherent and has appropriate detail. Terminology is used appropriately. Understanding is very good. Methodological knowledge is very good with 5 or more co-ordinated features.</p> | 7–8 |

GENERIC: General: In this question part each candidate is free to **suggest** a way in which the assessment request could be investigated; the ‘you’ is emphasised to show that in this question it is not *description* that is being assessed, but an individual *suggestion*.

- The question may be in the form of a suggestion for research, or an application.
- The question may allow a candidate a free choice of method to design their own study.
- It might be that a specific method is named in the question, and if it is this method *must be addressed*.
- Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme.
- Marks are awarded for methodological knowledge and how the methodology is applied to this topic area.

EXAMPLE: Specific: The named method is a **field experiment**, so inclusion where the experiment is to be conducted, IV and DV, controls, and design, task to be completed and sample for example, are essential features. Note: not all these features are needed for a max mark.

| Experiments | Observations | Q’nnaire/Interview | General features |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Type: lab or field | Participants: overt or covert | Type: open/closed | Sampling technique/sample |
| IV and DV | Observers: participant or non-participant | Setting: where conducted/how | Type of data Quantitative or Qualitative |
| Design | Data: structured or unstructured | Questions | Data analysis: descriptive or inf |
| Controls | Setting: controlled or uncontrolled | Rating scale e.g. type, 5-point | Ethics Reliability Validity |
| Allocate to conditions | Number observers/irr | Scoring | |

Section B: Essay question: (a) = 8 marks

| | |
|---|-----|
| No answer or incorrect answer. | 0 |
| Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. Description is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Understanding is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. | 1–2 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Definition of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Description is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Understanding is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. | 3–4 |
| Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Description is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. | 5–6 |
| Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Description is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised. | 7–8 |

Section B: Essay question: (b) = 12 marks

| | |
|--|-------|
| No answer or incorrect answer. Answer is descriptive with [no evaluation] | 0 |
| Evaluation (positive and negative points) is basic . [General evaluation] Range of evaluative points, <u>which may or may not include the named issue</u> , is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Evaluative points are not organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Sparse or no use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is severely lacking in detail and understanding is weak. | 1–3 |
| Evaluation (positive and negative points/advantages and disadvantages) is limited . Range of evaluative points, <u>which may or may not include the named issue</u> , is limited. Points <u>hint</u> at issues/debates, methods or approaches but with little or no organisation into issues. Poor use of supporting examples. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sparse. Evaluation is lacking in detail and understanding is sparse. Note: If issue is identified and has supporting examples , but no evaluation of the issue (positive or negative points), <u>maximum 4 marks, 6 marks with general evaluation</u> . Note: If evaluation is ‘study by study’ with same issues identified repeatedly with no positive or negative points of issues, however good examples are, <u>maximum 6 marks</u> . Note: If the issue stated in the question is not addressed, <u>maximum 6 marks</u> . Note: If only the issue stated in the question is addressed, <u>maximum 4 marks</u> . | 4–6 |
| Evaluation of issues (positive and negative points) is good . Range of evaluative issues/debates, methods or approaches, <u>including the named issue</u> , is good and is balanced. The answer has some organisation of evaluative issues (rather than ‘study by study’). Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation has good detail and understanding is good. | 7–9 |
| Evaluation (positive and negative points) is comprehensive . Selection and range of evaluative issues/debates, methods or approaches, <u>including the named issue</u> , is very good and which are competently organised. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed, and understanding is thorough. | 10–12 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|--|----------|
| Section A: Short answer question: (a) = 2 marks | | |
| 1(a) | <p>Explain, in your own words, what is meant by ‘improving learning effectiveness’.</p> <p>Typically: different techniques that can be applied to improve the learning effectiveness of a student; for example a strategy to enable a student to perform more effectively in an examination.</p> <p>Marks: 1 mark for basic statement and 1 mark for expansion/example.</p> | 2 |
| Section A: Short answer question: (b) = 4 marks | | |
| 1(b) | <p>Describe the ‘4-mat system’ study skill technique.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improving learning effectiveness (study skills) the 4-mat system (McCarthy, 1990); PQRST method: learning from textbooks; Strategies for effective learning and thinking (SPELT) Mulcahy et al. (1986). <p>Most likely: McCarthy’s (1990) 4-MAT system. Includes: motivation, concept development, practice and application. This is teacher-based who matches teaching styles with learning styles.</p> <p>Marks: 4 marks for correct description of 4-mat study skill, determined by quality of answer.</p> | 4 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|-------|
| Section B: Essay question: (a) = 8 marks | | |
| 2(a) | <p>Describe what psychologists have discovered about disruptive behaviour in schools.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to include some of the following details from the syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • types, explanations and effects of disruptive behaviours Types: conduct (e.g. distracting, attention-seeking, calling out, out-of-seat); immaturity and verbal and physical aggression (bullying), attention deficit hyperactive disorder. • Explanations and effects for one or more of above types. Poor teaching style. causes and effects of one disruptive behaviour Any disruptive behaviour (e.g. one from above) but not attention deficit hyperactive disorder. • Corrective and preventive strategies preventive: effective preventive discipline (Cotton, 1990); effective classroom management behaviour (Kounin, 1990). Corrective: behaviour modification techniques (Presland, 1990); cognitive behaviour modification e.g. self instructional training (Meichenbaum, 1971). | 8 |
| Section B: Essay question: (b) = 12 marks | | |
| 2(b) | <p>Evaluate what psychologists have discovered about disruptive behaviour in schools, including a discussion about the use of observations to gather data.</p> <p><i>NOTE: any evaluative point can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.</i></p> <p><u>Evaluation of theory:</u> internal strengths and weaknesses; theoretical issues: reductionism, determinism, ethnocentrism. Supporting/contradicting evidence; Comparisons and contrasts with alternative theory.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u> strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure. Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative methodologies.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> <i>Any relevant debate can be raised</i>, such as qualitative versus quantitative data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p> <p><u>Named issue: observations:</u> observations are often used to gather data about disruptive behaviour. The different types of observations can be discussed as can specifics such as event and time sampling. Candidates could also consider the problems of conducting an observation such as other children obstructing the view or the strengths and weaknesses of different settings.</p> | 12 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|-------|
| Section C: Application question (a) = 8 marks | | |
| 3 | Baron-Cohen et al. suggest that autism is more common in males because of increased levels of the hormone testosterone. | |
| 3(a) | <p>Suggest how <u>you</u> would design and conduct a study to test this claim.</p> <p>General: In this question part each candidate is free to suggest a way in which the assessment request could be investigated; the 'you' is emphasised to show that in this question it is not <i>description</i> that is being assessed, but an individual <i>suggestion</i>. The question may be in the form of a suggestion for research, or an application. The question may allow a candidate a free choice of method to design their own study. It might be that a specific method is named in the question, and if it is this method must be addressed. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme. Marks are awarded for methodological knowledge and how the methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> <p>Specific: Candidates are free to choose any method. The choice of method should be appropriate and the answer should include the essential features of that method. Marks awarded for methodological knowledge and how methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> | 8 |
| Section C: Application question (b) = 6 marks | | |
| 3(b) | <p>Describe the effects of <u>one</u> specific learning difficulty or disability.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> causes and effects of one specific learning difficulty or disability most likely: dyslexia or attention deficit hyperactive disorder, autistic spectrum disorder or any other need. <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ASD: Difficulties with social relationships (will not join in with others. Difficulties with verbal and non-verbal communication (e.g. is echolalic, little eye contact)). Difficulty in the development of play and imagination (pretend play). Preference for routine and dislikes change. Does not like loud noises; does not like large groups of people. Does not have a theory of mind. Dyslexia: letter reversal or rotation – the letter 'd' may be shown as 'b' or 'p'; missing syllables – 'famel' for 'family'; transposition of letters – 'brid' for 'bird'; Problems keeping place when reading; Problems pronouncing unfamiliar words. ADHD: can include hyperactivity with or without deficits. Inattention: difficulty concentratiog, not following instructions, etc. Impulsivity: behaves without 'thinking', can't turn-take. Hyperactivity: fidgets, leaves seat. <p>Marks: at least two features must be included. If detailed and examples max 3 marks each. If three features in less detail can be 2 + 2 + 2 marks. A list of six features will not score 6 marks because the question asks for a description. If three features <i>identified</i> max 3 marks.</p> | 6 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|----------|
| Section C: Application question (a) = 6 marks | | |
| 4 | It is claimed that learned helplessness is more difficult to change in females than in males. | |
| 4(a) | <p>Describe <u>one</u> explanation of learned helplessness.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> motivation issues: attribution theory and learned helplessness Attributing causes to behaviours (Weiner, 1984); learned helplessness (Dweck et al., 1978); changing attributions. <p>Most likely (any appropriate explanation to receive credit):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dweck (1978) distinguishes between those children who have a mastery orientation (a growth mindset) and those who have a fixed mindset. A mastery orientation leads to increased motivation in the face of failure and such children view failure as a challenge and as a learning opportunity, not as a negative of their ability. On the other hand there are those who experience negative feelings, including anxiety, and a helpless pattern to failure leading them to give up. Another explanation is that learned helplessness is caused by the feedback given by a teacher about work and the subsequent attribution a child makes about it. The work of Seligman and Meier's (1975) 'dog experiment' may be mentioned. This is an explanation and so should be credited even though it is not human or education. <p>Marks: 6 marks for correct explanation, determined by quality of answer.</p> | 6 |
| Section C: Application question (b) = 8 marks | | |
| 4(b) | <p>Suggest how <u>you</u> would design and conduct a study to investigate the effectiveness of a strategy to change learned helplessness in males and females.</p> <p>General: In this question part each candidate is free to suggest a way in which the assessment request could be investigated; the 'you' is emphasised to show that in this question it is not <i>description</i> that is being assessed, but an individual <i>suggestion</i>. The question may be in the form of a suggestion for research, or an application. The question may allow a candidate a free choice of method to design their own study. It might be that a specific method is named in the question, and if it is this method must be addressed. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme. Marks are awarded for methodological knowledge and how the methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> <p>Specific: Candidates are free to choose any method. The choice of method should be appropriate and the answer should include the essential features of that method. Marks awarded for methodological knowledge and how methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> | 8 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|--|----------|
| Section A: Short answer question: (a) = 2 marks | | |
| 5(a) | <p>Explain, in your own words, what is meant by 'promoting health in schools'.</p> <p>Typically: enhancing good health and preventing illness, in this case via programmes conducted in schools.</p> <p>Marks: 1 mark for statement about promoting health and 1 mark for relating to schools.</p> | 2 |
| Section A: Short answer question: (b) = 4 marks | | |
| 5(b) | <p>Describe <u>two</u> methods that can be used to promote health in schools.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • methods for promoting health. Fear arousal (e.g. Janis and Feshbach, 1953; Leventhal et al., 1967). Yale model of communication. Providing information (e.g. Lewin, 1992). • health promotion in schools, worksites and communities. Schools (e.g. Walter, 1985; Tapper et al., 2003). Worksites (e.g. Gomel, 1983). Communities (e.g. three community study, Farquhar et al., 1977). <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walter (1985) In 22 American elementary schools, a special curriculum was designed with the emphasis on nutrition and physical fitness. The schools were randomly assigned so that students would either participate in the programme or act as a control group. After 2 years the two groups were compared. • Tapper et al. (2003) The Food Dudes – a successful UK campaign using cartoons and a reward package. <p>Marks: 1 mark for correct identification of study and 1 mark for description/elaboration, × 2</p> | 4 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|-------|
| Section B: Essay question: (a) = 8 marks | | |
| 6(a) | <p>Describe what psychologists have found out about adherence to medical advice.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to include some of the following details from the syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • types of non-adherence and reasons why patients don't adhere. Types and extent of non-adherence. Rational non-adherence (e.g. Bulpitt, 1988); customising treatment (e.g. Johnson and Bytheway, 2000). • measuring adherence/non-adherence. Subjective: self reports (e.g. Riekart and Droter, 1999). Objective: pill counting (e.g. Chung and Naya, 2000); biochemical tests (e.g. Roth, 1987); repeat prescriptions (e.g. Sherman, 2000). • improving adherence. Improve practitioner style (e.g. Ley, 1988), provide information (e.g. Lewin, 1992), behavioural techniques (e.g. Burke et al., 1997). | 8 |
| Section B: Essay question: (b) = 12 marks | | |
| 6(b) | <p>Evaluate what psychologists have found out about adherence to medical advice, including a discussion about the usefulness of different techniques to improve adherence.</p> <p><i>NOTE: any evaluative point can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.</i></p> <p><u>Evaluation of theory:</u> internal strengths and weaknesses; theoretical issues: reductionism, determinism, ethnocentrism. Supporting/contradicting evidence; Comparisons and contrasts with alternative theory.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u> strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure. Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative methodologies.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> <i>Any relevant debate can be raised</i>, such as qualitative versus quantitative data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p> <p><u>Named issue: different techniques:</u> Candidates should compare and/or contrast the different techniques used to improve adherence. Reference to the third bullet point above reveals the most likely strategies and studies to be included, each of which has many advantages and disadvantages.</p> | 12 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|--|----------|
| Section C: Application question (a) = 6 marks | | |
| 7 | Pain can be managed using cognitive strategies. | |
| 7(a) | <p>Describe <u>two</u> cognitive strategies for managing pain.</p> <p>Syllabus: Managing and controlling pain: Medical techniques (e.g. surgical; chemical). Psychological techniques: cognitive strategies (e.g. attention diversion, non-pain imagery and cognitive redefinition); alternative techniques (e.g. acupuncture, stimulation therapy/tens).</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attention diversion: the technique of focusing on a non-related stimulus in the immediate environment in order to be distracted from the discomfort • non-pain imagery: a strategy whereby the person tries to alleviate discomfort by creating a mental scene that is unrelated to or incompatible with the pain • cognitive redefinition: where a person replaces negative thoughts about pain for constructive (positive) thoughts. <p>Marks: 3 marks for each appropriate strategy.</p> | 6 |
| Section C: Application question (b) = 8 marks | | |
| 7(b) | <p>Suggest how <u>you</u> would design and conduct an investigation to find out which strategy you described in (a) is more effective.</p> <p>General: In this question part each candidate is free to suggest a way in which the assessment request could be investigated; the 'you' is emphasised to show that in this question it is not <i>description</i> that is being assessed, but an individual <i>suggestion</i>. The question may be in the form of a suggestion for research, or an application. The question may allow a candidate a free choice of method to design their own study. It might be that a specific method is named in the question, and if it is this method must be addressed. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme. Marks are awarded for methodological knowledge and how the methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> <p>Specific: Candidates are free to choose any method. The choice of method should be appropriate and the answer should include the essential features of that method. Marks awarded for methodological knowledge and how methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> | 8 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|-------|
| Section C: Application question (a) = 6 marks | | |
| 8 | Life events can be measured psychologically and stress can be measured physiologically. | |
| 8(a) | <p>Describe the physiology of stress and its effects on health.</p> <p>Syllabus: Causes/sources of stress: Physiology of stress and effects on health. The Gas model (Selye). Causes of stress: lack of control (e.g. Geer and Maisel, 1972), work (e.g. Johansson, 1978), life events (Holmes and Rahe, 1967), personality (e.g. Friedman and Rosenman, 1974), daily hassles (e.g. Lazarus, 1981).</p> <p>Most likely: (any other appropriate example to receive credit):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the GAS model (alarm, resistance and exhaustion); • Description of effects of stress related hormones (e.g. adrenaline and cortisol) such as increase in breathing, blood pressure, heart rate, etc. • Possible description of measures of physiology (ECG, GSR, sample test: blood, urine cortisol, blood pressure) • Description of effects on health: stomach ulcers, on immune system, etc. <p>Marks: 6 marks for description explanation, determined by quality of answer.</p> | 6 |
| Section C: Application question (b) = 8 marks | | |
| 8(b) | <p>Suggest how <u>you</u> would design and conduct a correlational study, measuring life events psychologically and measuring stress physiologically.</p> <p>General: In this question part each candidate is free to suggest a way in which the assessment request could be investigated; the 'you' is emphasised to show that in this question it is not description that is being assessed, but an individual suggestion. The question may be in the form of a suggestion for research, or an application. The question may allow a candidate a free choice of method to design their own study. It might be that a specific method is named in the question, and if it is this method must be addressed. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme. Marks are awarded for methodological knowledge and how the methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> <p>Specific: candidates must use a correlation. This should include two variables, possibly mention of scattergram, positive or negative, and 0–1. The design of the study used to gather the data should be evident.</p> | 8 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|--|-------|
| Section A: Short answer question: (a) = 2 marks | | |
| 9(a) | <p>Explain, in your own words, what is meant by the simulation method to measure personal space.</p> <p>Typically: this is where personal space is measured without using human participants. Drawings of two people can be done on paper, it can be done using 'fuzzy felt' and images of people stuck on a board, or it can be done as used by Little (1968) where dolls are placed in different social situations.</p> <p>Marks: 1 mark for comment about simulation method and 1 mark for relating to personal space.</p> | 2 |
| Section A: Short answer question: (b) = 4 marks | | |
| 9(b) | <p>Describe <u>one</u> study which has used the simulation method to measure personal space.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> definitions, types and measures: Defining space (e.g. Hall, 1966) and territory (e.g. Altman, 1975). Alpha space and beta space. Measuring space: simulation (e.g. Little, 1968); stop-distance; space invasions (see below) <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The simulation method (as used by Little) involved use of grey plastic dolls placed at an appropriate distance from each other on a piece of newsprint (paper). Little measured the distance between the dolls and assumed that .5 inch equated to 1 inch in real life. Little compared 5 national groups: Greek, Scottish, Swedish, Southern Italian and USA. <p>Marks: 4 marks for correct description of relevant study, determined by quality of answer.</p> | 4 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|--|-------|
| Section B: Essay question: (a) = 8 marks | | |
| 10(a) | <p>Describe what psychologists have discovered about architecture and behaviour.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to include some of the following details from the syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theories and effects of urban living on health and social behaviour. Theories: adaptation level, behaviour constraint, environmental stress and overload. Effects on health (e.g. Soderberg et al., 1994) and social behaviour (e.g. Amato, 1983). • Urban renewal and housing design. Renewal and building design: (e.g. Pruitt-Igoe, 1954–1972); Newman (e.g. Clason Point and Five Oaks, 1994). • Community environmental design. Shopping mall atmospherics (e.g. Michon et al., 2003); casino environments (Finlay et al., 2006); public places (e.g. Whyte, 1980 or Brower, 1983). | 8 |
| Section B: Essay question: (b) = 12 marks | | |
| 10(b) | <p>Evaluate what psychologists have discovered about architecture and behaviour, including a discussion about competing theories.</p> <p><i>NOTE: any evaluative point can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.</i></p> <p><u>Evaluation of theory:</u> internal strengths and weaknesses; theoretical issues: reductionism, determinism, ethnocentrism. Supporting/contradicting evidence; Comparisons and contrasts with alternative theory.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u> strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure. Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative methodologies.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> <i>Any relevant debate can be raised</i>, such as qualitative versus quantitative data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p> <p><u>Named issue: competing theories:</u> Candidates should compare and/or contrast the different theories used to explain the effects of architecture and behaviour. Reference to the first bullet point above reveals the most likely theories to be included, each of which has many advantages and disadvantages.</p> | 12 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|--|----------|
| Section C: Application question (a) = 8 marks | | |
| 11 | Some people are more prepared for an emergency event such as a natural disaster or technological catastrophe than others. | |
| 11(a) | <p>Suggest how <u>you</u> would design and conduct a questionnaire study to gather data on how prepared people are for an emergency event.</p> <p>General: In this question part each candidate is free to suggest a way in which the assessment request could be investigated; the ‘you’ is emphasised to show that in this question it is not <i>description</i> that is being assessed, but an individual <i>suggestion</i>. The question may be in the form of a suggestion for research, or an application. The question may allow a candidate a free choice of method to design their own study. It might be that a specific method is named in the question, and if it is this method must be addressed. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme. Marks are awarded for methodological knowledge and how the methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> <p>Specific: The named method is a questionnaire study so candidates are expected to show knowledge of questionnaire type/design (e.g. open or closed), examples of questions (that clearly relate to ethics and personal space), any rating scale that may be used, possibly where the questionnaire will be conducted, on whom, and how the answers will be scored. Note: not all these features are needed for a max mark.</p> | 8 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|-------|
| Section C: Application question (b) = 6 marks | | |
| 11(b) | <p>Describe <u>two</u> studies about psychological intervention before an emergency event.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> psychological intervention before and after events. Before: preparedness (e.g. Sattler et al., 2000); evacuation plans (e.g. Loftus, 1972). After: treating PTSD. Herald of Free Enterprise – Belgium (Hodgkinson and Stewart, 1991). London Bombing (Rubin et al., 2005). <p>Most likely (any appropriate study to receive credit):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loftus (1972) prepared an evacuation message for the Bay Area Rapid Transport System in the United States. She outlined the major principles of successful meaasges: get attention, be short and repeat important instructions. Sattler et al. (2000) assessed level of preparedness using a questionnaire in a sample from the United States. It was found that most participants kept a store of basic items such as water. Those most prepared were older, had a larger income or had experience of disasters. <p>Marks: 1 mark for basic/anecdotal, up to 3 marks for accurate description of appropriate study, × 2</p> | 6 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|--|-------|
| Section C: Application question (a) = 6 marks | | |
| 12 | Males and females may make different types of error when drawing sketch maps. | |
| 12(a) | <p>Using examples, describe <u>two</u> errors typically made when drawing sketch maps.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> definitions, measures, errors and individual differences in cognitive map: Definitions, measures: sketch maps (Lynch, 1960); multidimensional scaling (e.g. Moar, 1987); errors and individual differences (e.g. Malinowski, 2001). <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> maps are often incomplete: we leave out minor details. we augment – add non-existent features we distort by having things too close together, too far apart or misaligning. People often over-estimate the size of familiar areas. superordinate-scale bias: We group areas together and make judgement on area rather than specific place, e.g. Stevens and Coupe (1978) Euclidean bias: people assume roads, etc. are grid-like: they are not segmentation bias: Allen & Kirasic (1985) we estimate distances incorrectly when we break a journey into segments compared to estimate as a whole. <p>Marks: 3 marks for each error: 1 mark for identification, 1 mark for description and 1 mark for example.</p> | 6 |
| Section C: Application question (b) = 8 marks | | |
| 12(b) | <p>Suggest how <u>you</u> would design and conduct an experiment to investigate differences in sketch map errors between males and females.</p> <p>General: In this question part each candidate is free to suggest a way in which the assessment request could be investigated; the 'you' is emphasised to show that in this question it is not <i>description</i> that is being assessed, but an individual <i>suggestion</i>. The question may be in the form of a suggestion for research, or an application. The question may allow a candidate a free choice of method to design their own study. It might be that a specific method is named in the question, and if it is this method must be addressed. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme. Marks are awarded for methodological knowledge and how the methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> <p>Specific: The named method is an experiment, so inclusion of type of experiment, IV and DV, controls, and design, task to be completed and sample for example are essential features. Note: not all these features are needed for a max mark.</p> | 8 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|--|----------|
| Section A: Short answer question: (a) = 2 marks | | |
| 13(a) | <p>Explain, in your own words, what is meant by a ‘case study’.</p> <p>Typically: A case study involves a detailed investigation of a specific individual (or small group; a ‘unit’). It is often longitudinal and takes place over a period of time.</p> <p>Marks: 1 mark for basic explanation, 1 mark for elaboration/example.</p> | 2 |
| Section A: Short answer question: (b) = 4 marks | | |
| 13(b) | <p>Describe <u>one</u> case study of obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD).</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> definitions, measures and examples of obsessions and compulsions: Defining obsessions and compulsions; case studies of/examples (e.g. ‘Charles’ by Rappaport, 1989); measures: e.g. Maudsley obsessive-compulsive inventory <p>Most likely: The case of ‘Charles’ by Rappaport (1989). Aged 12 Charles started to wash compulsively. He followed the same ritual each day in the shower and it would take up to 3 hours. Getting dressed would take another 2 hours. Charles was treated by Rappaport who prescribed Anafranil and for a while the symptoms disappeared. With behavioural management, such as washing in the evening, Charles went on to cope with his disorder.</p> <p>Marks: 1–2 marks basic; 3–4 marks increasing quality of description and elaboration.</p> | 4 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|-------|
| Section B: Essay question: (a) = 8 marks | | |
| 14(a) | <p>Describe what psychologists have discovered about models of abnormality.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to include some of the following details from the syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • definitions of abnormality. Definitions: deviation from statistical norms, social norms, ideal mental health, failure to function adequately. Problems with defining and diagnosing abnormality. • models of abnormality. Medical/biological, behavioural, psychodynamic, cognitive. Assumptions and applications of models. • treatments of abnormality. Treatments derived from models: biological/medical; psychotherapies; cognitive-behavioural. Effectiveness and appropriateness of treatments. | 8 |
| Section B: Essay question: (b) = 12 marks | | |
| 14(b) | <p>Evaluate what psychologists have discovered about models of abnormality, including a discussion about the effectiveness of different treatments of abnormality.</p> <p><i>NOTE: any evaluative point can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.</i></p> <p><u>Evaluation of theory:</u> internal strengths and weaknesses; theoretical issues: reductionism, determinism, ethnocentrism. Supporting/contradicting evidence; Comparisons and contrasts with alternative theory.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u> strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure. Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative methodologies.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> <i>Any relevant debate can be raised</i>, such as qualitative versus quantitative data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p> <p><u>Named issue: treatments of abnormality:</u> The use of biochemicals (drugs) to treat various abnormalities is controversial. Drugs such as clomipramine (for OCD) for example are used. Biochemical/medical treatments include the use of ECT. Comparisons and contrasts can be made with behavioural, cognitive and psychoanalytic treatments. Candidates can focus on just one (e.g. biochemical/medical) or widen discussion.</p> | 12 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|----------|
| Section C: Application question (a) = 6 marks | | |
| 15 | There are different explanations of what causes children to have a phobia of an animal. | |
| 15(a) | <p>Describe <u>two</u> case studies of phobias.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> explanations of phobias: Behavioural (classical conditioning, e.g. Watson, 1920); Psychoanalytic (Freud, 1909); biomedical/genetic (e.g. Ost, 1992); cognitive (e.g. DiNardo et al, 1988) <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little Albert as studied by Watson (1920) was conditioned to be fearful of various items including Albert's favourite white rat. Little Hans as studied by Freud (1909) who had a phobia of horses because Hans was in the Oedipus complex and associated horses with his father. <p>Marks: 1 mark for identification each of an appropriate example and 2 marks for each description/elaboration of it, × 2.</p> | 6 |
| Section C: Application question (b) = 8 marks | | |
| 15(b) | <p>Suggest how <u>you</u> would use systematic desensitisation to treat a child with a fear of animals.</p> <p>General: In this question part each candidate is free to suggest a way in which the assessment request could be investigated; the 'you' is emphasised to show that in this question it is not <i>description</i> that is being assessed, but an individual <i>suggestion</i>. The question may be in the form of a suggestion for research, or an application. The question may allow a candidate a free choice of method to design their own study. It might be that a specific method is named in the question, and if it is this method must be addressed. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme. Marks are awarded for methodological knowledge and how the methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> <p>Specific: This is an application question and candidates must apply systematic desensitisation to a phobia of animals. Relaxation techniques and anxiety hierarchy are essential features.</p> | 8 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|--|----------|
| Section C: Application question (a) = 8 marks | | |
| 16 | Chemical/drug treatments for depression can be effective, but they can have side effects | |
| 16(a) | <p>Suggest how <u>you</u> would design and conduct a study to find out whether chemical/drug treatments have side effects.</p> <p>General: In this question part each candidate is free to suggest a way in which the assessment request could be investigated; the 'you' is emphasised to show that in this question it is not <i>description</i> that is being assessed, but an individual <i>suggestion</i>. The question may be in the form of a suggestion for research, or an application. The question may allow a candidate a free choice of method to design their own study. It might be that a specific method is named in the question, and if it is this method must be addressed. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme. Marks are awarded for methodological knowledge and how the methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> <p>Specific: Candidates are free to choose any method. The choice of method should be appropriate and the answer should include the essential features of that method. Marks awarded for methodological knowledge and how methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> | 8 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|-------|
| Section C: Application question (b) = 6 marks | | |
| 16(b) | <p>Describe <u>two</u> other ways in which depression can be treated.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> treatments for depression: Biological: chemical/drugs (MAO, SSRIs); electro-convulsive therapy. Cognitive restructuring (Beck, 1979); rational emotive therapy (Ellis, 1962). <p>Most likely</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> chemical/drug: For depression: Tricyclics; MAOIs (Monoamine oxidase inhibitors); SSRIs (Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors); SNRIs (Serotonin and Noradrenaline Reuptake Inhibitors) Electro-convulsive therapy (ECT) Cerletti (1935). The patient is given anaesthetic/muscle relaxant and oxygen. An electrical current is passed through the brain either unilaterally or bilaterally for between 1 and 6 seconds and this produces an epileptic fit, a convulsion, a seizure; patients then wake up, feel better and may or may not have side effects Beck (1979) outlines cognitive restructuring. Using a six-stage process, the person is taught to identify unpleasant emotions, the situations in which these occur, and the associated negative thoughts. The person is taught to challenge the negative thoughts and replace them with positive thoughts Ellis (1962) describes the illogical or irrational beliefs using the terms 'musterbating' (we <i>must</i> be perfect at all times) and 'I-can't-stand-it-itis' (the belief that when something goes wrong it is a major disaster). In order to change to rational beliefs, Ellis expands the ABC model to include: D for disputing the irrational beliefs and E for the effects of successful disruption of the irrational beliefs. <p>Marks: 1 mark for identification each of an appropriate way and 2 marks for description/elaboration × 2.</p> | 6 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|----------|
| Section A: Short answer question: (a) = 2 marks | | |
| 17(a) | <p>Explain, in your own words, what is meant by the term ‘group cohesiveness’.</p> <p>Typically: this is defined by Carron (2003) as ‘the tendency for a group to be in unity whilst working towards a goal’. Group cohesion can be based on different factors, such as social relationships, task relationships, perceived unity and emotion.</p> <p>Marks: 1 for basic statement, 1 mark for elaboration.</p> | 2 |
| Section A: Short answer question: (b) = 4 marks | | |
| 17(b) | <p>Describe <u>one</u> theory of group development.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group dynamics, cohesiveness and teamwork: Group development (e.g. Tuckman 1965; Woodcock, 1979). Group cohesiveness, teambuilding and team performance. Characteristics of successful teams. <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tuckman (1965) outlines four stages (forming, storming, norming, and performing) that a group will go through in its development. A fifth stage (adjourning) was added in 1977. Woodcock (1979) suggests 9 building blocks: Clear objectives and agreed goals; Openness and confrontation; Support and trust; Co-operation and conflict; Sound working and decision-making procedures; Appropriate leadership; Regular review; Individual development; Sound inter-group relations. <p>Marks: up to 4 marks for description of one theory.</p> | 4 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|-------|
| Section B: Essay question: (a) = 8 marks | | |
| 18(a) | <p>Describe what psychologists have learned about the selection of people for work.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to include some of the following details from the syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection of people for work: Selection procedures: applications (e.g. weighted application blanks and biographical inventories i.e. a curriculum vitae). Selection interviews: structured and unstructured. Personal selection decision making. Use of psychometric tests. • Personnel selection decisions and Job analysis: The selection of personnel: decision-making (e.g. multiple regression, multiple hurdle and multiple cut-off models). Biases in selection decisions and equal opportunities. Job descriptions and specifications. Job analysis techniques (e.g. FJA and PAQ). • Performance appraisal: reasons for and performance appraisal techniques (e.g. rating scales, rankings, checklists). Appraisers, problems with appraisal and improving appraisals (e.g. effective feedback interviews). | 8 |
| Section B: Essay question: (b) = 12 marks | | |
| 18(b) | <p>Evaluate what psychologists have learned about the selection of people for work, including a discussion about the use of interviews.</p> <p><i>NOTE: any evaluative point can receive credit; the hints are for guidance only.</i></p> <p><u>Evaluation of theory:</u> internal strengths and weaknesses; theoretical issues: reductionism, determinism, ethnocentrism. Supporting/contradicting evidence; Comparisons and contrasts with alternative theory.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u> strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure. Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative methodologies.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> <i>Any relevant debate can be raised</i>, such as qualitative versus quantitative data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p> <p><u>Named issue: interviews:</u> candidates should show awareness of different types of interviews (structured, semi and unstructured) and be able to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each. Candidates can also discuss the importance of an interview in relation to other techniques to assess suitable candidates.</p> | 12 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|----------|
| Section C: Application question (a) = 6 marks | | |
| 19 | You have introduced job rotation into your factory. You want to know whether workers are satisfied with this change. | |
| 19(a) | <p>Describe <u>two</u> questionnaires/rating scales used to measure job satisfaction.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measuring job satisfaction: Rating scales and questionnaires: e.g. job description index, Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. Critical incidents: e.g. critical incidents technique. Interviews. <p>Most likely: (any other appropriate intrinsic motivator to be credited):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job Descriptive Index (JDI). Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) This measures five aspects of satisfaction: pay, promotions and promotion opportunities, co-workers, supervision, and the work itself. Participants answer either yes, no, or can't decide in response to whether given statements accurately describe their job. • The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) measures 20 aspects using 100 questions. It uses a five point scale (very satisfied to very dissatisfied). <p>Marks: 1 mark for identification each of an appropriate questionnaire and 2 marks for description/elaboration × 2.</p> | 6 |
| Section C: Application question (b) = 8 marks | | |
| 19(b) | <p>Suggest how <u>you</u> would design and conduct a study to investigate worker satisfaction <u>without</u> using a questionnaire.</p> <p>General: In this question part each candidate is free to suggest a way in which the assessment request could be investigated; the 'you' is emphasised to show that in this question it is not <i>description</i> that is being assessed, but an individual <i>suggestion</i>. The question may be in the form of a suggestion for research, or an application. The question may allow a candidate a free choice of method to design their own study. It might be that a specific method is named in the question, and if it is this method must be addressed. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme. Marks are awarded for methodological knowledge and how the methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> <p>Specific: The named method is a questionnaire so candidates are expected to show knowledge of questionnaire type/design (e.g. open or closed), examples of questions (that clearly relate to ethics and personal space), any rating scale that may be used, possibly where the questionnaire will be conducted, on whom, and how the answers will be scored. Note: not all these features are needed for a max mark.</p> | 8 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|--|---|-------|
| Section C: Application question (a) = 8 marks | | |
| 20 | Leaders can show different styles of behaviour | |
| 20(a) | <p>Suggest how <u>you</u> would design and conduct an observational study to investigate the styles of behaviour shown by a leader.</p> <p>General: In this question part each candidate is free to suggest a way in which the assessment request could be investigated; the 'you' is emphasised to show that in this question it is not <i>description</i> that is being assessed, but an individual <i>suggestion</i>. The question may be in the form of a suggestion for research, or an application. The question may allow a candidate a free choice of method to design their own study. It might be that a specific method is named in the question, and if it is this method must be addressed. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme. Marks are awarded for methodological knowledge and how the methodology is applied to this topic area.</p> <p>Specific: The named method is an observational study, so candidates are expected to show knowledge of the type (controlled, natural, participant, etc.), where the observation will be conducted, coding/response categories and sampling type (event, time, etc.). Finally, whether or not there are two or more observers. Note: not all these features are needed for a max mark.</p> | 8 |
| Section C: Application question (b) = 6 marks | | |
| 20(b) | <p>Describe <u>one</u> theory of leadership style such as that by Muczyk and Reimann.</p> <p>Syllabus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership style and effectiveness: Effectiveness: contingency theory (Fiedler, 1976); situational leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988), Path-goal theory (House 1979). Styles: permissive versus autocratic (e.g. Muczyk and Reimann, 1987). Leadership training and characteristics of effective leaders. <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muczyk and Reimann propose four styles of leader behaviour: directive democrat, directive autocrat, permissive democrat and permissive autocrat. These styles are determined by (i) the extent to which they involve others in decision-making and (ii) the extent to which they are involved in executing a decision. Hersey and Blanchard: style determined by styles (telling, selling, participating and delegating) maturity levels and development levels. <p>Candidates who write about theories of leadership (e.g. 'great person', charismatic, and behavioural (Michigan/Ohio)) can only receive credit if the theory is linked with a style. For example Ohio theory outlines initiating and task structure leading to four styles. Michigan theory: task and relationship lead to five types: 'country club,' etc.</p> <p>Marks: up to 6 marks determined by quality of answer.</p> | 6 |