www.dynamicpapers.com

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9990/12

Paper 1 Approaches, Issues and Debates

Key Messages

Candidates need to know all components of every core study as listed in the syllabus. Questions can be asked about any part of a core study.

Candidates need to read the whole question carefully to ensure that their responses are fulfilling the demands of each one. For example, the question may require data, a named issue to be included or relate back to a previous answer. To achieve full marks, these need to be correctly present in their responses. The essay (final question) requires four evaluation points to be in depth (two strengths and two weaknesses) with at least one of these about the named issue. In depth tends to be having two examples of a particular concept or to support an evaluative point. Credit is limited if the named issue is omitted or just described.

Candidates need to be careful about how they are presenting the results of studies. For example, they need to know if the results are about how many participants performed a task correctly or on how many trials the participant was correct. This can have a large impact on the interpretation of results and whether a response can gain credit.

Candidates need to engage with any stimulus material presented in a question (for example, a novel situation) to ensure they can access all available marks. In addition, when a question refers to 'in this study' the answer requires contextualisation with an explicit example from that study.

Candidates need to know the set procedure of studies in the order presented in the original journal article. Questions can be based around just *part* of a procedure and the candidate must be able to produce an answer that is directed and concise rather than writing about the whole of the procedure. This can sometimes mean a candidate may run out of time for other questions.

Candidates should be able to give full definitions of terms listed in the syllabus and provide full assumptions for all four approaches.

There is enough time for answers to be planned to ensure that the response given by a candidate is focused on the demands of each question. This is a crucial skill to develop as some candidates appear to have good knowledge of a study but do not apply this effectively to the question(s) set.

General Comments

The marks achieved by the candidates sitting this examination covered a wide spread of possible marks. Some candidates provided a range of excellent answers to many of the questions and could explain psychological terminology well, providing evidence that they were prepared for the examination.

Stronger overall responses followed the demands of each question with explicit use of psychological terminology and logical, well-planned answers in evidence. Appropriate examples were used from studies when the question expected it and there was evidence of candidates being able to apply their knowledge to real-world behaviours in terms of what and how.

There were several blank responses in this series. As positive marking is used, candidates should attempt all questions even if they are unsure of the response they are providing.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

Finally, there were several candidates who provided blank responses to any question related to a 'new' core study. It is essential that candidates have studied the correct syllabus – in this case the animal studies are Hassett and Fagen, not Yamamoto and Pepperberg.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) The majority of responses could correctly identify the correct sampling technique. Common errors included naming a different sampling technique or listing all sampling techniques, only the first answer would be given credit if appropriate.

(b) Stronger responses could clearly outline one hypothesis linked to sex of participants. These tended to correctly state the direction of hypothesis with a correctly named test. As there were several sex differences being predicted it was essential to name the measure to be awarded maximum credit. In addition, the groups being compared needed to be explicitly labelled, for example 'females in Group 2'. One common error was predicting that females with AS/HFA would score differently to males with AS/HFA. There were no females with AS/HFA in the sample.

(c) Stronger responses could clearly outline the instructions provided in the study by Baron-Cohen et al. Popular choices included being able to refer to the glossary during the study.

Question 2

(a) A significant minority of responses could provide a full definition of the term by covering both parts: positive and reinforcement. It is important for candidates to give full definitions to terms whenever possible to allow maximum marks to be awarded. A common one-mark response was 'giving a reward to a child/elephant'. This type of definition covers the positive but not the reinforcement part of the term.

(b) A substantial minority of responses could provide a result about the full trunk wash with a meaningful comparison. The main focus tended to be comparing juveniles to the adult elephant and these could be awarded the two available marks. However, the question expected data, and this was not always provided by the candidate or was often incorrect. However, stronger responses could present a correct example of data to be awarded maximum credit. Some candidates provided results about different components of the full trunk wash, but this was not answering the question. It is important for candidates to read the question carefully to ensure they are focused on the correct result from the core study.

Question 3

(a) The majority of responses could clearly identify two features for one of the victims. Popular choices included male, age and what they were wearing. This question highlighted the importance of reading the question carefully. A minority of responses identified ill and drunk as the two features. This could only be awarded one mark as these are features of the two victims and the question asked for just one of those. In addition, some responses focused on aspects of the sample of participants or the model which, in both cases, was not answering the question.

(b) The majority of responses could link an assumption to an aspect of the study by Piliavin et al. to show why it is from the social approach. Popular choices included how behaviour is influenced by individuals/groups and how it is also influenced by social context. Stronger responses could explicitly link an assumption from the social approach to an explicit example from the study by Piliavin et al. Less strong responses mainly provided an example that was implicitly linked to an appropriate assumption.

Question 4

(a) Stronger responses could present a full aim of the study by Hölzel et al. Responses tended to be succinct and cover the main aspects of mindfulness stress reduction and its effects on brain density. Many candidates could provide this full aim. Some responses were brief or muddled and tended to focus on the mindfulness or brain density part of the aim. Some candidates provided a result from the study which could not be awarded any credit.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) Only a small minority of responses could identify a factor from the FFMQ and then outline what that factor was measuring. The most popular was observing. Many responses described an aspect of the mindfulness program which was not answering the question set. Some responses did name one factor but then could not outline the factor. Some responses named all four other factors or named the one already in the question. It is important for candidates to know the main measures for every core study.

Question 5

(a) A majority of responses could clearly outline one assumption of the cognitive approach. The most popular choice was the computer analogy. There were some brief assumptions provided by some candidates with limited terminology linked to cognition. These could only be awarded partial credit. The assumptions for all four approaches are outlined in the syllabus.

(b) A minority of responses could clearly explain why the study by Pozzulo et al. is from the cognitive approach. These strong responses could provide a finding from the study and then give a clear explanation as to why it supported one of the assumptions provided in **Question 5(a)**. Many candidates wrote out the assumption from **Question 5(a)** again to 'explain' why Pozzulo et al. was from the cognitive approach and could not be awarded any credit as they had already been awarded marks in **Question 5(a)**. To improve, It is very important for candidates to read the entire set of questions from any question number, for example **5(a)**, **5(b)** and **5(c)** to ensure that their responses are logical and follow the demands of the questions.

(c) A minority of responses provided a clear definition of a false positive response with fewer then providing a correct example from the study by Pozzulo et al. The majority of responses tended to focus on the assertion that the choice is accurate but not explain that the choice would be incorrect. The most popular choice for the example was when children chose a person from the line-up in the target-absent condition.

Question 6

(a) The average mark awarded for this question was 2. Stronger responses could clearly describe the procedure from the two points highlighted in the question, providing a series of logical procedural points to be awarded maximum marks. Weaker responses tended to focus on all of the procedure rather than within the parameters of the question set. For example, describing the learning task or the debrief. It is essential for candidates to read questions of this type carefully to see from which two points their response should cover.

(b) Stronger responses could clearly identify the strength (standardisation and reliability: by themselves these are just descriptive and not evaluative) and then provide a specific example from the study by Milgram. Popular choices included receiving a 45v shock, having the same prods used, and the pre-recorded responses from Mr. Wallace. Some responses mixed up validity and reliability and could not be awarded credit. Candidates need to know the difference between validity and reliability.

Question 7

The majority of responses clearly outlined what Taara would expect in the part of the study mentioned in the question. The majority of candidates could provide examples from both parts of the study. Popular choices for the 'woken up' part included using a loud doorbell and for the 'asked about dreams part' having a recording device bedside to record any dreams experienced. Some candidates gave suggestions for other parts of the procedure and could not be awarded credit, for example, not drinking caffeine. Overall, candidates performed very well on this question.

Question 8

There were a range of responses to this question. Stronger responses could define the term subjective and present a series of examples from the study by Saavedra and Silverman. Popular examples included the self-ratings of the buttons, the mother's potential exaggeration of symptoms, and potential experimenter bias due to the nature of the case study. Other responses presented tautological definitions and/or examples that were not subjective limiting the amount of marks that could be awarded. To improve on question types like

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

these, candidate should be prepared to present examples from the study for any of the research methods component listed in the syllabus.

Question 9

(a) The majority of responses could describe at least two features of the sample used in the study by Andrade. Popular choices included the sample size, that they were from a research panel, and the sex distribution of people across each condition. Some responses outlined the sample from a different core study. Other responses provided several incorrect features including volunteer sampling. It is essential for candidates to know the features of the samples used in all 12 core studies.

(b) Stronger responses could clearly explain one similarity and one difference. Popular choices to compare the studies on included experimental designs, cause and effect, the collection and use of quantitative data, and the cognitive skills under investigation. To improve responses to this type of question, candidates need to choose comparison points that can be developed and explained, using examples from both studies to explain the similarity and/or difference. For example, explaining the experimental nature of both studies would involve explaining that cause and effect can happen in both studies with examples of controls from both studies to allow cause and effect be stronger. However, stating that each study had a different aim does not allow the response to be detailed so will only achieve Level 1. Candidates need to choose carefully what the comparisons are ensuring that they are logical and can be explained fully, using examples from both studies. It is also very important to read the question to see what can or cannot be used on the response. In this case, the candidates were told not to refer to the sample, yet a minority of candidates did use the sample in their responses and were awarded Level 0.

Question 10

The strongest responses evaluated the study by Hassett et al. in depth and in terms of two strengths and two weaknesses, with at least one of these points covering the named issue of ethics. Common choices included ethics, generalisability, observations, reliability and quantitative data. These strong responses could explain why an element of the study was a strength or a weakness using specific examples from the study by Hassett et al. to explicitly support their point. These answers tended to score Level 5 marks. Candidates need to ensure that they follow the demands of the question, covering two strengths and two weaknesses, all in equal depth. Some responses did cover the four evaluation points but were brief or did not use the study by Hassett et al. as examples, which meant the response scored in the lower bands. Other responses included three evaluation points that were thorough, logical, and well argued with a fourth point that was not in context which meant it could not be give Level 5. Candidates need to know that any description of the study does not gain credit in these type of questions as it is testing their evaluation skills only. In addition, some responses appeared to be following a GRAVE approach to this question (Generalisability, Reliability, Application, Validity, Ethics). A response that fails to have one evaluation point about the named issue can only score Level 3 (6 marks) maximum. There were many responses that briefly outlined strengths and weaknesses with only some being in context which is a Level 2 response. Any response that has no context cannot get above a Level 1 mark. In addition, many responses did use ethics in an evaluative sense but did not fully explain why it could be a strength and/or a weakness or tried to use human guidelines. Some responses did not cover the named issue. To improve on this question, candidates need to plan carefully, choosing two strengths and two weaknesses with one of these being the named issue, avoiding real world application where possible. Each strength and weakness should be of equal length with an explanation as to why it is a strength or weakness with examples (plural) from the study to show clear understanding. An evaluation that is in depth tends to have at least two explicit examples from the named study for every evaluative point made. These are the requirements for a Level 5 response. The average response was Level 2 for this cohort.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9990/22
Paper 2 Research Methods

Key messages

- This research methods paper asks candidates to answer a range of questions, including ones about the core studies, in relation to research methods, terms and concepts used to describe or evaluate research methodology, and application of this knowledge to both familiar and unfamiliar contexts. Responses to this paper demonstrated a range of ability in these skills.
- Candidates demonstrated excellent knowledge of basic concepts such as controls, samples, open and closed questions and graph drawing. Questions on strengths/advantages, populations, conclusions and expanding on answers, appeared to be found more challenging.
- Two key areas for focus are enabling candidates to draw conclusions from data and distinguishing between describing the difference between a purpose and a strength: the strength is not what the psychological tool *does*, but how *well* it does it.

General comments

Candidates were able to access marks across the whole paper. However, not all were able to accurately and/or consistently demonstrate knowledge and understanding or to access the additional marks for linking their response to the scenarios, thus limiting their performance as a whole. Nevertheless, there were some excellent answers relating to validity and to the ideas of controls and control conditions.

Overall, there were some very strong scripts in this first series of the new syllabus. There were many good responses to **Question 10(a)**, showing that candidates had used the syllabus effectively and were well prepared for the 'four required features' for each research method. In addition, candidates left very few blank spaces, showing that they were familiar with the range of the new syllabus. However, candidates did not always flag up when they had written a continuation to a response elsewhere on the paper. Using blank pages/spaces is acceptable, but it is sensible to indicate when and where an answer is continued.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) Most candidates scored 1 mark for words to the effect of 'As one variable increases the other decreases'. Not many candidates, however, gained both marks. One common mistake was to state the increase/decrease explanation and then repeat this in an example. The example was not asked for in the question so could not earn credit. Another common error was to refer to 'cause and effect', for example by using the words 'causes' or 'leads to'.

(b) Many responses did not answer the question. Variously, they describe what a correlation was, gave an explanation of practical advantages or discussed ethical issues without reference to correlations. Often those candidates who did focus on ethical issues were unable to offer detail, so earned 2 marks rather than 3.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question 2

Most candidates were able to score marks here. Where they did not, either they lacked knowledge of the procedure of Andrade's study, or they focused on the treatment of near-misses, such as 'Craig' for 'Greg', rather than on the question asked. Another common mistake was to inappropriately refer to calculating a mean.

Question 3

(a) This question part was very well answered. Almost all candidates gave 'no alcohol'/'no caffeine', with just a minority misunderstanding and referring to instructions given during the night.

(b) This was question part was answered very well, with some clear articulation of the role the chosen instruction played a role in the validity of the study.

Question 4

(a) (i) This first question part was generally well answered, with only a very small number of candidates incorrectly presenting histograms.

(ii) Responses to this question part were mixed. There were some good answers referring to discrete categories but also many referring just to comparisons and vague statements such as 'showing the data clearly'.

(iii) This question part was not well answered. Most responses described results or referred to participants or groups rather than drawing a conclusion, i.e., making a statement reaching beyond the sample.

(b) Although similar to question part **1(b)**, this was generally well answered, with responses identifying an appropriate guideline as a strength and linking it to the study.

Question 5

(a) (i) This question part was not well answered. The most common mistake was to give a simplistic response based on geography, such as 'everyone in the world' or 'the residents of a town'. These are examples rather than definitions.

(ii) This question part was also not well answered. There was a significant number of candidates who, even when they had earned credit for **5(a)(i)**, gave an example of a sample here. Conversely, some candidates who had incorrectly given 'geographical' definitions in **5(a)(i)** were able to give examples of populations based on other criteria of similarity, such as being male, or using subways.

(b) (i) This question part was answered very well.

(ii) This question part was generally answered well.

Question 6

This question elicited a range of answers. Many candidates appeared to struggle to explain these as experimental effects, giving examples of people getting better at something if they practiced it, or getting bored if they had to do the same thing all day, but did not relate this to taking part in two conditions of an experiment.

A common omission related to practice/fatigue EFFECTS, i.e., candidates missed the *effect* (i.e., the increase or decrease in performance). There were also inappropriate choices of examples. Boredom in Andrade is not an example of the fatigue effect and improvement in Fagan is not an example of the practice effect.

Another reason why marks were not gained for examples was because candidates were describing either the effects of demand characteristics or simply long tasks as measure of the DV within one level of the IV (e.g. over 30 questions in the eyes test).

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question 7

(a) Some candidates appeared to find this task difficult. Responses included tables with no DV and others had additional (non-required) information such as age and sex. Candidates often unnecessarily included a column for participant number rather than simply a box for tallying observations. A few candidates drew graphs here.

(b) There were some good suggestions here although many candidates scored only 1 mark as they did not explicitly link to validity and just said things like 'easier to observe'.

In addition, where there was an attempt at the second mark, this was often just a reversal of the same point e.g., 'easier to observe on a narrow street, harder on a wide street' or 'more control of variables on a narrow street, less control on a wide street'. However, to earn the second mark, the candidate needed to provide some detail, such as why it would be easier to observe, or what variables could be controlled.

(c) This was often answered well, with candidates clearly having a good understanding of validity. Many responses included strong explanations here.

Question 8

(a) (i) Most, but not all, candidates said non-participant, but many did not give a reason for this. For a minority who attempted to give a reason, this was not creditworthy, such as 'Non-participant because she is not involved in the study'. The researcher is involved in the study just not involved in the activity being performed by the participants.

(ii) This question part produced a range of answers, with a lot focusing on how her presence would affect the children's behaviour rather than the advantage of being apart from the group and being able to observe more objectively.

(b) Parts **8(b)(i)** and **8(b)(ii)** produced mixed responses. A common error was to make suggestions in part **(b)(i)** that were not observable behaviours. Nevertheless, in such cases there was often some explanation of this in part **(b)(ii)**, so candidates could gain some credit. Many responses related to behaviours other than counting, such as paying attention.

Question 9

(a) (b) Almost all candidates gave correct responses to parts **9(a)** and **9(b)**. To 'identify', candidates only needed to state the letter.

(c) In this question part, many candidates gave simple but correct responses. However, some candidates described what the data produced by Nila's new question would show, rather than offering a strength of the question. This reflects a common misunderstanding: the difference between a purpose and a strength. Candidates need to be able to distinguish between what something like a question or measure of the DV is or does (e.g. in a 'state' or 'describe' question) and what is good about the way it does it (e.g., in a 'strength' or 'advantage' question). The strength is not what the psychological tool does, but how well it does it.

Section B

Question 10

(a) This long question part was generally done well and candidates appear to have been well prepared for this, with many addressing IV, DV, design and control explicitly. Many candidates used Andrade as a base for this, arguing that memory could be used to measure extent of daydreaming, and some used Dement and Kleitman/EEG, although this was sometimes with a misunderstanding that daydreaming was dreaming when asleep. In this instance some marks could still be gained. Some candidates did not design an experiment with two conditions of the IV.

A significant number of candidates gave insufficient detail on some or all of the required features, e.g., saying 'ask the participants' rather than saying how, e.g., by interview or questionnaire, and then presenting an actual question.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

A minority of candidates seemed to be working on the who/what/how model associated with the previous syllabus.

Question 10

(b) (i)(ii) Many candidates misunderstood the demand of part **(b)(i)**, and described a part of the procedure rather than the strength of that part. In such cases, the candidate often gave the answer in part **(b)(ii)**. Some candidates explained the strength in the first part and then repeated themselves in part **(ii)**. However, candidates were able to identify a range of strengths and explain these, although most answers to part **(ii)** were generic.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9990/32

Specialist Options: Approaches, Issues and Debates

Key messages

Questions 1, 3(a), 5, 7(a), 9, 11(a), 13 and 15(a) –

These questions in this exam asked candidates to apply an area of the syllabus (theory, technique, study, disorder, etc.,) to explain how it is relevant to a particular scenario or context. It is important that candidates are aware of the bullet points in the syllabus. It would be helpful for candidates to do revision notes with the title of the topic area and bullet point at the top so that they can identify which part of the syllabus these types of questions are referring to. Candidates should also refer directly to the scenario/context in the question in their response.

Questions 3(b), 7(b), 11(b) and 15(b) –

These questions in this exam asked candidates to evaluate concepts, theories, studies, evidence that are referred to in the **part (a)** of the question. In this exam, these types of questions asked the candidate to evaluate the technique outlined in **part (a)** such as with a weakness, a problem a psychologist could have when they investigate the scenario/context given in **part (a)** or a practical problem with the application in **part (a)**. It would be helpful to candidates when doing revision to learn strengths and weaknesses of the concepts, theories, studies and evidence they have learned and put these into their revision notes.

Questions 2, 6, 10 and 14 –

Part (a) – These questions could ask the candidate to outline a theory, study, technique/treatment or self-report used by psychologists that is named in the syllabus or outline one of the issues and debates, possibly with an example from the syllabus content. The revision technique outlined previously in this report will aid candidates to learn the syllabus material. It would also be useful for candidates to write revision notes where they define the issues/debates and prepare a strength and a weakness of each issue and debate to prepare for the **part (b)** of this type of questions. These questions in this exam were worth 2 marks for each part of the response and therefore a short response is appropriate.

Questions 4(a), 8(a), 12(a) and 16(a)

These questions in this exam came from one or two of the bullet points in the syllabus. These questions either asked the candidate to outline a key study from the syllabus or two studies, theories, characteristics/ explanations/treatments of disorders or techniques identified in the syllabus under the appropriate bullet point. For this exam, some of the answers used the incorrect topic area in the syllabus or the description was brief. It could be useful for candidates to create revision notes with the title of each topic area and the description in the bullet point as the header. Alternatively, candidates could create a mind map and put this information in the centre.

Questions 4(b), 8(b), 12(b) and 16(b)

This question will always ask the candidate to evaluate the studies, theories, characteristics/explanations/ treatments of disorders or techniques described in **part (a)** of the question. The response must include at least two evaluation issues, including the named issue, in order to be considered to have presented a range of issues to achieve the top band. However, most responses that evaluated using two issues in this exam, achieved in the lower bands due to the response being superficial and often with little analysis. Some responses that considered three issues tended to achieve higher marks as these responses were able to demonstrate comprehensive understanding with good supporting examples from the studies, theories, characteristics/explanations/treatments of disorders or techniques described in the **part (a)** of the answer.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

The candidate must also provide some form of analysis to access level 2 and above. This could be done by discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the issue being considered, presenting a counter-argument to the issue under discussion or comparing the issue between two studies and/or theories. The response needs to explain the comparison/strength/weakness or counter-argument with examples from **part (a)** of the question. It was common for responses to state that two theories, for example, were similar or in contrast for an issue without any explanation as to why they could be compared in this way. This is limited analysis. A conclusion at the end of each issue would be helpful in order to show excellent understanding of the issue under discussion. In order to achieve the requirements of the level 4 and 5 band descriptors it would be best to structure the response by issue rather than by study and/or theory. It would also be ideal for the response to start with the named issue to make sure the answer covers this requirement of the question.

A small minority of candidates did not evaluate using the named issue. Quite a few of the answers were structured by study/theory/treatment rather than by the issue which often led the response to be quite superficial and repetitive. A number of the responses did do analysis. Candidates should be aware this question is worth 10 marks and need to include an appropriate amount of information.

General comments

The marks achieved by candidates for this session of the 9990 syllabus achieved across the full range of the mark band. Some candidates were well prepared for the exam and showed good knowledge, understanding, application and evaluation throughout their responses. Some candidates were not as well prepared and showed limited knowledge and understanding with brief, superficial and sometimes anecdotal responses. These candidates often had limited evaluation and application skills.

Time management for this paper was good for the majority candidates and most attempted all questions that were required. A number of candidates did not respond to one or more of the questions asked in the option area. A very small number of the candidates attempted to respond to more than two topic areas but often did not attempt all of the questions for each option chosen. These responses achieved at the lower end of the mark band.

The questions on clinical psychology were the more popular choice of option, followed by organisational psychology.

Comments on specific questions

Clinical Psychology

Question 1

There were some good responses to this question which asked for an explanation of Prisha's diagnosis of schizophrenia. The most popular explanation given was genetic and many referred to the Gottesman and Shields study to back up their explanation including stating the concordance rate for monozygotic twins and/or that concordance rates were higher for monozygotic compared to dizygotic twins. Most linked this to the scenario and referenced Prisha's twin sister. Weaker responses tended to just identify the genetic explanation without any specifics given of concordance rates. Some responses incorrectly stated that monozygotic twins are more likely to develop schizophrenia which was not creditworthy. The other most common explanation was the cognitive explanation and many outlined the failure to self-monitor and linked this to the scenario. Weaker responses often did not give a second explanation or stated that hallucinations are a characteristic of schizophrenia rather than answering the question in terms of an explanation for schizophrenia. These types of responses were not creditworthy.

Question 2

(a) Some responses were very good for this question with the candidate outlining what is meant by a situational explanation with reference to learning OCD from the environment. Some were able to give a good, brief example from the behavioural explanation for OCD with reference to negative reinforcement. A few responses were very long and although they frequently achieved full marks, it left less time to answer other questions in the exam paper. Incorrect responses sometimes reworded the question and outlined that a situational explanation is from the situation which was

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

not creditworthy. The most common incorrect example given was from the psychodynamic explanation for OCD rather than the behavioural explanation which was also not given credit.

(b) Many responses for this question were able to give a weakness of the situational explanation for OCD with the most common weaknesses being ignoring individual differences and offering a reductionist explanation for OCD. A few candidates did give an example from the behavioural explanation but many did not and this therefore limited them to 1 mark maximum for this question.

Question 3

(a) Some responses were very clear and gave a good suggestion of how ERP could be used to reduce both Mary's obsession and compulsion. Stronger responses often outlined how ERP could be used with Mary and then briefly explained at the end of the response first how this would reduce the obsession and then how it would reduce the compulsion. Weaker and often incorrect responses confused ERP with systematic desensitisation. As these two treatments do have some similarities (e.g., both expose the patient to something, in this case the door), these types of responses did often achieve some credit but it was in the 1–2 mark range. A few responses outlined ERP but did not relate this to Mary and instead outlined a different obsession/compulsion to the one in the scenario. These types of responses achieved very limited, if any, marks due to not referencing the scenario in the question.

(b) There were a number of good explanations of a weakness of using ERP to help Mary. Common weaknesses included that the treatment would be distressing to Mary (and this could cause her to stop treatment) or that Mary might not be motivated enough to continue with treatment. Weaker responses often either identified the weakness or gave a very brief explanation and achieved limited credit. A common incorrect response was to state that the 'study' was unethical showing a misunderstanding of the scenario as a piece of research being done by a psychologist on Mary rather than her receiving therapy.

Question 4

(a) Responses varied for this question and covered the full range of the marks available. There were some excellent descriptions of the study by Oruč et al. including an indication of sample (number of participants, different groups), procedure and results. The stronger responses clearly knew the study and were able to give a description that was accurate and detailed. Weaker responses were confused by the results, but did show some good understanding of the named study in terms of aim, sample and procedure. Other weak responses gave few details of the study (sometimes just the procedure or sample) and achieved in level 1. A common response that was not creditworthy was to give a vague outline of a study on twins.

(b) Similar to **part (a)**, there was a variety of responses to this question and the marks achieved were frequently between level 1 and level 3. Most responses included the named issue of reliability and there were many that included clear examples and some analysis. Better responses included fewer issues in some detail with effective analysis. For example, the way in which the nature side of debate found a genetic association for some of the participants as well as the female participants. However, nurture could also be involved as a strong genetic link was not found for all participants.

Other common evaluation issues included determinism versus free-will and reductionism versus holism. Weaker responses often used a large number of issues and just stated whether the study supported the issue or not without any example, explanation or analysis. These types of responses achieved level 1. Those responses that outlined the incorrect study in **part (a)** often achieved either no marks or limited credit due to making some very general evaluative points that did apply to the Oruč et al. study.

Consumer Psychology

Question 5

A few responses to this question were able to suggest two clear ways that Kabir can encourage people to enter his store, using knowledge of store choice, including demographics (e.g., age and gender). These types of responses gave a clear suggestion, such as put the store near the shopping mall entrance, and explained why a specific demographic would be encouraged by this. Weaker responses often were able to

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

give a suggestion but could not link this to a demographic or referred to all shoppers. A common response that did not receive credit often gave a vague suggestion such as making the store seem appealing.

Question 6

(a) Some responses were able to give a clear outline of 'convenience' from Lauterborn's 4 Cs marketing mix model. Full mark responses were able to fully outline the key concept such as how easy it is to find information about a product, purchase it and have it delivered. Weaker responses often gave an example of a convenient way of purchasing a product or how a company could make their product easier to purchase. A common response that did not receive credit was that 'convenience' is how easy a product is to use. Another common, non-creditworthy response was to simply restate convenience in the outline of the term.

(b) The marks achieved for this question covered the full range available. Stronger responses were able to give a detailed explanation of one strength in context of the convenience and advertising a product on the internet. Common responses included how companies could advertise much more widely on the internet and this could increase sales or the convenience of having products delivered to the home after responding to advertising and purchasing a product on the internet. Weaker responses tended to be very brief. Incorrect responses often occurred when the response to **part (a)** was incorrect, particularly where the response in **part (a)** was the 'convenience' in how easy a product is to use.

Question 7

(a) There were some good responses to this question with two reasons given why 'B is brilliant' is not an effective slogan. There were good references to lack of creativity or how it did not represent the brand. Good answers referred to the phone and the award it had been given and how these should be included in the slogan in some way. Some responses did not achieve full marks for one or both of their explanations due to not effectively linking to 'Company B' or slogans or for insufficient detail. A few responses gave more than two reasons and often achieved lower marks due to each reason being in less detail.

(b) Stronger responses to this question explained how it is hard to determine if participants in a study like a slogan as participants are often unaware of their feelings/responses to slogans. Many responses did not respond to 'one problem psychologists have when they investigate' and instead explained a problem a company might have in writing an effective slogan or knowing if their slogan is effective/causing sales to increase. These types of responses did not answer the question and were not creditworthy.

Question 8

(a) There were some good responses to this question. Many provided clear details of choice blindness, preferences and defending a choice and gave good details of the Hall et al. study. As this is a key study in the syllabus some of the responses were very long and candidates should write an appropriate amount for a response that makes up half of a six-mark question. Most were able to give a definition of how retroactive and proactive interference affect memory, and some attempted an outline of a study with the most common study being the Burke and Srull example in the syllabus. Weaker responses either lacked detail or gave some incorrect details of one or both of the studies. It was common for responses to mix up retroactive and proactive interference or give a muddled definition. Some responses just gave an outline of the Hall et al. study which limited their mark to level 2 maximum. There were a few responses that did not receive credit due to a lack of understanding of the theories in the question and no details of any studies given.

(b) The best examples of strong evaluation went into detail about the named issue, experiments, and made sure they referenced the research they described in **part (a)**. A very small minority used counter-points or gave an explanation for their analysis and often just stated that the studies were either 'similar' or 'in contrast'. Other common evaluation issues used were generalisability, determinism versus free-will, individual and situational explanations and practical applications.

There were a number of weak responses to this question. These sometimes attempted definitions of the evaluation issues with some success. The response then discussed the issue and applied it one of the studies, frequently by just naming it. This evaluation was very superficial. For example,

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

some responses just stated that the study by Hall et al. was done in the field so had good ecological validity. These types of responses were awarded limited credit.

Health Psychology

Question 9

Marks awarded for this question were varied. Stronger responses suggested two ways in which people could be encouraged to seek treatment quickly linked to chest pains. Common responses outlined free clinics in reference to cost and advertisement campaigns in doctors' surgeries. Weaker responses did not link to chest pains which was the context of the question, resulting in limited credit for a basic outline/identification. There were some apparent misunderstandings of the question with responses making suggestions that would not encourage someone with chest pains to seek treatment but instead what to do once the patient has sought treatment such as how to conduct the medical appointment.

Question 10

(a) There were a small number of full mark responses to this question with an identification of the age and location of the study. Another common feature given were that the sample were from a nursery/pre-school. Weaker responses often just stated the age of the children. Responses that did not receive credit gave the wrong age range of the study. All responses referred, or attempted to refer, to the Tapper et al. study.

(b) A few responses that answered well described how important it is to use children so that the effect of healthy eating on their bodies can be followed longitudinally to see long-term health effects. Some full mark responses were able to explain why it was important to use children when studying healthy eating rather than adults who have ingrained eating habits. Weaker responses often gave a basic outline of importance of using children in psychological research on healthy eating or for an outline of importance of using children in psychological research with no reference to healthy eating.

Question 11

(a) There were many good responses to this question. The vast majority were able to give at least one if not two suggestions for how Mr Sharma could use fear arousal to encourage his students to wash their hands correctly. Stronger responses were able to link to minimal fear arousal and give a detailed answer with clear understanding of fear arousal linked to help Mr Sharma to encourage his students to wash their hands correctly. Most common answers were presentations/lectures within lesson time and using posters around the wash basins/sinks. Weaker responses often just identified what Mr Sharma could do without linking it to fear arousal. Some responses failed to adhere to the question in terms of ethical ways in which Mr Sharma could encourage his students to wash their hands correctly by suggesting extreme fear arousal which was not creditworthy.

(b) Stronger responses gave an explanation of the practical problem in the context of implementing this suggestion with students. The most common response was that students may not take it seriously and that this would mean they would not wash their hands correctly or only do this for a short period of time and then return to the incorrect way of washing hands. Weaker responses often gave a brief outline of the practical problem without explaining why this might happen in the context of the suggestion given in **part (a)** and/or link this to the effect on the hand-washing technique used by students. Some responses stated that the suggestion given was unethical or that consent would be needed from parents. This is incorrect, as the suggestion given in **part (a)** was ethical and therefore could be implemented as part of the normal school day without consent being needed.

Question 12

(a) The responses to this question covered the full range of the mark scheme. Stronger responses gave clear and often detailed and accurate description of Stress Inoculation therapy with the three phases outlined. Many good responses for biofeedback outlined the study by Budzynski et al. in some detail outlining the experimental conditions. Some responses of biofeedback did not outline a study but gave a clear and accurate description of how it works to manage stress. Weaker responses gave fewer details of the two treatments for stress or gave some incorrect information either about the treatment or the study. Some responses gave other treatments for stress which

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

was not creditworthy such as relaxation and imagery in reducing stress during medical treatment with an outline of the study by Bridge et al.

(b) The marks awarded to responses to this question were varied with many achieving in level 1 and level 2 due to lack of specific examples and no or very limited analysis. Stronger responses were structured issue-by-issue and covered the named issue of determinism versus free-will with examples from the treatments in **part (a)**. Other common evaluation issues included practical problems with the treatments, evaluation issues with the study (usually Budzynski et al.) and individual and situational explanations.

Weaker responses that often gave very limited responses in **part (a)** gave very brief points about a number of evaluation issues. For example, stating that the treatment such as biofeedback was or was not deterministic with no example or explanation. Responses that identified the incorrect treatment and/or study in **part (a)** would then evaluate it which was not creditworthy.

Organisational Psychology

Question 13

The vast majority of responses showed an understanding of what is meant by 'SMART' goal, and many were able to explain what each letter in the term referred to. Stronger responses outlined a specific goal that could be set for the sales team and would reference each part of the 'SMART' goal in turn to explain how the goal fit with it (e.g., 'specific' – sell 1000 chocolates in the next month). Weaker responses often gave a general definition of each part of a 'SMART' goal without giving a specific example for the sales team such as reference to number of grocery stores or amount of chocolate.

Question 14

(a) The responses to this question were varied. Strong responses outlined creating general laws and then referred to a 'law' from the self-determination theory of motivation. Weaker responses frequently outlined what was meant by the nomothetic approach without including an example from self-determination theory of motivation.

(b) Stronger responses to this question explained how the self-determination theory of motivation can be used by organisations to motivate their workers. Responses frequently chose one of competence, autonomy and/or relatedness and gave an example of how an organisation could improve this for their workers and therefore improve their motivation. Some responses identified improving intrinsic motivation of their workers but this often achieved limited credit due to lack of detail. Those that were unable to outline self-determination theory of motivation in **part (a)** often achieved no marks for this question.

Question 15

(a) (i) Those candidates that knew the study by Giacalone and Rosenfeld were able to identify and sometimes outline one reason that a worker at Samir's factory could give for either leaving early or the theft of bicycle parts. Common responses included revenge/an 'eye or an eye', the company deserved it and just for fun. Weaker responses just identified the reason without linking it to the act of sabotage. Those responses that did not receive credit gave a reason which was not in the study by Giacalone and Rosenfield. This was often given as a reason for the behaviour, such as leaving early due to a family emergency, rather than sabotage.

(ii) There were a number of full mark responses to this question with a clear suggestion given that could reduce sabotage and a brief outline of why this might lower sabotage at the factory. Common responses included having a meeting with staff to discuss issues at the factory, reducing working hours and increasing pay. A typical reason for limited credit being awarded to the response was that it did not address why it would reduce sabotage.

(b) Most responses were able to offer a brief weakness for the suggestion given in **part (a)(ii)**. Common responses included that sabotage could continue and workers feeling that they could not be open about their grievances. Many responses did not refer to sabotage which limited their mark on this question.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question 16

(a) There was a range of responses to this question covering the full range of the mark bands. Some responses gave clear and detailed descriptions of Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory and Kelley's five followership styles. Weaker responses could often give some details of the followership styles but fewer or incorrect information about the LPI (and/or the theory underpinning the inventory). Some responses gave anecdotal responses to leadership and followership styles or outlined the incorrect part of the syllabus such as autocratic and democratic leadership which was not creditworthy.

(b) The marks for this question were commonly in level 1 and level 2 with some strong responses that achieved either level 3 or level 4/5 by giving detailed examples and analysis present throughout the response. With regards to the named issue of psychometrics, the strongest responses focused on the strengths and weaknesses and gave clear examples from the LPI. Other issues covered included generalisability, practical applications within organisations, individual differences with regard to followership styles and idiographic and nomothetic explanations.

Weaker responses were often structured by first evaluating the LPI and then followership styles rather than issue-by-issue which often led to superficial and repetitive responses. These types of responses would frequently identify the issue and then state that this was a strength or a weakness without any examples or explaining the effects of the strength/weakness. Weak responses rarely did analysis. If it was included it was often just stating 'similarly' or 'in contrast' with no attempt to discuss or explain the comparison.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9990/42

Specialist Options: Application and Research Methods

Key messages

- What has been learned from the AS component of the syllabus should be transferred to the A2 component. For example, at AS candidates learn about methodology, such as experiments, which also apply to A2.
- Questions should be read carefully ensuring that the focus is on what the question asks.
- For ***Section A*** answers, candidates should relate their answer to the study in question or include an example. Questions frequently end with 'in this study' and so the answer should be related to that specific study.
- All terminology should be explained. Writing 'it is valid and reliable' for example, is insufficient without explanation, application or example.
- The syllabus includes for 'example studies' such as 'e.g., Oldham and Brass (1979)'. Example studies can be substituted for alternatives, but these alternatives must cover the same or very similar content to the example study. If the Oldham and Brass study is substituted the alternative study must be about a move to open plan offices and the data that was gathered from that move. The alternative cannot be about something different.

General comments

Some candidates answered questions from one option only. For other candidates, answers for one option were very good, whilst answers to the second option were very poor, often limited to anecdotal or common-sense responses.

Many candidates answered two questions from ***Section B*** instead of one (only one of these Section B responses can receive credit). Candidates are advised to read the instructions on the front cover of the question paper and to read the heading instructions for each question section.

Candidates should double check that the terminology they use in their answers is correct. Often terms such as reliability and validity were muddled, as were qualitative and quantitative, and independent and dependent variables. There was also confusion with the terms format and technique in relation to questionnaires and interviews.

Section A

Question **part (c)** requires a general evaluative point that could relate to any study but it also requires that the general point be related to the specific study in the question. Answers often included strengths and weaknesses but often these were not related to the question, and so restricted marks.

Candidates should not use psychological terms without explanation. Frequently answers were limited to 'it is reductionist' or 'it is useful in everyday life' without further explanation. To state 'it is reductionist' is merely to identify; it is not automatically a strength or weakness.

www.dynamicpapers.com

Section B

Candidates should only answer one question from this Section.

Many candidates appeared to make the assumption that they must conduct an experiment whatever the question. An interview, questionnaire or observation are methods independent of an experiment and candidates should not try to make other methods 'fit' into an experimental format.

Some candidates evaluate their plan in **part (a)** by listing strengths and weaknesses. This should **not** be done because: the question does not ask for evaluation; there are no AO3 marks allocated to evaluation; evaluation is done in **Questions (c)(i)**, **(c)(ii)** and **(c)(iii)**.

Some candidates included a paragraph of results. This achieves no marks because the question asks for a plan only. Further, the proposed plan has not been carried out, so no actual results are gathered.

Candidates need to know the distinction between questionnaire format and technique, and interview format and technique, as stated on the syllabus: Questionnaire technique: paper and pencil (i.e., done by a person with the researcher present), online or postal). Questionnaire format: open and/or closed questions. Interview technique: telephone or face-to-face. Interview format: structured, semi-structured, unstructured.

Answers to **part (a)** questions in this section should include an appropriate plan, have applied a range (four or five) of specific (to the named method) methodological features, each of which should be explained fully, to show good understanding. Candidates should also include appropriate 'general' methodological features such as sample, sampling technique and location of the study. Many answers listed features such as 'I would have a random sample' and 'It would be an independent measures design' without explanation of why it would be a random sample, or how this would be obtained. Elaboration of these general sentences should be included.

In **part (b)(i)**, candidates should describe some relevant psychological knowledge that the whole question is based on. If the question, for example, asks about ways in which pain can be measured, then candidates should describe relevant measures.

In **part (b)(ii)**, candidates should explain what aspects of this psychological knowledge their **part (a)** plan is based on. These two question parts must be linked.

Section B can be considered as follows: A teacher teaches a sub-topic from the syllabus and gives the candidate some psychological knowledge. The teacher then tells each student to plan a study using method 'x' to investigate some part of that sub-topic. How does the student plan the study? They use the psychological knowledge of the sub-topic and they use their methodological knowledge about method 'x'. In the examination **part (a)** is the plan; **(b)(i)** is the sub-topic knowledge and **(b)(ii)** is how the knowledge was used to construct the plan. Exam question parts **(c)(i)**, **(ii)**, **(iii)** then ask about some methodological decisions and evaluation about the plan.

Comments specific to questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates could explain what was meant by a double-blind design and were awarded limited credit. However, most candidates did not mention the Grant et al. study. Some candidates explained what was meant by a placebo-controlled trial, although many did not do this. Again, most candidates needed to relate this to the Grant et al. study. Answers should be related to the study in question.

(b) 'Suggestion' questions like this require candidates to use their wider psychological knowledge to answer questions. In this instance the question required them to consider what would happen if a double-blind study had not been used. Most candidates were awarded limited credit for suggesting there could be participant bias or by suggesting there could be experimental bias. Very few candidates addressed the 'in this study' part of the question.

www.dynamicpapers.com

(c) Most candidates had little difficulty in providing two strengths of placebo-controlled trials and were awarded limited credit. The remaining marks allocated this question could often not be awarded because candidates needed to focus on studies of gambling disorder. Generic answers will be awarded partial marks, because they are correct. However full marks can only be awarded if the answer is focussed on the specific question set.

Question 2

(a) Many candidates wrote very good answers identifying a four-point scale ranging from 0 'not at all' to 3 'nearly every day'. Marks were also awarded for commenting on the assessment scale where a score of 15 to 21 indicated severe anxiety. Other candidates did not appear to be familiar with the GAD-7 scale.

(b) Candidates were required to suggest how the validity of the GAD-7 could be tested. Candidates awarded full marks frequently wrote about criterion validity and even identified a relevant test of anxiety to which the GAD-7 could be compared. Many candidates wrote about test-retest reliability which could not be credited. Candidates should ensure that the terms validity and reliability are understood.

(c) Many candidates wrote that the GAD-7 was 'quick and easy to do'. Without elaboration as to why this might be the case, no credit could be awarded. Candidates are encouraged to write informed answers showing the depth of their psychological knowledge.

Question 3

(a) (i) Candidates were required to outline two variables from the North et al. study. Full mark answers required an outline rather than identification, e.g. 'temperature was maintained at a constant level and lighting was kept the same throughout the study'. Responses limited to 'lighting and temperature' could not be credited. Candidates are encouraged to show their psychological knowledge and try to impress the examiner.

(ii) Many candidates appeared to be confused with this question thinking that counterbalancing could only apply to participants. In this study counterbalancing applied to the type of music being allocated to six days of the week over a three-week period. This meant that classical music, for example, only appeared on Monday once.

(b) Those candidates understanding how counterbalancing applied to this study wrote some excellent suggestions. For example, 'the day of the week might have been associated with a particular type of music and the result confounded. Customers may have spent more money if classical music was always played on Saturday or Sunday rather than midweek'. This answer showed a clear understanding of counterbalancing and related it to the study for full credit.

(c) For this question candidates could give examples but struggled to identify strengths. For example, a response such as 'there were two 76-minute CDs' that didn't say what the strength of this was. The strength could have been 'controlling variables increases validity' or that 'no customer heard the same piece of music twice when in the restaurant'.

Question 4

(a) Partial credit was awarded to answers such as 'Primacy is when items are more likely to be recalled when they are at the beginning of a list'. Then, relating to menu choice, answers such as 'people order items from a menu because they are the first things that they see' were awarded a full credit. Responses received limited credit without addresses both these components.

(b) There were some very good answers which earned full marks in response to this question. Some candidates referred to the use of fonts or highlights and explained how these would be used on a menu. Other candidates referred to eye magnets such as slashes, or arrows.

(c) Many answers gave a strength and a weakness of conducting a study in a laboratory, giving a weakness, for example, 'the participant is in an artificial environment'. However, this needed to be related to a study on menu item choice, for instance: 'the participant is in an artificial environment and is not choosing a menu item in a restaurant because they are hungry'.

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question 5

(a) (i) A number of candidates confused counterbalancing with confounding. In this study by Yokley and Glenwick confounding may have resulted if individual children were targeted and children in the same family then received mail prompts from different conditions emphasising different things.

(ii) Yokley and Glenwick prevented confounding by mailing individual families (rather than individual children) and so only one prompt was sent to each family. Candidates explaining this were awarded full marks.

(b) Many candidates assumed that this question part focused on encouraging individual children to take medication. Rather, the focus was on the Yokley and Glenwick study, improving adherence using community interventions. Other candidates correctly referred to a fear arousal strategy but then incorrectly wrote about oral hygiene rather than immunisations.

(c) Most candidates could provide two strengths of conducting field experiments. However the strengths were not always related to the specific question set.

Question 6

(a) All candidates knew something about mirror treatment for phantom limb pain, but often this was limited to 'the person sits in front of a mirror'. Elaboration was needed to explain how mirror treatment works, such as explaining that the person performs various exercises such as bending a leg. Referring to the case study of 'Alan' by MacLachlan et al. was an alternative way of explaining the treatment.

(b) Most candidates were awarded limited credit for writing that pain relief medication could be taken. Some candidates went on to give examples of specific drugs and some candidates, referring to the case study of 'Alan' by MacLachlan et al., correctly mentioned Neurontin.

(c) There were some very strong answers, but there were many where the strength was not related to the specific question. For example, writing 'the treatment does not have side effects' is correct, but insufficient for full credit.

Question 7

(a) This question required a description of the two forms of electronic presence used in the Claypoole and Szalma study. An answer as follows would be awarded 4 marks. 'The webcam placed on top of the computer screen (1 mark) was used to monitor the participant's performance and engagement while they completed the task, (+1 mark). The video recorder was placed on a tripod one metre behind the participant (1 mark) to record the participant's performance so that it could be evaluated later (+1 mark).

(b) There were many brief answers such as 'workers could be observed', but there were many stronger answers which referred to the type of observation (overt or covert) showing a methodological knowledge, and mentioning what would be observed, such as work efficiency.

(c) In relation to students being used as participants, many candidates wrote that students would be more likely to be under pressure and that this was unethical, but didn't address why students would be under more pressure than workers in a full-time job, and didn't acknowledge that students could withdraw from the study if they were under pressure as any participant could. Many candidates assumed that 'students' in the question referred to children and wrote about the weakness of using children who were under 16 years of age. The question was based on the key study by Claypoole and Szalma whose participants were university students.

Question 8

(a) For questions which refer to an exemplar study, in this case Oldham and Brass (1979), alternative studies can be used if they cover the same bullet point content on the syllabus. This series, all candidates answering this question were familiar with the study by Oldham and Brass (1979). There were different answers that were creditworthy such as reference to a longitudinal study, pre-move, after move and six weeks after move. Also correct was the completion of closed

questionnaires using a 7-point scale, and also correct was that participants were interviewed (such as mentioning the 'fish bowl effect').

(b) The question asked about the effect on job characteristics, of which there are many: task identity, autonomy, supervisor and co-worker feedback, friendship opportunities or any job characteristic identified by Hackman and Oldham. However, many candidates wrote about productivity or working overtime which are not job characteristics.

(c) Candidates made valid points but needed to relate each point to the study in question. For example, a candidate might write 'the participant completing the questionnaire might not tell the truth because of social desirability' but needed to refer to open-plan office design.

Section B

Question 9

(a) The simplest way to answer this question would be to conduct a covert, structured observation in a store six months after the covert sensitisation treatment had ended to see if the patient stole items from the store or not. However, many candidates designed an experiment instead of a covert observation, and rarely referred to observation. Other candidates had an observer observing the actual treatment process, but this could not test its effectiveness. Candidates are advised to answer the question specifically using the named method and are encouraged to consider their plan before starting to write.

(b) (i) For psychological knowledge. most candidates referred to the case study by Glover. Stronger answers correctly referred to classical conditioning which involved pairing of stealing with vomiting, whereas some candidates wrote relevant detail about her husband and embezzlement. Some candidates correctly wrote about covert sensitisation as a treatment method, but some details were confused. The process of desensitisation such as using systematic desensitisation to relax, when a person is anxious or has a phobia, involves progressive muscle relaxation.

(ii) Candidates usually used the procedure outlined by Glover involving the pairing of the image of stealing with the image of vomiting. When answering questions like this, it might be helpful for candidates to begin their answer with 'my plan involved doing 'x' because…'

(c) (i) Candidates had to explain why they used structured or unstructured observation. Those opting for a structured observation explained that they had a simple checklist about whether the person stole an object or not, which would test the effectiveness of the treatment. Those opting for an unstructured observation often simply stated that the observer would observe 'anything/everything' but doing this would not test the effectiveness of the treatment.

(ii) Candidates often stated: 'one strength of covert observation is that participants do not know they are being observed'. This is correct and was awarded limited credit. However, this is generic and could relate to any study. Answers must be linked to the question which specifies 'in your study', in this instance a study relating to kleptomania. A full mark answer could be: 'If the person does not know they are being observed and they steal an item, is a clear indicator that covert sensitisation has not been effective'.

(iii) Steps for making a study reliable could be standardising the procedure if the method is an experiment. If the method is an observation, as in this instance, then a check for inter-rater reliability can be included, as was often the case in response to this question for many candidates. Candidates often incorrectly assumed that inter-rater reliability was high simply because they have two observers. Rather, the reliability of two observers can be checked to see if there is good inter-rater reliability.

Question 10

(a) This question required a plan to use a questionnaire with the bullet point instruction to include question format and sampling technique. This means that the answer needed to include open and/or closed questions, which was not always done. The plan of many candidates was to invite people to participate when at the entrance to a shopping mall and then complete a questionnaire with closed questions after shopping. Many provided examples of questions to demonstrate the use of signs and/or 'you are here' maps. Some candidates planned to conduct an experiment instead of

the questionnaire study required, and wrote about IV, DV, controls and other features of experiments. If the named method is a questionnaire then the specific features of questionnaires should be described in detail.

(b) (i) For psychological knowledge, the most appropriate research would be the exemplar study by Dogu and Erkip (2000), who conducted a study on wayfinding in shopping malls in Turkey. Description of what they did and found on signs and you are here maps would be apposite.

(ii) This question part required a link so show how what was described in **10(b)(i)** informed the plan in **part (a)**. For example, in **part (b)(i)** it could have been written that Dogu and Erkip asked their participants the closed question 'Every time I turn a corner, I know which direction I am facing' with answer choices of: always/sometimes/never. Then in **part (b)(ii)** it could be explained that this same closed question was used or explained that on the basis of this question a modified version was used instead. The questions asked of participants should be based on psychological knowledge, i.e., that described in **part 9(b)(i)**.

(c) (i) Many candidates chose an opportunity sampling technique and provided an appropriate reason for this choice; others chose a volunteer sample and again often explained why this was appropriate to their plan. A few candidates chose a random sample which was often incorrectly explained, a random sample is where everyone in a population has an equal chance of participating. Choosing people walking into a shopping mall is not a random sample; it is an opportunity sample.

(ii) For candidates choosing an opportunity sample the answer to this question was often that it might result in researcher bias because researchers might choose people who look appropriate for the study. Those candidates choosing random sample for **(c)(i)** could often not give a weakness.

(iii) Question format is about whether questions are open and/or closed. Candidates could choose open or closed, or a combination of the two, and here the reason for that choice needed to be explained. Most candidates opted for a combination and then could gather numerical data for comparison and open-ended answers for clarification of the reason for the closed question answer.

Question 11

(a) This question required the planning of a field experiment to investigate the effectiveness of psychological treatments for managing pain. Most candidates identified an appropriate IV and DV but often needed to identify a location in which the study would be conducted. Further, many candidates did not identify an experimental design or include a directional or non-directional hypothesis. If the question includes a specific instruction of what to include (the two bullet points) the plan must include details about them because they are essential components and they will relate to questions in **part (c)**.

(b) (i) For psychological knowledge, the most appropriate research would be that of attention diversion where a person focuses on a non-related stimulus in order to be distracted from the discomfort; non-pain imagery, where a person tries to alleviate discomfort by creating or imagining a mental scene that is unrelated to or incompatible with the pain; and cognitive redefinition, where a person replaces negative thoughts about pain with constructive (positive) thoughts.

(ii) Most candidates included at least two techniques in their plan, described them in **(b)(i)** and explained the link in this question part, achieving full marks. A few candidates did not answer the question and instead gave their own evaluation points which could not be credited.

(c) (i) Most candidates identified the experimental design that they had used, but very few elaborated how this applied to participants in the two or three conditions of the IV. Some candidates wrote that they used a repeated measures design because it uses fewer participants. This might be true, but it is not an appropriate reason for the choice. Those participants are used for all conditions of the IV and there is no difference between using fewer participants for longer or more participants for a shorter time (as when using an independent design).

(ii) Weaknesses of repeated or independent designs were provided and were awarded limited credit. Some candidates went on to relate this to their study but others did not. Questions like this are about the candidates' specific plan, so any strength or weakness must be related to their specific plan.

www.dynamicpapers.com

(iii) Quite a few candidates did not provide a hypothesis in **part (a)** and could not answer this question. Other candidates provided an answer, but simply stated 'because it predicts a direction' without linking their response to their specific study. A strong response would be 'I used a directional hypothesis because it was predicted, on the basis of psychological knowledge described in **(b)(ii)**, that attention diversion would be more effective than cognitive redefinition for managing pain.'

Question 12

(a) Some answers achieved limited credit because they did not answer the question set. The focus of this question was on the effect of work patterns on workers' job satisfaction, not about moving from office A to office B. Some candidates planned an experiment when an interview study was specified. Specific features of the interview method should have been included in the plan. The bullet points with this question were interview technique and question scoring/interpretation. Interview technique is specified in the syllabus as relating to whether the interview is telephone or face-to-face. Whether the interview is structured, unstructured or semi structured is specified in the syllabus as interview format.

(b) (i) Psychological knowledge here could have described work hours as the same each day, such as 9-5, or flexi-time, meaning the person works the same hours each week but can choose their own start/finish time. Additionally appropriate psychological knowledge would be about job satisfaction, perhaps that outlined by Hertzberg.

(ii) Rather than explaining how the psychological knowledge described in **part (b)** informed the plan, many candidates evaluated their plan using their own methodological issues. For example, it was often written that an interview is time consuming. Responses needed to focus on the question set.

(c) (i) Many candidates confused interview technique and interview format. In this instance the question asked about interview technique which is specified in the syllabus as whether the interview is by telephone or face-to-face. Those writing about interview technique often provided a good reason for their choice of either face-to-face or telephone interview. Responses about interview format (structured, semi-structured, unstructured) could not be credited.

(ii) Candidates writing about interview technique often explained an appropriate weakness of the interview technique they had used, related it to their plan and were often awarded full marks. Responses about interview format (structured, semi-structured, unstructured) could not be credited.

(iii) Because question scoring/interpretation was a bullet point, how question scoring/interpretation was done should have been included in the answer to question **part (a)**. For this question part an explanation of why a particular choice of scoring/interpretation was used was needed. For example, if closed questions had been asked with yes/no answers then comparisons between the two different types of work patterns could be made using descriptive statistics.