

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/01

Core Studies 1

General comments

As in previous years, the marks achieved by candidates sitting this examination covered the entire range of the mark spectrum. It is a pleasure to award high marks to the answers of candidates who are prepared for the examination, who clearly show their understanding and who answer the questions directly and concisely. Equally it is frustrating to read the answers of candidates who are prepared but who do not follow the rubric or who write too much for **Section A**, or who do not answer the questions set.

Many candidates have good knowledge and have prepared well, but do not score high marks because they do not write in sufficient detail to score maximum marks. Often a single sentence is provided which, although correct, does not go far enough to score maximum marks. Without writing too much candidates should show sufficient knowledge to guarantee maximum marks rather than remain on the edge of the 1 mark or 2 mark boundary. For example, in response to **Question 5(b)** many candidates merely stated that "it was used as a control". Whilst this is true, this answer scores 1 mark because there is no elaboration or understanding of *why* it was a control. Similarly, in response to **Question 11 (b)** candidates stated that there was "higher glucose metabolism between NGRIs and the control group" but often did not say in which cortical region this was taking place. This is crucial because for some areas there is lower metabolism.

Questions 16 and **17** showed an imbalance in the amount of writing for each question part, with **part (a)** being most detailed and **part (d)** being the most brief. Each **Section B** question part carries equal marks and so the amount of writing for each question part should be similar. As a rule of thumb 45 minutes should be spent on **Section A** and 45 minutes should be spent on **Section B** (with about 10 minutes per question part with 5 minutes reading and thinking time).

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) This question focused on the second experiment by Loftus and Palmer on eyewitness testimony. The requirement was to briefly describe the quantitative results of the second experiment. Many candidates referred incorrectly to the speed of the vehicles which was the concern of the first experiment. Many others correctly described appropriate findings often giving actual numbers such as 16 out of 50 participants reported seeing broken glass in the 'smashed' condition. Question **part (b)**: A variety of answers were provided and the most frequent advantages of quantitative results mentioned were that: the numbers allow statistical analysis; data from each condition can be compared; numbers are objective and so are more scientific, and finally that quantitative data is less open to interpretation or bias.

Question 2

For question **part (a)** most candidates could correctly state that a cross cultural study is where psychological phenomena are examined in people from more than one cultural background. For question **part (b)** the request was to describe the findings of one study included in the Derogowski review. Two crucial features were needed here and many candidates provided only one or neither. The first was any *study* (anecdotal or empirical) included in the Derogowski review. Such a study would include the reports by Robert Laws; Mrs Fraser, and 'other reports'; or any of Hudson's studies such as the antelope/elephant/ man, the 'two-pronged trident', 'cube construction'; or preference for split-style. Any other aspect would not score marks. The second requirement to achieve maximum marks was to describe the *findings* of one of these studies, which

many candidates failed to do. As always some candidates incorrectly stated that people ‘have no depth perception’ when they mean ‘have no depth perception of pictures’.

Question 3

- (a) This question asked about one ethical issue that applied to the children in the study by Baron-Cohen, Leslie and Frith on autism. Note that with any question on ethics the question does not state guidelines that were *broken*. The question applies to all ethical *issues*, including those that were maintained. So for this question informed consent is applicable as children under 16 cannot give informed consent. The children probably did not understand they had the right to withdraw. They were not deceived, or harmed, and confidentiality was maintained. They were probably not debriefed as they would not understand reason for study. Question **part (b)** asked candidates to suggest *why* psychologists have ethical guidelines. Any appropriate answer to this question would receive credit, and nearly all candidates scored at least one mark here. Ethical guidelines exist to protect participants from harm; to set standards for professionalism and to ensure that fundamental human rights are not violated, setting boundaries for privacy and decency.

Question 4

The training methods which Gardner and Gardner adopted to encourage Washoe to use sign language are as follows. One method was imitation – Washoe copied the Gardner’s behaviour and then Washoe was positively reinforced for imitating that behaviour. Another method used by Gardner and Gardner was behaviour shaping, using successive approximations and operant conditioning. If Washoe produced a sign close to that required she would be rewarded for it. Many candidates described both of these methods with ease, but many could not begin to form the basics of an answer. Two notable points: Washoe was female, contrary to popular belief, and secondly, after being in captivity for some 35 years after the study, Washoe died in October 2007.

Question 5

- (a) This question focused on the fixed array condition of the Samuel and Bryant study on conservation, which candidates were asked to briefly describe. Samuel and Bryant describe this as being where “the children saw no transformation being made but only saw the post-transformational display”. Answers showing awareness of this scored one mark and answers which added that the children were asked the ‘one question, post-transformational question’ were awarded 2 marks. Question **part (b)** asked candidates to suggest one reason why this condition was included in the study. To quote directly from the Samuel and Bryant article: “this was to check that children who answered the post-transformational correctly in the other two conditions did so by bringing over information from the pre-transformational display”. Although a direct quote is never needed to score maximum marks, an understanding of the meaning is needed. Often candidates stated simply that the fixed array was used as a control condition and such answers scored 1 mark compared to those who elaborated and showed more understanding.

Question 6

Part (a) saw many candidates achieve 1 rather than 2 marks, and indeed many candidates did not score any marks because they provided a result of the study rather than a category of observation. The requirement of the question was to describe one of the categories of behaviour that was observed in the study by Bandura, Ross and Ross on aggression. Identifying any of the following categories would score 2 marks: imitative physical aggression; imitative verbal aggression; imitative non-aggressive verbal; mallet aggression; sits on bobo; punches bobo; non-imitative aggression; aggressive gun play. Those candidates stating “physical aggression” or “imitative aggression” scored 1 mark as neither of these were actual categories, but were close enough to score 1 mark. Question **part (b)** asked for one way in which the reliability of any observation can be checked. There were many answers showing a lack of understanding of the complexity of reliability. The reliability of an observation is best checked by inter-rater reliability, where two or more observers are used. In this study there was a correlation of .89 between ratings. This different from the reliability of a questionnaire where test-retest is used, and it is also different from replicating an experiment.

Question 7

In order to describe how qualitative data was gathered in the study by Hodges and Tizard candidates had to say in what form and from whom the data was gathered. The perfect answer would be to write "from interviews with the ex-institutional participants and their mothers". Many candidates were able to do this, but many could not. A frequent error was to state that teachers were interviewed when they were not and another common error was to assume that the questionnaires provided qualitative data. They did not, as both the Rutter A and Rutter B questionnaires provide quantitative data. Question **part (b)** asked for one weakness of qualitative data and most candidates gave a correct response which focused on the subjective nature of the data; that participants may give socially desirable answers or simply may decide not to tell the truth.

Question 8

This question asked candidates to briefly describe the 'giraffe episode'. There was a tremendous amount of variation in answers with many candidates making false assumptions. The correct answer, to quote directly from article is: "...Hans: In the night there was a big giraffe in the room and a crumpled one, and the big one called out because I took the crumpled one away from it. Then it stopped calling out, and then I sat down on top of the crumpled one". For question **part (b)**, the requirement was to explain why the giraffe episode is evidence for the Oedipus complex. Correct answers stated that the boy's father and mother were the two giraffes; that Hans sexually desires his mother and the sitting on the crumpled giraffe is said to represent Hans having sex with his mother, and so Hans is in the Oedipus complex.

Question 9

This question required two ways in which participants were deceived in the study by Schachter and Singer on emotion. There were a number of deceptions and these included: participants were told that it was a study on vitamin supplements and vision using the drug suproxin; participants were given false information regarding the actual injection of adrenaline; in the epi mis group they were given false descriptions of the effects of adrenaline and finally, the mere existence of a stooge is deception. Most candidates were able to provide at least one deception and many were able to describe two correctly.

Question 10

The study by Sperry (split brain) was a case study and most candidates were able to state one advantage. The most common answer was that rich and detailed data could be gathered. Also popular was a mention of the ability to provide both qualitative and quantitative data and, because case studies are often longitudinal. Any change in behaviour can be recorded over a period of time. Question **part (b)** asked about a limitation when generalising and again most candidates were able to provide a correct answer. The most common limitation mentioned was that the limited sample may not be representative of the wider population.

Question 11

(a) This question on the Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse study required candidates to name two of the cortical areas that were studied. Whilst many candidates could do this with little difficulty (correct regions were lateral prefrontal, medial prefrontal, parietal, occipital, and temporal) many other could not, often listing sub-cortical and even suggesting that left and right hemispheres were studied. Although the answer to question **part (b)** was relatively straightforward, there were numerous differences in brain activity that could have been mentioned. However, many candidates described any difference far too briefly and so did not score full marks. To say "there were differences in glucose metabolism" is correct and worth one mark, but for two marks candidates need to go further and say in which brain region these differences were. For example to state "NGRI's had higher glucose metabolism than controls in the occipital lobe" is a perfect answer. Full details of all the differences appear in the mark scheme.

Question 12

The focus of this question (prison simulation) was not on the initiation procedure as many candidates thought (this happened *after* participants were selected) and neither were the participants all candidates from the same University. Participants were selected in two main ways, as many candidates correctly described. Firstly they responded to a newspaper advertisement and then 70 of them were given diagnostic interviews and tests to select the final sample of twenty-four. Question **part (b)** was misunderstood by some candidates who described the weaknesses of the sample itself, that they were all male for example, rather

than the weaknesses of the selection procedure. The main weakness of the selection procedure was that using a newspaper advertisement is restricted to those reading that newspaper *and* seeing the advertisement. It is then restricted to those who decide to volunteer, because volunteers may have a number of personality characteristics different from those who do not volunteer.

Question 13

In his study of intelligence testing Gould made many assumptions and candidates had to outline one of these assumptions. For example he assumed that Intelligence is inherited; that coloured people had inferior intelligence to whites; and he assumed that more recruits were literate than there actually was. Whilst a good number of candidates provided correct answers, many could not. For example many candidates thought that Gould assumed that the people of the United States were a nation of morons. This was only concluded on the basis of the results. Question **part (b)** asked whether the findings of the testing supported this assumption. Candidates could say simply ‘yes’ or ‘no’ but a reason was needed for full marks. Yerkes still believed that intelligence was inherited despite evidence to the contrary and the results, as biased as they were, did support his assumption because whites did score higher than non-whites.

Question 14

The focus of this question was a problem of the technique Hraba and Grant used to measure racial preference. Some candidates wrote correct answers which showed understanding, when they commented that “just because one doll is not chosen, it does not mean that is it rejected” or alternatively that “it was a forced choice and children could not say that it depends or choose both”. Other correct answers would include mention of dolls, or low ecological validity or demand characteristics. For question **part (b)** candidates were required to suggest an alternative way the choices of the children could be measured. The most common answers included: having more question options, or widening range of questions, such as a 5 point scale; using an alternative method such as observation and watching the children play; and using ‘real people’ rather than dolls. Yet again those giving very brief answers such as “use real people” scored only one mark rather than two marks as there was no expansion or clarification on what was meant.

Question 15

This question required a brief description of the findings of two tests carried out by Thigpen and Cleckley. One mark was gained by correctly identifying a test and the other mark was given for the finding of the test. So, for example, if a candidate wrote “IQ test where Eve White scored 110 and Eve black 104”, then two marks would be awarded. Most candidates were able to do this and for the second test most mentioned the Rorschach (inkblot) test although some did mention the memory test. No one mentioned the drawings of human figures test.

Section B

Question 16

The concern of question 16 was research that is conducted in a laboratory. By far the most popular choice of study was that by Milgram with the Tajfel study rarely being chosen. Question **part (a)** required a description of the procedure, and many candidates provided excellent descriptions. Some candidates wrote far too much whilst others wrote too little. The amount written should be equivalent to the time allocated to this question part and the marks available. Question **part (b)** required a description of how being in a laboratory helped to control variables and in response many candidates provided an appropriate list; those choosing the Dement and Kleitman study performing just as well as those choosing the Milgram study. Question **part (c)** required both advantages and disadvantages. If a candidate wrote only about advantages (or disadvantages) then they scored a maximum of 5 marks, however good the answer was. The most common advantage quoted was that being in a laboratory allows control over extraneous variables, whilst the most common disadvantage was that being in a laboratory meant that the study was low in ecological validity, which was followed closely by the disadvantage that controlling too many variables is reductionist often making the study unrealistic. Question **part (d)** as always required consideration of an alternative way of gathering data, and the focus this time was gathering data outside the laboratory. Those choosing the Dement and Kleitman study suggested conducting the study in the home of each participant for example. In general candidates write less for this question part than others, even though it carries equal marks.

Question 17

This question was on data collection using the method of observation with the studies of by Rosenhan, Bandura et al and Piliavin et al being those available for selection. The Piliavin et al study was the most popular with the Bandura et al study the least popular. Question **part (a)** required a description of how observational data was gathered in the chosen study. Often this became a description of the procedure, with a number of candidates failing to state the crucial aspect of how data was actually gathered. For example in the Piliavin et al study detail was given regarding the subway train, victim type and use of models, with little mention of the two observers and what they were actually observing. Question **part (b)** focused on the results of the study and often a reasonable range was provided by candidates although on occasion, this was sparse and such answers scored few marks. Question **part (c)** as always looked for advantages and disadvantages and those relevant to this question included: that those being observed behave naturally, which is high in ecological validity; but on the downside that there may be observer bias in the reliability of recording since, to use the Piliavin et al study, the two observers recorded different things. Question **part (d)** looked for another way in which data could be collected. For those choosing the Piliavin et al study, most logically this would be through questionnaire, and for those choosing to write about the Rosenhan study this was also a popular option. For those who went for the Bandura et al study an observation in the home (or School) of each child was the most popular suggestion.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/02 Core Studies 2

General comments

As usual there were a range of responses; some candidates developed excellent responses achieving full marks whilst others struggled to provide enough detail in their answers. It is important for candidates to practise exam technique, in particular that required in the essays; studying the mark schemes can help in this respect. The paper allowed all of the candidates to achieve as well as they were able to. **Question 6** was the most popular and gave candidates the chance to discuss experiences of discrimination in their country

Individual Questions

Section A

Question 1

Generally well answered but responses were not always clear about limitations or came up with no obvious disadvantages in **part (b)**.

Question 2

- (a)** Reasonably well answered by most but some candidates did not appreciate that the question asked for 'features'.
- (b)** Real world applications were often not included and some candidates just summarised findings.

Question 3

- (a)** Well answered
- (b)** Demand characteristics and validity were often identified.

Question 4

- (a)** Most candidates knew this but there was a wide variety of responses across the range of candidates.
- (b)** Reasonably well answered but this question provided good differentiation across a wide range of candidates.

Question 5

Many candidates did not make their answer specific to the named study. Many others gave difficulties that were actually dealt with in the study. Others concentrated on issues that did not demonstrate the methodology used in the named study. Surprising numbers of candidates confused Samuel and Bryant with a longitudinal study.

Section B

Question 6

In **Part (a)** there were many excellent answers from candidates. **Part (b)** was not so well completed as many candidates concentrated on studies and the problems. Ecological validity was often mentioned for most studies and nothing else. **Part (c)** Many candidates did not use evidence and were restricted to 3 or 4 marks. Many answers were anecdotal and included little reference to psychology.

Question 7

In **Part (a)** there were reasonable answers but some candidates confused the meaning of 'psychometric'. This seriously affected their marks. Particularly in this question part where the psychometric component of some of the studies listed was often ignored or not understood. In **Part (b)** if candidates had problems with Section A as noted it was evident in **part (b)** they did not know what psychometric tests were. This resulted in a further reduction in marks. In **Part (c)** some candidates reduced their overall mark by confusing the belief question in the autism study and also EEG etc. with psychometric tests. The need for psychometric tests to measure a scalar quantity was not understood by many. Evidence was often lacking which inevitably reduced the marks awarded.

Question 8

Part (a) was well answered by many candidates. **Part (b)** many candidates were able to identify relevant problems but some failed to support their answer with an example from a study.

There were some good answers to **Part (c)** by some candidates that seemed well prepared. Evidence again was often lacking resulting in the mark being limited to 3 or 4 marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/03
Specialist Choices

General comments

A number of candidates wrote superb answers and they are to be congratulated on their efforts. But as always there are candidates who are not prepared for this examination. There are those who attempt every question, hoping that a few marks will be scored for each answer. This strategy will always fail, because depth and detail are needed from just four answers. For such candidates all their answers are marked and the best four answers which follow the rubric (i.e. one *Section A* and one *Section B* from two options) are credited.

There are some candidates who think that this specialist choices paper allows them to write about their own real-life experiences. Whilst psychology is about people and their experience, the purpose of an examination is to show what they have learned and the best way to do this is to quote psychological knowledge. Papers one and two require candidates to study specific work and this approach appears to be forgotten when answering paper 3 questions. The only difference between these papers is that for paper 3 candidates, or indeed teachers can choose for themselves which studies to focus on.

Many candidates do not know how to evaluate properly. They treat **part (a)** as an introduction and then use **part (b)** to expand on what has been written in **part (a)**. **Part (a)** carries marks for description only and **part (b)** carries marks for evaluation only, and so any description appearing in **part (b)** scores no marks. However, Examiners will transfer any description in **part (b)** to **part (a)** so giving candidates an enhanced mark in **part (a)**. It is worth candidates and teachers becoming familiar with the requirements of the mark scheme, particularly the evaluation section. For example, the mere addition of an appropriate comparison or contrast in an answer will score two marks for cross referencing.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

For question **part (a)** candidates had to explain what was meant by the term 'improving learning effectiveness'. Most candidates scored two marks as appropriate answers were provided. For **part (b)** candidates performed less well, although some excellent answers were evident. The three most common techniques to improve learning effectiveness are: 1. McCarthy's (1990) 4-MAT system which is a teacher-based strategy who matches teaching styles with learning styles, and involves motivation, concept development, practice and application. 2. the PQRST technique: preview, question, read, self-recitation, test. This is intended to improve the ability to study and remember material in a textbook. 3. SPELT (Mulcahy, 1986) is concerned with learning how to learn and SPELT stands for Strategies for Effective Learning, Thinking. **Question 1 (c)** asked for a description of a problem with a study skill and candidates who had outlined one of the above techniques had little problem in providing a correct answer, whilst those who did not outline a technique could not suggest a problem.

Question 2

Answers to this question were far more common than **Question 1**, but the quality of answers showed just as much variation. For **part (a)** many candidates still failed to make the distinction between corrective and preventative. A corrective strategy refers to the modification of the behaviour of children that has already happened (rather than trying to prevent a behaviour from happening in the first place). **Question part (b)** wanted a description of one cause and one effect of a disruptive behaviour. A wide variation of answers was acceptable here ranging from a cause as in someone standing up in class and the effect would be to distract others; alternatively a cause such as ADHD (attention deficit hyperactive disorder), or the cause of ADHD

itself being genetic or diet. Any appropriate cause and effect received credit and marks awarded according to the quality of the answer. For question **part (c)** a corrective strategy (not preventative) was required and most answers focused on various behaviour modification techniques involving rewards and/or punishments.

Question 3 this question on motivation and educational performance gave candidates an opportunity to write freely on this topic area. Many did just that and wrote excellent answers showing detailed knowledge and understanding. Others had not prepared or were unaware of appropriate theories and concepts in this area. Better answers revolved around the three behaviourist, humanistic and cognitivist perspectives. The Behaviourists emphasise extrinsic praise and reward. For example Brophy (1981) lists guidelines for effective and ineffective praise. The Humanistic approach emphasises intrinsic motivation and includes, amongst others, Maslow's (1970) hierarchy and self actualization and White's (1959) competence motivation. The Cognitive approach could focus on the Attribution theory by Weiner (1974) or Rotter's Locus of control. As with all answers, these suggestions are indicative and not prescriptive. Evaluations of motivation and educational performance varied from those who provided no evaluation at all, to those who considered a wide range of issues with each point being supported with relevant evidence. Question **part (c)** looked at the syllabus topic of attribution theory for the first time. Some candidates had not covered this area and made wild guesses as to what it was, scoring no marks at all, whilst others provided thorough answers showing excellent understanding. Stated simply attribution theory applied to education is the way that individuals attribute their success or failure either to internal (ability, effort) or external (difficulty, luck) factors.

Question 4

Part (a) required candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about the design and layout of educational environments. This is a question which has been asked a number of times previously so the prepared candidate should have enjoyed writing competent answers. Whilst there were those who were well prepared, and their answers included a range of relevant theories and evidence, there were those who imagined their own School or College and ran through a list of things that were good or bad about their own teaching rooms. Candidates are reminded that this is an advanced psychology examination and answers must show evidence of the study of psychology which most explicitly quotes the research done by others. Those who wrote competent answers to **part (a)** often wrote competent answers to **part (b)** and those who could not answer **part (a)** simply wrote more of the same for **part (b)** scoring very low, if any marks at all. Question **part (c)** focused on physical features of a classroom and rather than tailor answers to match the question, as able candidates did, weaker candidates just wrote yet more of the same.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 5 (a) asked candidates: 'what is meant by the term 'positive uses of sound (music)'. Noise is unwanted sound and so is negative, whereas wanted sound is positive and such sounds (probably in the form of music) can be beneficial in many ways. Most candidates provided an explanation sufficient to score maximum marks. Question **part (b)** asked for a description of a study showing the negative effects of noise on health. This question is taken directly from the syllabus and so candidates should have had little problem in providing a correct answer. Many had no problem at all, but others struggled to mention a relevant study. Relevant studies most typically are those by Grandjean (1983) and Eggersten (1987), or Rosenlund (2001) who found higher blood pressure in those exposed to airport noise, whilst Knipschild (1981) found low birth weight in babies exposed to noise. Question **part (c)** asked for a description of two studies which have made positive use of sound. To answer this question candidates could focus on: music played in doctor/dental waiting rooms to distract patients from worry; muzak, used in shops, supermarkets, etc. to encourage people to buy certain products; the use of music in studying (mozart effect). Specifically: North (2003) found that classical music leads to increased profit in restaurants; Fox (1983) found that industrial music helps production-line workers, and Chafin (2004) found that listening to classical music can reduce blood pressure.

Question 6 focused on the area of environmental cognition, specifically the topic of wayfinding. Most candidates were able to state what wayfinding is: the way in which people actually navigate in their environment. Question **part (b)** asked for a description of two ways to improve the design of maps. The most commonly quoted work is that of Levine who looked specifically at 'you-are-here' maps. He suggests two aspects significantly improve maps which are 1) structure mapping – the map should reflect the layout and appearance of the setting it represents and 2) orientation – the map should be aligned the same way as the setting and it should have forward equivalence (i.e. the top of the map should be straight ahead). Question **part (c)** asked for a description of a study on wayfinding. Whilst some candidates looked at wayfinding in humans and referred to the studies by Garling et al (1986) most commonly, others looked at

wayfinding in animals and either quoted the work of Tolman (1932) on rats in mazes, or Walcott (1973) on homing pigeons or squirrels trying to find their lost nuts.

Question 7 was on the area of density and crowding. Some candidates either misread the question or were not prepared for it, because some candidates wrote answers on crowds/collective behaviour instead. Some candidates even merged the two areas writing half an answer on crowds and half an answer on crowding. These are two distinct syllabus areas and one is labelled as density and crowding and the other as crowd behaviour. As this question was on density and crowding, those candidates writing about crowds scored no marks at all. Those choosing the appropriate material often wrote excellent answers looking at both animal and human studies and referring to relevant syllabus topics such as effects on health, social behaviour and performance. Evaluations for question **part (b)** were often competent with issues being discussed such as the ethics of animal studies and the differences between laboratory experiments and field experiments. Question **part (c)** looked at the third 'bullet' point from the syllabus, that of coping with the effects of crowding. One possible answer would be to look out of a window (e.g. Baum, 1976) if one were on public transport but alternatively one could try to increase cognitive control as suggested by Langer & Saegert (1977) or use a technique such as attention diversion as suggested by Karlin et al (1979).

Question 8 asked candidates what we have discovered about natural disaster and/or technological catastrophe. Some candidates began with a definition and others launched straight into examples. Description of actual events is acceptable but it limits evaluation. If evaluation is considered before **part (a)** is started, then evaluation will flow more easily. For example if description of one or more disaster *and* catastrophe is included in **part (a)** then they can be compared and contrasted in **part (b)**. Another pertinent evaluation point would be to debate how psychologists study disaster and catastrophe. They clearly cannot create an event as that would be far too unethical and a laboratory experiment (such as that by Mintz, 1951) is low in ecological validity. A simulation is a good compromise between the two. Candidates could also look at how people behave during emergency situations and contrast the wild panic of contagion theory with that where people follow a 'script' of how they usually behave. All of these issues described in **part (a)** and evaluated in **part (b)** would impress Examiners. Question **part (c)** asked about the role of psychologists after an event and most candidates here successfully wrote about systematic desensitisation for post traumatic stress disorder.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 9 part (a) required candidates to 'explain, in their own words, what is meant by the term 'quitting' a substance'. Any substance that a person abuses is an appropriate example. Whilst many candidates stated that quitting is merely 'giving up', others scored full marks by showing their knowledge of the area and referring to addiction or withdrawal or some other appropriate 'jargon' term relevant to quitting. Question **part (b)** asked for two ways in which people try to quit. Smoking was by far the most common substance addressed with an occasional mention of drugs and alcohol. Some candidates suggested quitting 'with help from the family' whilst others focused on psychological techniques such 'rapid smoking' which is a form of aversion therapy. Candidates also mentioned using nicotine replacement therapy and better answers referred to the nicotine regulation model. Question **part (c)** changed emphasis and looked at preventing substance abuse. By far the most common answer focused again on smoking and looked at health promotion programmes, particularly those emphasising fear appeals and those done in Schools.

Question 10 (a) focused on 'health promotion in Schools' which is enhancing good health and preventing illness through programmes done in Schools. Most candidates provided adequate explanations in response to the question. **Question 10 (b)** required description of one School health promotion study and one worksite health promotion study. Most candidates chose to describe the study by Walter (1985) where 22 North American elementary Schools completed a curriculum with an emphasis on nutrition and physical fitness and after two years were much healthier compared to the control group. The most common worksite study was that by the Johnson & Johnson Company whose 'live for life' programme began in 1978, and is said to be one of the largest, best funded, and most effective worksite programmes yet developed. Question **part (c)** required a specific health problem to be outlined and then a campaign to address the problem. Some candidates chose smoking and the Gomel et al (1983) Australian campaign attempting to stop worksite smoking was often quoted. The most common answer focused on diet and the Farquhar 'Three Community Study' was then described.

Question 11 looked at the syllabus topic of pain, which appeared for the fourth time since the revised syllabus was introduced in 2002. Whilst some candidates struggled to mention the basics, others had difficulty in trying to fit everything in to their answers, often writing a **part (a)** that was very long. Nearly all candidates began with a distinction between acute and chronic pain and then more able candidates went on to describe theories, such as the pattern theory and gate control theory. A reminder that there are no

marks for evaluation in **part (a)** and any evaluation should be included in **part (b)**. Some candidates considered ways in which pain could be measured, often contrasting observations by medical staff (using the UAB for example) with self report measures (such as the McGill pain questionnaire). Some candidates went even further and looked at different ways in which pain could be managed, often contrasting medical with psychological techniques. Question **part (c)** asked for ways in which acute pain could be managed. Whilst the use of drugs (painkillers) is appropriate as is a psychological strategy such as attention diversion, the use of TENS (transcutaneous nerve stimulation) is more appropriate for chronic pain.

Question 12

As always this question attracted a significant number of candidates who know very little psychology and think they be successful by writing common sense anecdotal answers. While such answers are often interesting to read, they score very few and often no marks at all. As has been said before, this strategy simply does not work and this question must be answered following the same 'formula' as any other *Section B* essay question. On the other hand some candidates wrote excellent answers which achieved top marks. Such candidates or their teachers had clearly read the published mark schemes which indicate relevant content. There are two main ways of looking at the causes of accidents: Theory A is the person approach believing that accidents are caused by the unsafe behaviour of people and prevention is achieved by changing the ways in which people behave. As part of Theory A candidates could consider accident prone personality or the reasons for human error such as the illusion of invulnerability. The second is Theory B, the systems approach, where accidents are caused by unsafe systems at work. Prevention here is achieved by redesigning the work system or 'fitting the job to the person'. Such a distinction also provides a basis for question **part (c)** answers. On this occasion Question **part (c)** required consideration of how accidents could be reduced without specifying whether this was at work, in the home or elsewhere, and allowed candidates freedom to chose and the strategy to be adopted.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

This question asked candidates for an explanation of the term 'somatoform disorder'. Typically this is a disorder in which physical symptoms that mimic disease or injury are prominent and for which there is no identifiable physical cause. Question **part (b)** asked candidates to describe two types of somatoform disorder. The majority of candidates choosing this question were able to do this with little difficulty and chose from: Hypochondriasis: a preoccupation and exaggerated concerns about health, or having a serious illness. Conversion: where patients present with neurological symptoms such as numbness, paralysis, or fits, but where no neurological explanation can be found. Somatisation: (Briquet's syndrome) where patients who chronically and persistently complain of varied physical symptoms that have no identifiable physical origin. Psychogenic pain where people report pain with no physical cause. Also creditable is Body dysmorphic disorder in which the affected person is excessively concerned about and preoccupied by an imagined or minor defect in his or her physical features. **Part (c)** concerned one explanation for somatoform disorders and most candidates chose the psychoanalytic explanation that emotionally charged conflicts were repressed then converted into physical symptoms that serve as outlets.

Question 14

This question focused on 'obsessive-compulsive disorder' in which obsessions are recurring thoughts that interfere with normal behaviour, and compulsions are recurring actions which the individual is forced to enact. When put together these two form obsessive-compulsive disorder where irresistible thoughts must be acted on. Most candidates correctly identified these two aspects in their answers to question **part (a)**. For **part (b)** two characteristics of obsessive-compulsive disorder were required to be described. Generally this was an expansion of **part (a)** with candidates often considering how repetitive thoughts, images or impulses invading consciousness are difficult to dismiss or control, or that the responses to an obsession are time consuming and interfere with normal routine, work or social relations. Question **part (c)** asked for one explanation for obsessive-compulsive disorder. Answers were divided between chemical, behavioural and psychoanalytic explanations.

Question 15

The topic of schizophrenia is one of the recent additions to the specification and given the quality and detail of a significant number of answers, it is evidently very popular. Many candidates began their answer with a description of the term which is from the Ancient Greek schzein (split) and phren (mind). Many candidates considered the different types of which there are five: Hebephrenic with incoherence, disorganised behaviour, disorganised delusions and vivid hallucinations; Simple: the gradual withdrawal from reality; Catatonic: impairment of motor activity, where the schizophrenic often holds the same position for hours; Paranoid with well organised, delusional thoughts (and hallucinations), but with high level of awareness. Finally there is undifferentiated/untypical for all the other schizophrenics who do not fit into any of the above categories! Candidates often focused on explanations of schizophrenia with genetic and family explanations being most common, followed by behavioural, cognitive and psychodynamic. Many candidates used the different explanations as a basis for evaluations in **part (b)** whilst weaker candidates just extended their **part (a)** answers. Question **part (c)** asked how schizophrenia may be treated and some excellent and very thorough answers were written covering a wide range of approaches including the use of drugs, electro-convulsive therapy and behaviour therapy.

Question 16

Questions on abnormal avoidance and need have appeared before and are very popular. As always candidates can focus on avoidance or need or on a combination of the two. For those focusing on need, compulsive gambling, kleptomania and pyromania were most prominent. However candidates tended to describe these three rather than quoting relevant research and/or theory. For those focusing on avoidance, phobias were to the fore and sometimes candidates provided a list of ten or more, but such candidates tended not to provide any explanation for the onset of the phobia. A few answers did look at the behaviourist explanation where a phobia is maladaptive learning which can be modified through strategies such as systematic desensitisation. As with all *Section B* questions evaluations were at the extreme ends of the mark range. There are those who do not, or cannot evaluate and at the other extreme are the answers that are a pleasure to read. Question **part (c)** asked for a treatment for abnormal need and some candidates misread the question and wrote about treatments for avoidance and phobias. It is advantageous to actually read questions rather than assuming what a question is asking.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

Nearly all candidates scored maximum marks for question **part (a)** by providing an explanation of group decision-making. Some answers were rather basic and others very involved and looked at decision-making processes such as a SWOT Analysis - evaluation by the decision making individual or organization of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats with respect to desired end state or objective. Question **part (b)** asked for two ways in which group decision-making can go wrong. There were those who made statements such as "when people argue" to candidates who examined relevant psychological concepts such as groupthink and group polarisation. Groupthink is a syndrome characterised by a concurrence-seeking tendency that overrides the ability of a cohesive group to make critical decisions (Janis, 1965) and group polarisation is where groups make decisions that are more extreme than those made by individuals. Question **part (c)** asked for one way in which group conflict can be managed and answers ranged from an irrelevant "the leader can tell the team to be quiet" to those who considered aspects such as encouraging evaluation; promoting open enquiry; using sub-groups; admitting to shortcomings; holding second-chance meetings; and not rushing to a quick solution.

Question 18

Part (a) of this question required an explanation of performance appraisal. The crucial aspect of this is that it is concerned with the process of assessing or evaluating workers/employees on various work related dimensions and not, as many candidates thought, about rewarding workers by paying them more money. The misinterpretation often continued to **part (b)** where performance appraisal techniques often became two ways of rewarding. Candidates who correctly answered the question focused on actual appraisal techniques. Such techniques can be informal, but more formal or specific job analysis techniques include: FJA (functional job analysis) a technique examining the sequence of tasks in a job; the PAQ (positional analysis questionnaire) which uses structured questionnaires to analyse jobs. The CIT (critical incidents technique) uses examples of successful or unsuccessful job performance. One problem of such techniques was asked for **part (c)** and the most common answer was that 'they have bias' often without elaboration.

Question 19

An examination question such as this allows candidates the freedom to fully express their psychological knowledge and understanding. But, because knowledge in this area is extensive, candidates must make a careful selection of what to include and what to miss out of their answers. The most logical reason for inclusion is whether a particular aspect can be evaluated, but many candidates ignored this, preferring to opt for a chronological review. Those candidates who tried to include everything found that there was no time to complete the task and compromises had to be made either for question **part (b)** or **(c)**. Answers included Universalist theories, behavioural theories and contingency theories. Generally more traditional theories were included at the expense of more modern theories. In **part (c)** the focus was on job satisfaction and here candidates considered a wide range of aspects such as job enlargement and job rotation rather than the usual 'pay more money' approach.

Question 20

This is the first time this topic area has been examined though it was not a popular choice for candidates which is disappointing as it is a fascinating area. This area involves 'human factors' in organisations which are concerned with the design of tools, machines, work systems and work places to fit the skills and abilities of workers. Chapanis (1976) outlines the 'operator-machine system' which can include human systems: senses, information processing/decision-making and controlling; and machine systems involving controls, operation and display (feeding back to human senses). Also relevant are displays, which can be visual or auditory and controls which can be of many types, but should be matched to the operator's body; they should be clearly marked and they should mirror the machine actions they produce. Errors in operator-machine are important. There can be errors of: Omission (failing to do something), commission (performing an act incorrectly), sequence errors (doing a step out of order) and timing errors – too quickly, or too slowly. Errors such as these can be rectified either by 1. changing the design or 2. selecting people who can operate the systems. Question **part (c)** asked candidates to suggest an efficient workspace design for a candidate which would have allowed thinking about appropriate requirements matched with a number of the factors outlined above.