

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/11
Core Studies

Key messages

- **Section A** answers were often brief - to score full marks some elaboration and detail was required.
- **Section B** answers required more focus on the question for part (c) where candidates often wrote about the advantages and disadvantages of the study itself with no reference at all to observations or generalisations as the question required.

General comments

This is the final time a June report will be written on this current syllabus, although a report will still be written in November 2011. The revised syllabus is examined for the first time in June 2012. Although the comments below are written with this examination in mind, the comments generalise to all examinations. For example, candidates as always are advised to read all parts of a question and to think about what they should include on each part before they begin to write. Marks are not given twice for the same answer and if an answer is in the wrong place it is not the role of the Examiner to renumber questions or question parts for candidates. Candidates often don't read the words 'in this study' as in **Question 4(a)** and so only score one of the two available marks. For **Section A** 'short answers' candidates are, as always, advised to write sufficient detail in order to score all the marks available. In most cases a single sentence answer will be insufficient to score full marks. For example in **Question 4(b)** many candidates wrote "participant attrition" for a disadvantage of a longitudinal study. Whilst this is correct and scores a mark, it is not worth the second available mark because there is no additional detail or elaboration. A simple description of what attrition is would be sufficient. For **Section B** many candidates did not answer the questions set. For **Question 17(b)** candidates did not write about generalisations instead writing about the procedure of the study. In question part (c) for both **Questions 16** and **17** candidates often wrote about the advantages and disadvantages of the study itself with no reference at all to observations or generalisations as the question required. If the question is not answered then no marks can be awarded.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

For question part (a) candidates were asked to briefly describe the quantitative results of the first experiment by Loftus and Palmer on eyewitness testimony. Many candidates gave a table of data with speed estimates in mph: smashed 40.8, collided 39.3, bumped 38.1, hit 34.0 and contacted 31.8. This type of answer resulted in a single mark being awarded because the question asks for a description of the results. A table, however accurate, does not *describe* the results. Question part (b) asked candidates to suggest one disadvantage of quantitative results. Answers receiving one mark commonly had nothing more than "it is only numbers" without elaboration, whilst answers receiving both marks wrote for example "it is only numbers and does not provide information about *why* people behave the way they do."

Question 2

Question part (a) asked candidates to suggest, from the review by Deregowski on picture perception, why it was concluded that the perception of pictures is learned. This was concluded because participants in some cultures did not perceive pictures in the same way as participants from other cultures. For example, there were differences in drawing the two-pronged trident; the preference for split-style drawings; construction of the cube. If the perception of pictures was inherited, there would be no cultural difference. Question part (b) extended from part (a) by inviting candidates to explain what would have to be found to conclude that picture perception is inherited. Most candidates who answered part (a) correctly could also provide a reasonable answer to this question part by stating that if the perception of pictures was inherited, there would be no



cultural differences. Further that in all the tests, all participants would perceive in the same way. There would be what are known as 'cultural universals'.

Question 3

Question part **(a)** asked for two reasons why the participants in the study by Baron-Cohen et al on autism could not give informed consent. The participants themselves could not give informed consent because they were under sixteen years of age, and because there would be no point in gaining consent because they would not understand what it meant. However, a consenting adult would have given consent for them which is perfectly acceptable. Question part **(b)** asked candidates: What is informed consent? Most candidates were able to provide an answer which scored them both available marks. A more formal answer is, according to the British Psychological Society's ethical guidelines, before taking part in a psychological investigation, participants should be informed of the aims of the research and any aspects of it that might reasonably influence their decision to participate. Informed consent cannot be given by participants under 16 years of age.

Question 4

This question combined two features of the study by Gardner and Gardner on Washoe, longitudinal and case study, in one question. Part **(a)** required candidates to give one disadvantage of the case study method as used in this study. Some candidates gave a correct disadvantage, that there was only one participant and so the findings could not be generalised, but often didn't gain the second mark because they didn't write about how it applied to this study. This was often the case for other disadvantages despite this question wording being used frequently on past examination papers. Part **(b)** asked for one disadvantage of a longitudinal study. Participant attrition, where participants drop out for a variety of reasons was the most commonly stated disadvantage. The answer to this question part did not need to be related to the study of Washoe. Answers merely stating "participant attrition" only scored one mark whereas those going on to say what this meant scored full marks.

Question 5

The study by Samuel and Bryant on conservation examined the work of Piaget. Part **(a)** invited candidates to outline two findings that were *similar* to those of Piaget and part **(b)** to outline two findings that were *different* from those of Piaget. The Samuel and Bryant study is an extension of the work of Piaget, so candidates should know how the Samuel and Bryant study compares and contrasts. Some candidates did know and provided four excellent answers overall. The most commonly used similarities were that: the number of errors decreases as age increases; and the conservation of volume is more difficult than either mass or number. Differences between Piaget and Samuel include the finding that children performed better with one question rather than the two question (Piaget) task and that children of five years could conserve whereas Piaget found that they could not.

Question 6

Question part **(a)** asked candidates how the participants were matched in the study by Bandura et al. A number of candidates wrote nothing more than "by age and sex" without elaboration. A much better answer is that the children were matched on pre-existing levels of aggression using four five-point rating scales by the experimenter and a nursery school teacher, both of whom were well acquainted with the children. Part **(b)** asked candidates: Why are the participants matched in any study? The correct answer is that participants are matched to control as many participant and other variables as possible; to reduce/eliminate confounding variables. In this study, although this was not needed in the answer, it was to ensure that children put into the aggressive group had the same pre-existing levels of aggression as those put into the non-aggressive group to counter-act any pre-existing aggression.

Question 7

This question required candidates to identify two psychometric tests used in the study by Hodges and Tizard on social relationships and say who the tests were given to. One mark was allocated to the correct identification of the test and one mark for stating to whom the test was given. The response "they were given a questionnaire" was vague, but it just scored one mark. The correct answers were that the parent completed the 'A' scale questionnaire (Rutter, 1970) on the adolescent's behaviour. The Rutter B scale was given to teachers of the adolescent.

The adolescents themselves did a questionnaire on 'social difficulties'.

Question 8

This question asked for two problems with the self-report data gathered in the study by Freud on little Hans. One problem might be that participants provide socially desirable responses and not give truthful answers. For example Hans might have said what he thought his father wanted to hear; he wanted to please his daddy. Another possible problem is that researchers have to be careful about use of leading questions as this could affect the validity of the data collected. For example, both Freud and the father asked Hans leading questions such as “when the horse fell down did you think of your daddy”. Answers such as these would score full marks because a problem with self-report data is given and there is a clear example from the study itself.

Question 9

Part (a) asked candidates to identify two pieces of equipment used by the stooge in the euphoria condition in the Schachter and Singer study. Whilst some candidates confused the two conditions when they made reference to the 'anger-causing questionnaire', others simply identified two appropriate items and scored full marks. Relevant items included: rough paper, wastebasket, pen/pencil, manila folders and hula hoops amongst others. Question part (b) asked candidates to suggest what effect the stooge's use of this equipment had on the participants in the epinephrine ignorant (EPI IGN) condition. There is always a small number of candidates who do not understand which groups copied the stooge and which groups did not and so some candidates guessed as to the effect on the EPI IGN group. Those candidates who understand the point of this study answered that the behaviour of the EPI IGN participants was to copy the behaviour of the stooge and behave in a euphoric way.

Question 10

The prison study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo was a simulation and for question part (a) candidates were asked what a simulation is. A simulation can be defined as the imitation of some real thing, situation or process. A simulation is usually done because it is not possible to conduct a study in a real-life situation. Many candidates understood the essential elements of this and scored full marks. Question part (b) wanted one advantage and one disadvantage of using a simulation. As two marks were available for two things, brief answers were acceptable. Most candidates mentioned for the advantage that participants can be protected from any harm that may be present in a real situation. For the disadvantage most candidates wrote about the lack of ecological validity because the situation is not actually real life.

Question 11

Part (a) asked candidates, in relation to the study by Piliavin et al on subway Samaritans, to outline one way in which an ethical guideline was broken. Nearly all candidates could provide a correct answer, but not all could elaborate sufficiently to score full marks. Correct answers mentioned included deception: participants were deceived because the victim was a stooge and was not ill or drunk; psychological harm: participants may have been afraid of a drunk male or stressed by witnessing a person fall over in front of them. Any other appropriate ethical issue also received credit. Question part (b) wanted candidates to outline one way in which an ethical guideline was *not* broken. As with part (a) nearly all candidates could provide a correct answer, but not all could elaborate sufficiently to score full marks. Correct answers included physical harm: no participant was physically harmed; and confidentiality: no participant was identified. Any other appropriate ethical issue also received credit.

Question 12

Question part (a) asked candidates to describe the sample of participants in the study by Tajfel on intergroup categorisation. Any two appropriate features received credit and these included: all the participants were boys, aged 14-15 years, and they were from a comprehensive school in Bristol. Also creditworthy was that there were 64 of them in experiment 1 and 48 in experiment 2. Question part (b) asked: How did the participants think they were allocated to groups in experiment 1 and how did they think they were allocated to groups in experiment 2? This question appeared to confuse weaker candidates who did not understand that there were two experiments. Correct answers mentioned that in experiment 1 participants thought they were grouped by being an over-estimator or an under-estimator of dots on a screen whilst in experiment 2 they thought they were allocated according to their artistic preference for either Klee or Kandinsky.

Question 13

From the review by Gould on IQ testing question part **(a)** asked: What did Yerkes mean when he said that the tests measure 'native intellectual ability'? The correct answer was that he meant innate or inherited (genetic) intelligence. Whilst many candidates answered this correctly and scored full marks, many other candidates did not, commenting on the intelligence tests by Yerkes themselves or even referring to evidence presented in the Deregowski review. Reference to the tests was much better placed in question part **(b)** which wanted one reason why the tests did not measure 'native intellectual ability'. Again many candidates referred to the nature of the tests themselves such as the cultural bias or the fact that the amount of time spent in USA was linked with better scores.

Question 14

The study by Hraba and Grant on doll choice looked at racial self identification and question part **(a)** asked simply: How did Hraba and Grant measure racial identification? The answer to this is that they asked just one question: Give me the doll that looks like you. Those candidates who understood the study answered this question part with little difficulty. Those candidates who do not understand the study made a mention of the other seven questions or referred to racial awareness. Question part **(b)** asked: Why did Hraba and Grant ask this control question? The answer to this is simple: if the child did not know what colour they were then they could not correctly answer any of the other questions. A number of candidates stated this and scored full marks, but many others gave inappropriate answers with some simply stating what a control is.

Question 15

Question part **(a)** required candidates to consider two advantages of the case study method. A hint was given in the question by referring to the fact that a case study usually only has one participant as used in the case study by Thigpen and Cleckley for example. However, as two advantages were needed for two marks, examples from the study were not required to score full marks. Most candidates answered this question part very well, most writing about the richness of data gathered and the individual or unique nature of it. Question part **(b)** wanted candidates to give one limitation when generalising from a small sample of participants. The vast majority of candidates scored at least one mark here by writing that there is always a limitation when generalising because what may be true of one participant may not be true of others.

Section B

Question 16

This question focused on observations and the three studies to choose from were those by Rosenhan, Dement and Kleitman, and Bandura et al.

- (a)** This question part asked candidates to describe how observational data were gathered in their chosen study. Many candidates wrote superbly detailed and accurate answers which clearly focused on observational data which scored them maximum marks. Other candidates wrote good answers but if there was no mention at all of how observational data was gathered then candidates could not score in the top band of marks.
- (b)** This question part asked candidates to describe the observational results of their chosen study. This question allowed candidates to write at length about results and many candidates did, showing impressive recollection of specific numbers and showing good understanding of what the data meant. Other candidates provided just one or two relevant details, reflected in their middle to bottom band mark.
- (c)** This question part asked candidates to describe the advantages and disadvantages of observations using examples from their chosen study. If a response is provided that merely goes through the advantages and disadvantages of a chosen study, then the response is not answering the question, that is, on observations, and no marks can be awarded. Whilst a number of candidates did not answer the question, many did and gave an impressive range of points, showing understanding of the concepts and an ability to relate appropriate examples.
- (d)** This question part as always asked for a different way in which data for the chosen study could be gathered. As this is a known question format candidates should have thought about possibilities for all core studies in advance. Whilst many answers showed evidence of this, many others appeared to be making up answers on the spot that were not thought through at all. The second problem is

that candidates do not address the second part of the question. The question asks for the effect on results that any alternative way of gathering data might have. Many candidates simply do not attempt this question part; others refer to ecological validity, ethics and other *implications* of the change. Very few candidates actually suggest how the results might be different.

Question 17

This question focused on observations and the three studies to choose from were those by Raine et al, Milgram, and Sperry.

- (a) This question part invited candidates to outline the main findings of their chosen study. Those candidates choosing the Milgram question generally did not answer this question part well because after stating that 63% went to 450 volts they were unsure what to write next. The results can also include the way in which the participants responded nervously to the situation, for example. A few candidates chose to write about the Raine et al study and there were some impressive answers that went into every detail in full.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe generalisations that could be made from the chosen study. This question part confused many candidates because they clearly wanted to describe the procedure of their chosen study, and many did, and in doing so did not answer the question set. If candidates do not answer the question then they cannot score marks and as always candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer. There were also some very good answers often describing in detail a number of generalisations that could be made.
- (c) This question part asked candidates to describe the advantages and disadvantages of making generalisations and again this was a question part that required answering rather than merely going through the advantages and disadvantages of the chosen study case study method using examples from their chosen study. As was mentioned before, it is not a good strategy to begin writing on a favourite study in part (a) only to realise that parts (b) and (c) cannot be answered.
- (d) This question part as always asked for a different way in which data could be gathered for the chosen study. As with **Question 16 (d)** many candidates did not address the second part of the question and as a consequence were restricted to a maximum of six marks. To address the second part of the question all candidates are required to do is to suggest how the results of the study might be different. This depends on the suggestion made for the first part of the question, but here candidates score marks not for recalling information, but for writing their thoughts on how things might be different.



PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/12
Core Studies

Key messages

- *Section A* answers were often brief - to score full marks some elaboration and detail was required.
- *Section B* question part (d) requires candidates to consider the *effect on the results* in order to gain full marks.

General comments

This is the final time a June report will be written on this current syllabus, although a report will still be written in November 2011. The revised syllabus is examined for the first time in June 2012. Although the comments below are written with this examination in mind, the comments generalise to all examinations. For example, candidates as always are advised to read all parts of a question and to think about what they should include on each part before they begin to write. Marks are not given twice for the same answer and if an answer is in the wrong place it is not the role of the Examiner to renumber questions or question parts for candidates. There are two instances on this paper where candidates wrote the same answer twice or wrote an answer that was better placed in a different question part. For **Question 3** candidates often wrote in part (a) "because autistic children have no theory of mind" and then realised that **Question 3(b)** asked for this very answer. For *Section A* 'short answers' candidates are, as always, advised to write sufficient detail in order to score all the marks available. In most cases a single sentence answer will be insufficient to score full marks. For those candidates answering **Question 17** on Freud, for part (a) many candidates told the little Hans story rather than answering the question specifically which asked what the findings were. They then came to question part (b) where the little Hans story was much more applicable. *Section B* question part (d) continues to be misunderstood. Candidates must consider the effect on the results in order to be awarded full marks.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

For question part (a) the vast majority of candidates were able to provide a correct answer. Some gave a definition straight from the Loftus and Palmer study itself, whilst others gave an answer that showed they clearly understood what a leading question is. Both these types of answer scored full marks. Other candidates merely stated the leading question from experiment 1, and some from experiment 2 but these were examples and did not address what a leading question actually is.

Question part (b) asked what the effect of leading questions was on the estimations of speed. Answers which scored a partial mark were those who simply wrote "it affected the answers" without elaboration. Similarly partial marks were given to those who merely reproduced the results without answering the question. Answers which attracted full marks were those candidates who commented on the effect of leading questions such as those who wrote "it affected speed estimates depending on the leading word asked such as smashed or bumped".

Question 2

Question part (a) asked candidates to briefly describe the anecdotal evidence by Robert Laws (from the review by Derogowski on picture perception). The Robert Laws anecdote is about participants being unable to draw an ox or dog until Laws pointed out what a drawing was. No other anecdote in the review was creditworthy. Although the mark scheme has the description of the Robert Laws study in full as it appears in the original study, candidates are never expected to write so much detail for a two mark question. A



summary to show understanding is all that is needed. Those candidates who could provide a summary of the correct study, rather than that of Mrs Fraser for example, and clearly understood what they were writing about were awarded full marks. Question part **(b)** invited candidates to suggest one problem with this anecdotal evidence. Anecdotal evidence has doubts about its validity. It may be true, partially true, or it may not be true at all. Those candidates who knew what anecdotal evidence is frequently scored both available marks, whilst those who did not know scored no marks. In this instance an example from the study was not needed.

Question 3

This question concerned the study by Baron-Cohen, Leslie and Frith on autism. Part **(a)** asked candidates to describe what was found when the different groups of children were asked the belief question. The group of children with autism could not answer the belief question correctly, and an answer like this, addressing just one group of children, scored no more than one mark. The other groups of children, the Down's syndrome and the 'normal' children could answer the belief question correctly and this second part answer to the question would also score one mark. Any other answer scored no marks at all. Question part **(b)** wanted candidates to suggest an explanation for the findings. Nearly every candidate wrote simply "because autistic children have no theory of mind" and scored a mark. However many candidates did not suggest why the other two groups could answer the belief question correctly and so did not score the second available mark. The correct answer is "because they do have a theory of mind".

Question 4

The first question part invited candidates to describe the sample of participants in the study by Samuel and Bryant on conservation. Any two correct features of the sample would score full marks for this question. Most candidates scored both marks by stating the number of children, their ages, that they were boys and girls, or where they were from. A number of candidates placed Crediton, Devon in various parts of the world rather than the UK, but this did not prevent them from getting full marks if they had 'Crediton'. A small number of candidates confused the sample in this study with other studies involving children and such answers scored no marks. Question part **(b)** wanted two reasons why the participants in the study could not give informed consent. This type of question regarding informed consent with children has appeared before, and so good answers were expected, but never before have two reasons been required. Many candidates answered the question with little difficulty, most commonly suggesting that the children were too young to give full informed consent and that if the study was explained to them they would not understand.

Question 5

The study by Bandura, Ross and Ross on the imitation of aggression used a number of experimental controls. Question part **(a)** required candidates to identify two variables that were controlled. There were a number of different answers that could be given here, all of which could receive full credit. For example, the researchers controlled the pre-existing levels of aggression in the children, the number of participants in each group, the procedure the model followed, and the number and placement of toys in each room. Any two of these, or other appropriate variable, scored two marks. Some candidates outlined the independent variables, but these were not variables to be controlled and so such answers did not receive credit. Question part **(b)** asked simply: Why do psychologists want to control variables? In response, most candidates scored some marks by showing understanding of the experimental process when replying that controlling variables means that cause and effect are more likely. Some candidates wrote that controlling variables "makes the experiment better" without explanation of what "better" actually meant and so only scored a single mark.

Question 6

In their study on emotion Schachter and Singer used an independent groups design. Question part **(a)** asked candidates: What is an independent groups design? This question appeared to confuse a number of candidates despite a question about an independent groups design being asked in relation to another key study on a previous examination. An independent groups design is where each participant performs in a different condition of the independent variable. Part **(b)** asked for one reason why an independent groups design was used in this study. Some studies in psychology can only use a repeated measures or an independent groups design if the study is to be successful. In this study, a participant could not receive the same injection and be given different information. If a participant was in the same group, they could not do the euphoric condition and then the angry condition. If any aspect was to be replicated then the study would be confounded and serve no purpose. Whilst many candidates struggled to understand this logic, many others wrote excellent answers which were impressive in their understanding of both methodology and this study.

Question 7

The study by Sperry on split brain patients involved a number of tests. Part **(a)** wanted candidates to identify two different tests conducted by Sperry. This question was a good discriminator, doing so between those candidates who knew this study and those who did not. For example some candidates suggested that one test was the 'test' to split the brain, and went on to suggest that Sperry tested their memory, their eyesight and seemingly other random things. Those candidates who scored full marks knew of the different tests Sperry did, making it clear what the tests were. For example, the three most common tests were: Vision and Memory (has it been seen before); Vision and Speech (can it be named) and Vision and Writing (draw what is seen). Reference to the stereognostic and the olfactory tests would also be perfectly acceptable. Question part **(b)** wanted candidates to identify one finding that was common to all split brain patients. This question part continued to discriminate because some candidates suggested that the most common finding was that after the operation the participants had a split-brain. The most simple and correct answer, that was provided by candidates scoring full marks, was that the participants acted as if they had two separate minds where one did not know what the other was doing.

Question 8

This question part **(a)** on the Raine et al study asked candidates for two features that were *similar* between the murderers and the control group. Any two appropriate features were credited, such as the similarity in numbers: 41 murderers and 41 control participants; that there were 39 men and 2 women in each group; and that there were 6 schizophrenics in each group. Also credit worthy was age because the mean ages were similar: 34.3 for murderers and 31.7 for the controls (this can be difference too). Some candidates suggested methodological similarities, such as both groups had their brains scanned, and this also received credit. Question part **(b)** asked for two features that were *different* between the two groups and candidates listed things such as: there were murderers and controls who had not murdered; the murderers were claiming they were not guilty for reasons of insanity whilst the controls were not claiming this as they had not murdered. Age could also be given as a difference as the mean ages were different: 34.3 for murderers and 31.7 for the controls, but importantly this could not be counted if it was given as both a similarity and a difference.

Question 9

The study by Milgram on obedience to authority recruited participants through a newspaper advertisement. Part **(a)** invited candidates to suggest one advantage of recruiting participants through newspaper advertisements. Most candidates correctly stated that the main advantage of newspaper advertising is that the target population is likely to be wider and larger than say a candidate sample and that it increases the range and type of respondents, in this case in relation to their age and occupation. Question part **(b)** asked candidates to suggest a disadvantage of recruiting participants through newspaper advertisements. Those candidates who could not suggest anything appropriate in part **(a)** often were able to provide a correct answer here. For example it was suggested that those responding can only be those receiving the newspaper, reading it, seeing the advert and making the decision to reply to it. This meant that the sample may not be representative of a wide population.

Question 10

Question part **(a)** invited candidates to outline one finding that can be generalised from the prison simulation study. There are many findings that can be generalised and the most likely is that people will adopt a social role when they are placed in a situation that requires it. Similarly it could be generalised that it is the situation we are in that determines our behaviour rather than our own disposition. Most candidates who knew the study were able to provide an answer worth one mark at least. Question part **(b)** asked candidates what a generalisation is. A significant majority of candidates correctly stated that a generalisation is a 'psychological ability' that could be said to apply to most people most of the time. A minority of candidates did not know the answer and some interesting, but incorrect attempts were made.

Question 11

Question part **(a)** asked candidates to describe one of the categories of behaviour that was observed in the study by Piliavin et al and to say what was found. For one mark candidates had to identify a category of behaviour that was observed and then say what the finding was for the second mark. Some candidates appeared to be unable to make this distinction, often quoting nothing more than a result. Candidates scoring full marks focused on four main things: frequency of helping: spontaneous helping given 62/65 for ill and

19/38 for drunk; speed of helping: median helping time 5 seconds for ill, 109 seconds for drunk; race of helper: 45% black and 55% white for ill, same race helping for drunk; sex of helper: men were much more likely to help than women. This question part (b) asked about one way in which reliability of any observation could be checked. The main way is by having two or more observers observe the same event. Data can then be compared and correlated to determine the level of agreement. Notably inter-rater reliability was not applied in this study (and hence the general question) because the two observers were recording different things. As usual those candidates giving partial answers such as "have two observers" scored one mark whilst those with some appropriate elaboration scored both marks.

Question 12

From the study by Tajfel on intergroup categorisation part (a) asked candidates to outline two ways in which the participants were deceived. Many candidates scored full marks by referring to their group selection where the boys thought they were put into groups on the basis of over- or under-estimating dots or artistic preference, or by referring to the aim of the study where they were falsely told that it was a study on visual judgements. Part (b) invited candidates to give one advantage of deceiving participants. This question part was probably answered correctly in full by more candidates than any other, and the answer most commonly provided was that participants behave naively – they do not know the true nature of the study so they behave more naturally and will not show demand characteristics.

Question 13

Question part (a) asked candidates: What is a review of studies? A more formal definition might be that a review is a type of research which provides a synthesis of research on a particular area of interest. Many candidates were able to provide a reasonable explanation of a review, although many could go no further than to say that it is a summary of studies. Question part (b) asked candidates to give one advantage and one disadvantage of a review. This question appeared to confuse many candidates who appeared not to have thought of a question like this before. For example, many candidates believed that it "is easy to do" not appreciating that a review might be far more time-consuming or far more complex than an experimental based study. Some good answers mentioned that an advantage is that there is no complex equipment involved (such as an MRI scanner) and others mentioned that no participants need to be gathered. For a disadvantage some really good answers mentioned that no first-hand evidence is gathered; and that the reviewer cannot change what was done in the original study.

Question 14

Question part (a) asked: What were the three categories of skin colour used in the study by Clark and Clark? Many candidates often assume that the children were merely stereotyped 'black' and 'white' but, as the original article states, the Clarks classified their subjects by skin colour into three categories: light (practically white), medium (light brown to dark brown), and dark (dark brown to black). Those candidates knowing this scored the full two marks available, but those merely going for the 'black' and 'white' were awarded a single mark. Question part (b) asked what was found by Clark and Clark in relation to skin colour and what was found by Hraba and Grant in relation to skin colour. The Clarks found that the children of light skin colour showed the greatest preference for the white doll and the dark children the least. On the other hand Hraba and Grant state: "We did not find this trend. The children of light skin colour were at least as strong in their preference for a black doll as the others."

Question 15

Question part (a) required candidates to suggest, from the study by Rosenhan on sane in insane places, two ways in which the study was true to real life. The most logical answers, as used by most candidates, were that the study took place in real mental institutions and that the study involved real psychiatrists and nurses. Many candidates scored full marks, but many others seemed not to understand what the question was asking. This confusion continued for some into part (b) which asked candidates to suggest two ways in which the study was *not* true to real life. Others were not confused at all and mentioned correctly that those seeking admission were not genuine patients, but 'pseudo-patients'. Another appropriate answer was that the pseudo-patients claimed they were hearing voices when they were not. Any other appropriate aspect also received credit.

Section B

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked candidates to outline the procedure of their chosen study. Many candidates wrote superbly detailed and accurate answers which scored them maximum marks. Other candidates wrote good answers but, given the lack of detail for the time allowed, such answers could not achieve top band marks. This is an essay question rather than another short answer question.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe the quantitative and qualitative results of their chosen study. By the wording of the question candidates should have assumed that they needed to make the distinction between these two types of data. Whilst many candidates did do this, and showed their understanding of the terms, other candidates merely wrote out the results without distinction. Such candidates did not answer the question and scored no more than middle band marks.
- (c) This question part asked candidates to describe the strengths and weaknesses of qualitative data using examples from their chosen study. As has just been mentioned, the wording of the question is important. If a response is provided that merely goes through the strengths and weaknesses of a chosen study, then the response is not answering the question and no marks can be awarded. Whilst a number of candidates did not answer the question, many did and gave an impressive range of points, showing understanding of the concepts and an ability to relate appropriate examples.
- (d) This question part as always asked for a different way in which data for the chosen study could be gathered. As this is a known question candidates should have thought about possible alternatives for all core studies in advance of the examination. Whilst many answers showed evidence of this, many others appeared to be making up answers on the spot that were not thought through at all. The second problem is that candidates do not address the second part of the question. The question asks for the effect on results that any alternative way to gather data might have. Many candidates simply do not attempt this question part; others refer to ecological validity, ethics and other *implications* of the alternative. Very few candidates actually suggest how the results might be different.

Question 17

- (a) This question part invited candidates to describe the main findings of their chosen study. Those candidates choosing the Freud study generally did not answer this question part well. Rather than describe the findings, for example that little Hans was in the phallic stage, candidates frequently described the 'story' of the study. In addition, candidates were often answering question part (b). This meant that when it came to question part (b) candidates either wrote less (because they had already written the same answer) or wrote exactly the same again. Candidates are advised to read all parts of the question and to think about their answer before starting to write. Those choosing the other studies often made the same error.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe how the case study was carried out. This was the question part where candidates could provide details of the procedure but, as stated, many candidates were confused as to what to do if they had already described the procedure in part (a). Many other candidates answered the question perfectly and provided superb answers.
- (c) This question part asked candidates to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the case study method using examples from their chosen study. As was mentioned for **Question 16(c)**, the wording of the question is important and for this question a significant number of candidates merely wrote about their chosen study rather than specifically answering the question set.
- (d) This question part as always asked for a different method that could be used to investigate the chosen study. As with **Question 16(d)** many candidates did not address the second part of the question and as a consequence were restricted to a maximum of six marks. To address the second part of the question all candidates are required to do is to suggest how the results of the study might be different. This depends on the suggestion made for the first part of the question, but here candidates score marks not for recalling information, but for writing their thoughts on how things might be different.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/13
Core Studies

There were too few candidates for us to be able to produce a meaningful report.

Teachers may find it helpful to refer to the report for Paper 12

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/21
Core Studies

Key messages

- In *Section A* answers often gave correct information about the study but did not answer the question. Candidates must ensure they are clear on the meaning of all psychological terminology (e.g. ecological validity, ethics, qualitative/quantitative, etc.).
- In *Section B* candidates must focus their answer on the question asked in part **(a)** of the essay rather than writing lots of detail of the studies. Evidence must be given in part **(c)** to achieve above 4 marks.

General comments

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

Time management for this paper was generally good with candidates spending an appropriate amount of time on each section. Fewer candidates 'over-wrote' for part **(a)** of the *Section B* essay this time which left more time for part **(b)** and part **(c)** which enabled the candidates to achieve higher marks overall.

Some candidates continued to show poor time management and achieved less well overall in *Section B*. This was most evident in the increasing number of candidates who gave very long details of the studies in part **(a)** of the *Section B* essay and this left less time for the other two parts of the essay. Candidates should aim to spend half an hour on *Section A* and an hour on *Section B* as this is worth more marks. Candidates should spend 20 minutes on each part of the essay.

Very few candidates attempted all three essays; when this did happen the candidate was awarded the mark for the best of the three questions (**Question 6**, **Question 7** or **Question 8**) although their marks tended to be low owing to the lack of time spent on each question.

Compared to previous years, candidates were not as well prepared for the content required in the exam. Many did show good understanding of the details of the core studies and this was most evident in *Section B*. Candidates seemed to struggle with the terminology used in *Section A* and therefore performed less well compared to previous years. Some candidates did include evidence in part **(c)** of the *Section B* essay and were able to achieve well. However, many candidates included no evidence and could not achieve further than the 3-4 mark band. **Question 7** was the most popular question. After this, **Question 6** was chosen by a number of candidates. Very few candidates answered **Question 8**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a)** This question wanted the candidate to describe one result from the misinformed condition in the Schachter and Singer study. The majority of candidates found this question very difficult. A lot claimed anger/aggression was measured when it was not for this group. Some candidates achieved two marks by giving a specific result from the study by either describing the happiness rating of this group or the behaviour of this group.



- (b) Most candidates could draw a conclusion from Schachter and Singer's study (they knew this part very well and were able to achieve one mark for this question). Candidates found it challenging to give an application/use for the study although a few did attempt to discuss something to do with what doctors might say to patients when giving them medicine. These candidates were awarded one mark.

Question 2

This was well answered by many candidates. They were often able to identify two different ethical issues and explain how these related to little Hans. There were some excellent answers that tackled such issues as debriefing, harm and consent. There was some confusion by some candidates over what constitutes an ethical issue and some discussed leading questions and Freud's bias, which were incorrect responses and were awarded no marks.

Question 3

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to achieve full marks by giving a clear example of an imitative behaviour in the study. A few candidates achieved one mark as they just mentioned that the child was aggressive and did not give a specific example from the study.
- (b) This was also well answered by candidates who were able to explain (even if quite briefly) the link between the child observing a model and then later imitating this behaviour. The majority of candidates were able to achieve full marks for this question which was pleasing.

Question 4

- (a) Many candidates found it difficult to describe qualitative data and often gave answers that described quantitative data from the review article by Derogowski. These candidates achieved no marks for this question. Some candidates could give descriptions of the anecdotal evidence or how one of the participants described their dislike of the split style drawing and achieved full marks for these answers.
- (b) Many good answers were seen that focused on the ethnocentrism found in the study. Some discussed the issues with the western materials/depth cues used while others discussed the problems with just testing African participants. These candidates were able to achieve full marks. A few believed Western participants had been tested which achieved no marks.

Question 5

There were some very good answers from a few candidates who did focus on the artificial nature of the study and the tasks given to the children. The vast majority of candidates could identify the reason the study lacked ecological validity was because the study took place in the laboratory. These candidates achieved one mark for their answer. If this was extended with an example then a further mark was awarded.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) In this part there were some excellent answers. Candidates often achieved full marks in this question and were able to describe the psychometric tests used in each study as well as how the tests were used. Some candidates just described the psychometric tests and achieved lower marks for each study. A few candidates described the Sally Anne task in depth for the Baron-Cohen study and only achieved one mark for this study. Many candidates incorrectly believed the Rorschach ink blot test is a psychometric test.
- (b) In this part the vast majority of candidates did focus on the strengths and weaknesses of psychometric tests and they were able to give evidence to back up their answers. Candidates mainly focused on ethnocentrism, bias and quantitative data in their responses.
- (c) In this part there were a few insightful answers and most did bring in evidence to back up their points. The majority of candidates just described how psychometric tests are used to compare people rather than discussing this point. These candidates achieved in the 5-6 mark band. Some were able to bring in other techniques used by psychologists such as lab experiments, observations,

projective tests, physiological tests, etc. and with a balanced discussion they were able to achieve in the 7-10 mark band.

Question 7

- (a) This part was well answered by many, with candidates identifying and describing the social behaviours in the studies. Many candidates were confused about the focus of the question and gave very long detailed descriptions of the studies rather than just focusing on the social behaviours. This led to these candidates having less time to complete the exam.
- (b) In this part most candidates focused on the problems with studying social behaviour and were able to bring in evidence to back up their points. Candidates need to be careful to identify four separate problems and quite a few identified ethics and ecological validity many times but are only credited a maximum of three marks for each of these problems.
- (c) There were some good answers to this part by some candidates that seemed well prepared. Similar to other the other part (c) answers in this exam, evidence again was often lacking resulting in the mark being limited to 3 or 4 marks.

Question 8

- (a) In this part there were some good answers for this question with candidates describing how each study was useful. Some mentioned the usefulness in court cases for Loftus and Palmer and how doctors need to be more careful with their diagnosis of psychiatric disorders for Rosenhan. Some candidates were less clear on the use of Raine and Hrabka and Grant but did give general conclusions of the studies which achieved one mark per study. Some candidates were unsure of the focus of this question and gave long descriptions of the studies and results which only achieved one mark per study.
- (b) In this part many candidates did keep their answers focused on the problems with conducting useful studies. In order to improve, candidates need to make sure each point refers back to usefulness rather than just doing this at the start of their response. Most candidates did attempt to describe problems with examples from the studies.
- (c) In this part there were a small minority of candidates who addressed their answer to the question and achieved higher marks through using evidence to back up their points. These candidates were able to weigh up the benefits of useful research against the benefits of research that gives only knowledge. The majority of candidates did not seem to understand the question and gave muddled responses that achieved few marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22
Core Studies

Key messages

- In *Section A* many excellent, detailed answers were seen. Candidates sometimes 'over-wrote' for this section and should aim to write two to three sentence answers for any two mark question. Some answers often gave correct information about the study but did not answer the question. Candidates must ensure they are clear on the meaning of all psychological terminology (e.g. conclusion, qualitative data, reductionism, etc.)
- In *Section B* candidates must focus their answer on the question asked in part (a) of the essay rather than writing lots of detail of the studies. Evidence must be given in part (c) to achieve above 4 marks.

General comments

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

Time management for this paper was generally good with candidates spending an appropriate amount of time on each section. Fewer candidates 'over-wrote' for part (a) of the *Section B* essay this time which left more time for part (b) and part (c) which enabled the candidates to achieve higher marks overall.

A few candidates did have poor time management and spent too long on part (a) of the *Section B* essay and therefore fewer marks were achieved overall in *Section B*. Candidates should aim to spend half an hour on *Section A* and an hour on *Section B* as this is worth more marks. Candidates should then spend 20 minutes on each part of the essay.

Compared to previous sessions, the number of candidates attempting all three essays has decreased to just a handful which is pleasing. When this did happen the candidate was awarded the mark for the best of the three questions (**Question 6, Question 7 or Question 8**) although their marks tended to be low owing to the lack of time spent on each question.

Most candidates were well prepared for the content required in the exam. Many candidates did include evidence in part (c) of the *Section B* essay and were able to achieve well. To improve, candidates need this evidence to achieve further than the 3-4 mark band. **Question 6** was the most popular question. After this, **Question 7** was chosen by a number of candidates. Very few candidates answered **Question 8**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to achieve at least one mark for this question by giving the results of either experiment 1 or experiment 2. Fewer candidates were then able to draw a conclusion referring to the effect of leading questions on memory. Candidates did not need to give a result as a clear conclusion was sufficient for full marks.
- (b) This was well answered by candidates with most achieving full marks. Most referred to the application to the police and courts.

Question 2

- (a) Many candidates gave a clear description of a piece of qualitative data from the Freud study. Candidates chose from a variety of pieces of data with most focusing on one of Hans' fantasies. Some candidates described how the data was collected and could only achieve one mark.
- (b) Most candidates were able to achieve one mark for this question by referring to the detail provided by qualitative data. To improve their answer, candidates needed to link their response to the Freud study in order to achieve full marks.

Question 3

- (a) Almost all candidates were able to give a clear definition of the longitudinal method. A few candidates achieved one mark by defining the longitudinal method as a study that takes place over a number of years. In order to improve, candidates need to be aware that longitudinal studies do not necessarily have to last years and could last a few weeks or months.
- (b) Most candidates were able to achieve one mark by providing a general strength of the longitudinal method. Similar to previous questions, candidates must clearly link their answer to the Gardner and Gardner study in order to achieve full marks.

Question 4

- (a) Many good responses were seen to this question with a pleasing variety of answers. Quite a few candidates had a really good understanding of the cost-benefit analysis and were able to express their understanding in terms of benefits to the participants. A few candidates gave answers from the point of view of the researchers rather than the participants and achieved no marks.
- (b) A few candidates gave very clear explanations of the complexity of the study and the conclusions reached. Many candidates seemed unaware of the meaning of reductionism though and were unable to answer the question. A few did discuss the fact the study had many elements in it and were able to achieve one mark.

Question 5

- (a) A variety of responses were given for the example of the psychological measure in the Thigpen and Cleckley study. Many candidates achieved one mark by identifying tests such as the ink blot test, IQ, etc. Candidates were also awarded one mark for interviews and hypnosis. Some candidates were able to identify the EEG as the physiological test and achieved one mark for this part of their answer. Many candidates incorrectly identified a different psychological measure and achieved no marks. Candidates who did not label their answers or got the measures the wrong way round were also awarded no marks.
- (b) The majority of candidates achieved one mark for this question as they could identify a problem with the measure. In order to improve, candidates must put their answer into the context of the study in order to achieve full marks.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) In this part there were some good answers from some candidates. Candidates had a good knowledge of the core studies and were able to describe the effect of situational factors on the behaviour of the participants in the studies. This was more easily achieved for Zimbardo, and Milgram. In order to improve, candidates should focus their description on the situational factors in each study and then link these factors to the behaviour of participants rather than giving long descriptions of what happened in each study. In addition to this, some candidates believed the pseudopatients were the participants in the Rosenhan study rather than the staff and patients in the hospitals.

- (b) This part had many good and well thought through answers where the candidates focused on problems with studying situational explanations. Many candidates focused on ethical issues as well as ecological validity and generalisability. In order to improve, candidates must focus on the problems with studying situational explanations specifically rather than just general problems with the studies. This meant at times there were many repetitions of points and the candidate achieved fewer marks overall as each separate problem can only receive a maximum of three marks. In addition to this, candidates should be aware that ethics counts as one point and should only be used once in their response.
- (c) In this part there were a few insightful answers that referred back to situational explanations and some candidates did bring in evidence to back up their points. In order to achieve the top band marks candidates must extend their discussion beyond the core studies. In order to improve, candidates must include evidence to achieve higher than the 3 to 4 mark band.

Question 7

- (a) In part (a) there were some excellent answers. Such answers focused more on ethnocentrism and gave fewer details of the studies which was pleasing to see. Most could identify the ethnocentrism in both Deregowski and Gould but found it more challenging with the Hraba and Grant study as well as Tajfel. In order to improve, candidates need to focus on ethnocentrism rather than just giving the procedure and results of the studies. Where candidates did this, they were able to achieve one mark per study described.
- (b) In this part many candidates kept their answers focused on the problems with studying ethnocentric bias. In order to improve, candidates need to make sure each point is relevant to ethnocentrism rather than just giving an evaluation of each study.
- (c) In this part there were a few very creative answers that extended beyond the core studies and achieved the high band. It was very pleasing to see that some candidates had a really good understanding of the problems psychologists have overcoming ethnocentrism in their studies. Some candidates were confused by the definition of ethnocentrism and just gave general evaluation points for the studies for their answers. As with previous exams, candidates need to bring in evidence to achieve higher than the 3 to 4 mark band.

Question 8

- (a) In this part there were some very good responses that gave clear descriptions of the physiological processes investigated in each of the studies. Candidates found this easier to accomplish with Raine and Dement and Kleitman. In order to improve, candidates should focus on the question and not describe the procedures of studies.
- (b) In part (b) the vast majority of candidates focused their response on the problems with investigating physiological processes. Very few candidates gave incorrect problems or general evaluation of the studies in the question. In order to improve, candidates must use evidence to back up their points.
- (c) There were some good answers to part (c) by some candidates who seemed well prepared and gave a balanced argument. In order to improve candidates should extend beyond the points made in the part (b) of their essay. As with other part (c) answers in this exam, evidence was sometimes missing resulting in the mark being limited to 3 or 4 marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/23

Core Studies

There were too few candidates for us to be able to produce a meaningful report.

Teachers may find it helpful to refer to the report for Paper 22

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/31
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer.
- Candidates should answer *both* parts of a question where there are two components. See **Questions 1(c), 14(c) and 17(b) and 18(c)** for example.
- Candidates should quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as they appear in the syllabus.

General comments

For many Centres this will be the last time this paper will be taken in its current format because from June 2012 papers based on the revised syllabus will be examined. Note that the November 2011 examination will be based on the 'old' syllabus.

The comments specific to each question apply to this paper but these general comments apply to both this paper and to future papers.

Many candidates do not gain marks because they do not allocate writing time according to mark allocation. There was a small but significant number of Centres where all candidates wrote just as much for *Section A*, short answer questions, as for *Section B*, essay questions. The total mark for a *Section A* question is 11, whereas for *Section B* it is 24. Simple logic suggests that more needs to be written for *Section B* than for *Section A*. Candidates are always advised to allocate time according to the marks allocated to that question.

This paper and any future paper will require candidates to evaluate. Whilst many Centres have candidates who write excellent evaluative answers, others have candidates who appear not to know what evaluation is. Evaluation is an assessment of what is good or not so good about something that has been described. For psychologists we do not do this anecdotally, but through 'evaluation issues'. We might therefore say that a study is unethical, or that it lacks ecological validity. The full range of issues appears on the syllabus and candidates could usefully look at how these issues apply to each and every piece of psychological knowledge described.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'assessment of educational performance'. Most answers showed understanding of the concept of assessment and often referred to a type of test e.g. intelligence, aptitude or diagnostic to illustrate their answer.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one type of performance assessment used in education. Whilst some candidates chose to describe an IQ test many others decided, legitimately, to describe this very examination. Indeed this examination is a standardised performance assessment test and so was entirely appropriate.

- (c) This part required candidates to describe one strength and one weakness of psychometric tests. Many candidates scored no more than one mark for each question component. Most could give a strength of a psychometric test, that it is standardised, or that it is reliable and valid for example. However, candidates often could not go beyond the initial statement, for example writing about what reliability or validity actually are. For a weakness the most common answer was that a psychometric test categorises a person and labels them and again there was little elaboration added to answers.

Question 2

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'perspectives on learning'. Typically a perspective is a 'way of looking at the world', so here perspectives on learning refers to different ways of looking at education. Most candidates acknowledged this and many went on to give examples and in doing so scored full marks.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one way in which the humanistic approach has been applied in education. Many candidates knew a little about the humanistic approach and could only provide a basic description of how the approach applied in a classroom. Better answers quoted psychological studies such as that by Dennison or that by Dunn and Griggs.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one weakness of the cognitive approach and one weakness of the behaviourist approach to education. There were some excellent answers written in response to this question showing that many candidates knew and understood the different perspectives that have been applied to education.

Question 3

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have learned about disruptive behaviour in schools. This question attracted many anecdotal answers with stories told about how children disrupted their own classroom. This approach would have been fine if these candidates had gone on to describe the underlying psychology. For example of what *type* was the disruptive behaviour; what was the possible *cause* of it (was it behavioural, e.g. maladaptive learning, cognitive or social for example). Better answers did consider types, explanations and examples and impressed with their psychological knowledge.
- (b) This part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have learned about disruptive behaviour in schools. Throughout this report there will be a mention of those candidates who have still not learned how to evaluate; there are those who make a few generalised comments and those who evaluate fully through psychological issues, methods and debates as appear on the mark scheme. This topic area was no exception.
- (c) This question asked candidates to suggest how a teacher may prevent disruptive behaviour from happening. The question clearly stated how to *prevent* disruptive behaviour and those candidates writing about corrective strategies scored no marks. Some candidates wrote about both, seemingly not knowing which were corrective and which preventative. Those candidates writing about preventative strategies scored good marks, particularly those who answered the question fully and mentioned the behaviourist approach on which many strategies are based.

Question 4

- (a) Candidates were asked to describe what psychologists have found out about the design and layout of educational environments. This question distinguished between those who could write anecdotally about whether their own classroom was too warm or cold, too light or dark and other similar features and candidates who applied psychological evidence to these factors showing that they had at least studied some psychology.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about the design and layout of educational environments. Evaluations for this question covered the entire mark range including some candidates who did not appear to be able to evaluate at all and some candidates who included a range of issues and debated them thoroughly using a variety of evidence to support their argument.



- (c) Candidates were asked here to suggest a suitable design for arranging the tables and chairs in a classroom to improve learning. This question part revealed many anecdotes like “I learn better with the desks in rows” compared with those answers making suggestions that were supported with the appropriate psychological knowledge.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 5

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by ‘urban renewal’. The vast majority of candidates scored full marks when writing that urban renewal is a program of land redevelopment in areas of moderate to high density urban land use.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two studies of community environmental design. A number of candidates did not know two studies, or even one, and so struggled to score any marks at all. More able candidates knew the ‘classic’ studies by Whyte and Brower and described them clearly and in detail.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one type of urban housing design that has been successful. This question appeared to confuse some candidates who apparently did not process the word ‘successful’ at the end of the question when they wrote about the totally *unsuccessful* Pruitt-Igoe development. Other candidates answered the question perfectly and most chose to write in detail about the work of Oscar Newman and his designs which included Clason Point in New York City and Five Oaks in Dayton, Ohio where streets were closed, speed bumps introduced and the development divided into ‘mini-neighbourhoods’.

Question 6

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term ‘scenic environment’. Again some candidates gave anecdotes rather than drawing on their psychological knowledge. In psychological terms the scenic environment is an individual perception and preference of images/scenes, whether real or in a picture, of the ‘great outdoors’.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one study that has been done on the scenic environment. Some answers here were superb with a number of candidates describing Berlyne’s model of aesthetics (e.g. novelty, incongruity, complexity or ‘surprisingness’) in detail and showing excellent understanding of this work.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe two ways to improve the design of maps. Some candidates chose two of the features as suggested by Levine, namely structure mapping and orientation whilst others chose the work of Levine as one way and looked at the use of colour as another. Either of these approaches was acceptable.

Question 7

- (a) This question asked candidates to describe what psychologists have learned about climate and weather. Yet again the anecdotalists were evident showing nothing of significance about what *psychologists* had learned about climate and weather. Answers at the top end of the mark range considered a variety of relevant studies such as the effects on performance, health and social behaviour. The most able candidates considered the effects of cold in addition to the usual heat.
- (b) This part invited candidates to evaluate what psychologists have learned about climate and weather. In addition to the usual issues of ecological validity and generalisations of studies conducted in controlled environments a small number of very able candidates brought in the issue of environmental determinism with much success.
- (c) For this part candidates were asked to suggest ways in which the negative effects of climate and weather on health may be overcome. Answers to this question varied significantly in quality. Some candidates showed insight and understanding by providing appropriate suggestions based on psychological knowledge, for example some suggested using a light box for those with seasonal affective disorder. Others suggested that “people should move country” or that people should just accept where they live.

Question 8

- (a) This part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about personal space and territory. A significant majority of candidates wrote superb answers which were well prepared and covered a range of theory and evidence and some even defined terms and distinguished between the types of personal space and the different types of territory as they went along.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about personal space and territory. Again there were some superb answers here. Many candidates considered a range of appropriate issues, often focusing on the different ways in which personal space can be measured and brought the issues of ethics, ecological validity and individual and cultural differences. Even at the bottom end of the mark range most candidates mentioned the unethical nature of the study by Middlemist.
- (c) This part required candidates to suggest ways in which people can defend their secondary territory in places such as a library. A small number of candidates ignored the question and wrote about defending primary territory, such as their home, but most candidates made appropriate suggestions, usually the use of territorial markers, and brought supporting psychological evidence into their answers.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 9

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by practitioner and patient 'interpersonal skills'. Nearly all candidates scored a mark here and most scored both available marks. The typical answer is that interpersonal skills are the verbal and non-verbal forms of communication displayed by both the patient and the practitioner in a medical consultation.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two studies looking at practitioner interpersonal skills. Answers to this question covered the whole mark range. Some candidates knew no studies at all and made anecdotal comments instead. Other candidates knew studies but could not recall more than a sentence about them. The best answers came from candidates who knew two studies and could describe them in sufficient detail to score full marks. Such impressive answers chose the McKinstry and Wang study to illustrate non-verbal skills and the McKinlay study to illustrate verbal skills.
- (c) This part required candidates to suggest one practitioner style that shows good practitioner skills. Most candidates suggested that a patient-centred style was one that showed good practitioner skills with the reason that it was a much more friendly style that put the patient at the centre of the interaction rather than the practitioner.

Question 10

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'promoting safety behaviour'. Whilst safety behaviour is maintaining healthy existence through safe practices at work and in the home, a mention of which scored one mark, for the second mark this question needed the 'promoting' component to be addressed and those candidates doing this scored both available marks.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two causes of accidents. Many candidates decided to give anecdotal answers rather than ones based on psychological knowledge. For example it was suggested that the cause of accidents is "people not being careful" and "people not sleeping enough". Such answers never attract many marks if any at all. Candidates scoring maximum marks gave answers based on psychological knowledge and considered theory A and B or cognitive overload or the illusion of invulnerability for example.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one way in which safety behaviours can be promoted in worksites. This answer again revealed the difference between candidates who knew very little psychology and merely guessed and those candidates who had studied some relevant psychology and could either quote a relevant study, such as that by Fox et al (1987), or suggest a strategy based on reward and punishment as outlined by behaviourists.

Question 11

- (a) Candidates were asked to describe what psychologists have learned about stress. Many candidates wrote excellent answers in response to this question. Particularly evident were the methods used to gather data and candidates made a useful distinction between physiological recording devices and the use of psychological questionnaires. Causes of stress were also mentioned. At the bottom end of the mark range some candidates suggested “work” and “living life” whereas at the top end were those who linked causes and measures, including Holmes and Rahe’s social readjustment rating scale to measure those events.
- (b) Candidates were asked to evaluate what psychologists have learned about stress. For many candidates this topic area raised many issues to choose from in their evaluations. Many compared physiological measures with psychological measures and brought in the related issues of reliability, validity, and subjective versus objective data. In a few cases some of the assumptions of the physiological approach completed comprehensively debated answers.
- (c) This part asked candidates to suggest how the stress of a candidate may be measured. There was a wide variety of answers to this question, some of which were entirely appropriate and some which were rather basic, such as “I would ask them” with the reason for this measure being “because they know the answer”. Answers of higher quality were those based either on a physiological measure or a psychological measure, supported with good reason, such as, for example, “the measure is scientific because it is much more reliable than a self-report measure”.

Question 12

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about substance use and abuse. There were two extremes of answer evident here. On the one hand there were candidates who wrote excellent answers which had definitions (e.g. physical and psychological dependence), described a range of theories (genetic, regulation models and social learning) and supported this with appropriate evidence. On the other hand there were those who had a little knowledge from a social/health education course but could not compete with the breadth or depth of those writing psychological answers.
- (b) This part invited candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about substance use and abuse. The excellent answers of part (a) more often than not converted into excellent part (b) answers and these impressed with the range of issues included. A popular issue was the nature versus nurture debate and most impressive were those candidates who extended the social learning approach and brought in the behaviourist approach.
- (c) Here candidates were invited to suggest ways in which people can be prevented from abusing a substance. The syllabus distinguishes between preventing and quitting and past questions have also made this distinction. This meant that those candidates who wrote exclusively about quitting scored no marks as they did not answer the question set.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term ‘types of schizophrenia’. To score full marks candidates had to mention ‘types’ which is a kind or category into which various forms are placed. In this case there are 5 main types of schizophrenia and candidates used an example of a type to support their answers.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two types of schizophrenia. Most candidates had little difficulty in describing two types, and the only difference between three marks and two marks was the amount of detail and accuracy in answers.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one explanation for one of the types of schizophrenia described in (b). Whereas most candidates had little difficulty in describing types, many had more difficulty in describing a cause. This was disappointing because the same explanations underlie most if not all mental disorders and all candidates had to do was to generalise from one of those to score some marks. The five main explanations are the behaviourist, psychodynamic, cognitive, genetic and social.



Question 14

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'pyromania'. Pyromania is an impulse control disorder where a person has a need to deliberately start fires (and then often to watch the fire or emergency services) to gain euphoria or relieve tension and typically it includes feelings of gratification or relief afterwards. Although this is a more formal definition, most candidates described sufficient to score full marks.
- (b) Here candidates had to outline the characteristics of one abnormal need. Some candidates chose to continue with pyromania, others chose to write about kleptomania and others who understood the term abnormal need included gambling or even a substance to which there was psychological dependence.
- (c) This part required candidates to give one explanation for, and one way of overcoming, pyromania. There are many explanations and the same applies here as it did for **Question 13(c)** where the behaviourists and others explain abnormal need. The cognitive approach has particularly interesting explanations for abnormal need and impulse control disorder. To overcome pyromania again some candidates suggested "use drugs" without clarifying exactly what drugs would be used. Others suggested cognitive-behaviour therapy whilst a few candidates suggested a psychodynamic approach to address the underlying problems that generated the abnormal need of pyromania.

Question 15

- (a) This part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have learned about abnormal affect. There were many superb answers written in response to this question, there were also some less impressive answers. Better answers made a distinction between bipolar and unipolar disorders and some candidates wrote about seasonal affective disorder which was appropriate. A good number of candidates wrote about the different causes and many candidates wrote about the various treatments that are available for affective disorders.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have learned about abnormal affect. In response to this question a range of different evaluation issues were considered such as cultural and individual differences; comparing and contrasting different explanations of cause; and occasionally the issue of reductionism was thrown in with very good effect.
- (c) This part asked candidates to suggest ways in which depressive states can be treated medically. At the bottom end some candidates suggested nothing more than "give them anti-depressants" whilst at the top end some candidates wrote about four main types of drug that relieve the symptoms of depression: Tricyclics; MAOIs (Monoamine oxidase inhibitors); SSRIs (Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors); and SNRIs (Serotonin and Noradrenaline Reuptake Inhibitors). A number of candidates wrote about electroconvulsive therapy which in some countries is very common for severe depression.

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about somatoform disorders. Somatoform disorders are where physical symptoms are prominent but no cause can be found. Most typical examples, which many candidates described really well, include hypochondriasis, conversion disorder, somatisation, psychogenic pain and body dysmorphic disorder. There were no bottom band answers, presumably because those not knowing what this topic area was about could not even guess at the term somatoform.
- (b) This part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about somatoform disorders. Many very good part (a) answers continued to be very good in part (b) though there were a few that did not evaluate and just continued with even more detail than that included in part (a).
- (c) This question part invited candidates to suggest ways in which somatoform disorders may be treated. A few candidates suggested the use of drugs but they were not convinced of what could be used. This is because here the problem is a psychological one rather than a physical one. Most candidates suggested cognitive-behaviour therapy which aims to influence dysfunctional emotions, behaviours and cognitions through a goal-oriented, systematic procedure.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'group decision-making strategies'. Most candidates were able to provide a basic explanation which was sufficient to score both of the available marks. A small number of candidates gave an example which confirmed their mark but disappointingly this was the old autocratic versus democratic rather than a more up-to-date 'SWOT' analysis for example.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one way in which group decision-making can go wrong and one way that this can be avoided. Most candidates chose to describe 'groupthink' which is a syndrome characterised by a concurrence-seeking tendency that overrides the ability of a cohesive group to make critical decisions. A number of candidates either forgot to answer the second half of this question or were not able to provide an answer. Those who did answer made appropriate suggestions based on psychological knowledge.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one decision-making strategy. Group decision-making is deciding what action a group should take. As always, many candidates went for the autocratic/democratic distinction without awareness that there is anything different. Better answers did consider alternatives and some candidates extended the answer they had briefly mentioned in question part (a).

Question 18

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'communication channel'. Most candidates wrote correctly that a communication channel is the passage of information between one person or group to another person or group. Some candidates went on to mention that this involves the sender, the message and the receiver.
- (b) Here candidates had to briefly describe one type of communication channel. Whilst most candidates correctly described the varieties of communication (such as telephone, talking face-to-face, having a meeting, sending a memo, newsletter, email, voice-mail, amongst others), some candidates described a communication network. This concerns how a communication channel might be structured rather than the channel itself.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one advantage and one disadvantage of the communication channel described in (b). Those choosing to describe a communication network scored no marks here. Many appropriate answers could describe an advantage and a disadvantage of a channel as they understood it, such as sending an email whereas only a few candidates could go beyond the anecdotal and describe the advantage and disadvantage in organisational terms.

Question 19

- (a) This part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about leadership and management. Many candidates wrote excellent answers which covered a wide range of types and theories of leadership. Universalist theories featured prominently as did Fiedler's contingency model. Weaker answers considered nothing more than the 1920s autocratic and democratic leadership styles.
- (b) Here candidates were required to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about leadership and management. Evaluation here followed the same pattern as for all other evaluation answers with many evaluating competently (for example, comparing and contrasting different theories) whilst others made a few generalised comments, scoring low marks.
- (c) This question asked candidates to suggest what a company owner should look for in a new manager. All candidates could make a suggestion, and so scored some marks, but only the most able candidates included psychological knowledge and most apposite here is the work of Kirkpatrick and Locke, although even what is in the recommended text by Riggio would add knowledge to any suggestion to score more marks.



Question 20

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about human factors in work design. This question appeared to attract candidates who knew nothing about leadership (**Question 19**) and so chose this to write what they thought they knew about this topic area. Such anecdotal answers may occasionally score a few marks, but with no psychological knowledge answers will often score no marks at all. Human factors are concerned with the design of tools, machines, work systems and work places to fit the skills and abilities of workers. Chapanis provides a good summary of all the factors that should be considered for this topic area.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about human factors in work design. As candidates more often than not described very little or no psychological knowledge in part (a) they were not able to evaluate it in part (b). This meant that most candidates scored very few marks for this question part.
- (c) This part invited candidates to suggest an efficient workspace design for a teacher. The emphasis of this question was on workspace design and there are features that are common for every worker at a desk, beginning with chair design which should be an appropriate height and have back support. Sadly some candidates simply described what a teacher would need such as desk, chair, pens and paper, seemingly unaware that this was a psychology examination.



PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/32
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer.
- Candidates should answer *both* parts of a question where there are two components. See **Questions 6(a)** and **9(a)** and **17(b)** for example.
- Candidates should quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as they appear in the syllabus.

General comments

For many Centres this will be the last time this paper will be taken in its current format because from June 2012 papers based on the revised syllabus will be examined. Note that the November 2011 examination will be based on the 'old' syllabus.

The comments specific to each question apply to this paper but these general comments apply to both this paper and to future papers.

Many candidates do not gain marks because they do not allocate writing time according to mark allocation. There was a small but significant number of Centres where all candidates wrote just as much for *Section A*, short answer questions, as they did for *Section B*, essay questions. The total mark for a *Section A* question is 11, whereas for *Section B* it is 24. Simple logic suggests that more needs to be written for *Section B* than for *Section A*. Candidates are always advised to allocate time according to the marks allocated to that question.

This paper and any future paper will require candidates to evaluate. Whilst many Centres have candidates who write excellent evaluative answers others have candidates who appear not to know what evaluation is. Evaluation is an assessment of what is good or not so good about something that has been described. For psychologists we do not do this anecdotally, but through 'evaluation issues'. We might therefore say that a study is unethical, or that it lacks ecological validity. The full range of issues appears on the syllabus and candidates could usefully look at how these issues apply to each and every piece of psychological knowledge described.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'cultural diversity' in education. Most candidates were able to provide a good answer to this question part and most scored full marks.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one cultural difference in educational performance. Any cultural difference was acceptable here including any difference that candidates may experience in their own country. Answers were varied and covered the whole mark range.
- (c) This question part required candidates to give two explanations for a cultural difference in educational performance. Again many answers were possible and the two explanations could

include social class, type of family, position in family, expectation of family, gender, time-orientation, competitiveness and individualism, as well as any other appropriate explanation.

Question 2

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'attribution theory' in education. Although some candidates guessed at what attribution theory is, and were often incorrect when doing so, many others provided detailed explanations that scored full marks. Most typically, 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.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one type of motivation and one theory of motivation in education. For the type of motivation most answers made a distinction between intrinsic (e.g. a reward might be learning a skill) and extrinsic motivation (e.g. praise from a teacher). For the theory of motivation some candidates described the theory of Maslow but often did not mention at all how this related to education. Credit was also given to candidates who explained motivation through theories derived from approaches or perspectives.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one example of attribution theory in education. Any appropriate example indicative of attribution theory was acceptable. Some candidates chose to outline an example from theory whilst others chose to give an anecdotal example. Anecdotes were fully credited in this case provided they clearly illustrated attribution theory.

Question 3

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about special educational needs. In response to this question some candidates focused entirely on those with learning difficulties and disabilities whilst others focused on children with both learning difficulties and disabilities and those children who are gifted (who also have special educational needs). Typically, candidates wrote exclusively about dyslexia as if it is the only learning difficulty and only very rarely were children who are partially sighted or blind, for example, mentioned.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about special educational needs. The most commonly debated issue was individual differences, followed closely by the issues of generalisations and implications. A small number of candidates did not evaluate, instead opting to re-describe what they had in part (a) in more detail. This strategy may have added more marks for description to part (a) but if there is no evaluation then no marks can be awarded in the evaluation section.
- (c) Candidates were asked, giving reasons for their answer, to suggest how a specific learning difficulty could be assessed. A small number of candidates wrote nothing more than "assessed by the teacher" or "assessed by an IQ test". Very few considered actual tests that determine say dyslexia or dyscalculia and also very few considered the different ways in which giftedness could be assessed.

Question 4

- (a) Here candidates were asked to describe what psychologists have found out about teaching and learning styles. The quality of many answers was impressive with candidates considering both teaching and learning styles, supported not only with different perspectives on learning but also by specific models such as those by Grasha and Curry. At the opposite end of the mark range were those candidates who assumed that because they had spent a number of years in a classroom they knew all about teaching and learning styles. The question does ask what *psychologists* have learned and so their anecdotal knowledge was rather lacking.
- (b) This part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about teaching and learning styles. Again there were the anecdotalists who could write no more than "it was a good style and we learned a lot", but others provided superb evaluations which showed confident use of a range of issues, approaches, perspectives and methods.
- (c) Candidates were invited to suggest how the learning styles of candidates in their psychology class could be measured. The anecdotalists suggested "using a questionnaire" which gained them a mark because a questionnaire would be an appropriate measure. However, they rarely went



beyond this suggestion. Others did progress further and often based their answers around the work of Kolb who devised a 'learning kite' to distinguish different types of learner.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 5

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'sources of noise'. Nearly all candidates scored full marks for this question part simply because any source of noise, whether it is psychological or not, was credit worthy.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one study showing the negative effects of noise on performance and to describe how such negative effects could be reduced. Most candidates wrote about the Bronzaft study to answer this question. This study was where noisy trains and rail track affected the reading ability of children in a nearby school. This study was also used to answer the second half of this question because rubber tracks were installed and the rooms in the school were soundproofed.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one study showing the negative effects of noise on social behaviour. There were far more answers focusing on anti-social rather than pro-social behaviour and many more candidates described a laboratory experiment more than any other; the studies by Geen and O'Neal and Donnerstein and Wilson being most prominent.

Question 6

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'density' and 'crowding'. Whilst many candidates provided two clear explanations and scored full marks, others could explain the term density but not crowding. Whereas density refers to physical conditions, crowding is a psychological state.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one study showing the effects of crowding on social behaviour and describe one study showing the effects of crowding on performance. For the former the popular studies by Bickman et al and Jorgenson and Dukes were most often chosen. Marks were allocated according to accuracy and detail of answers. For the latter part of the question many candidates appeared not to know an appropriate study to describe, whilst others described the Paulus et al task clearly and accurately.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one way in which a person can reduce the effects of crowding. Interestingly a number of candidates chose to write about modifying architecture, and for a different question such answers would have scored full marks. However, in this case the question focused on what a *person* could do and the most logical strategy would be to increase cognitive control. More able candidates also threw in some psychological evidence, most often referring to the work of Langer and Saegert.

Question 7

- (a) This question part invited candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about crowd behaviour. As usual there were a small number of candidates who wrote about density and crowding, a totally different topic area of the syllabus, and these candidates scored no marks. Those writing about crowd behaviour often considered the different types of crowd such as acquisitive, apathetic, baiting, etc. and went on to consider a number of explanations such as those offered by Le Bon and Zimbardo for example.
- (b) This part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about crowd behaviour. Some candidates took the lead from their part (a) descriptions and compared and contrasted the different explanations and others debated the ethics of the Zimbardo deindividuation study. A third common issue was to consider the extent to which studies of crowd behaviour can be generalised to a wider population.
- (c) This question part wanted candidates to suggest what may be done to prevent panic in a crowd during an emergency situation. Some candidates made anecdotal and often inappropriate suggestions whereas others made appropriate suggestions and quoted relevant psychological



evidence to support their suggestion. As this format (suggest and quote psychological knowledge) addressed the mark scheme directly such answers often scored full marks.

Question 8

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about natural disaster and/or technological catastrophe. Whilst there were many who chose to write exclusively about the events in Japan (March 2011), there were those who did so, quoted other disastrous events in addition and went on to add psychological theory and evidence to their examples of events. This distinguished the excellent from bottom band answers.
- (b) In this question part a favourite issue is to debate how psychologists can study disaster/catastrophe. It can be done in a laboratory, with low ecological validity or a simulation can be done to increase ecological validity. Interviews with survivors can be conducted to determine how they behaved. Another popular issue is to contrast the traditional Le Bon panic model with the more recent 'we-ness' model arguing that people do not panic but help each other and develop a 'we are all in this together' attitude.
- (c) This question part asked candidates to suggest ways in which psychologists could help people *after* the occurrence of a disaster and/or catastrophe. As usual there were those candidates who focused on helping before an event and did not score any marks because they did not answer the question set. Those answering the question set looked at using systematic desensitization to help reduce post-traumatic stress disorder and some candidates suggested that studying an event will help understand behaviour and so this can help future evacuation plans.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 9

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'measuring non-adherence'. Whereas most candidates could explain the term adherence, the extent to which people carry out the instructions given to them by a medical practitioner, many candidates did not go on to address the 'measuring' component of the question and so did not score full marks.
- (b) Here candidates had to outline two ways in which adherence to medical advice can be measured. Some candidates provided an appropriate distinction between subjective and objective measures whilst others merely gave two different ways. Candidates received some credit for writing "the number of pills not taken could be counted" and full credit was often given for those candidates who went on to quote a psychological study on this such as that by Chung and Naya.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one reason why people may not adhere to medical advice. Answers here were similar to those in (b) where some candidates wrote anecdotally, whilst others quoted psychological evidence. Most common was 'rational non-adherence' where for example the side effects of treatment may be worse than the problem itself and so patients stop taking medication.

Question 10

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'health promotion in worksites'. Two components were required here, such as enhancing good health and preventing illness (for one mark) and then with reference to worksites (one further mark). Many candidates addressed the first but often did not write anything about worksites.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two methods for promoting health in people with a specific problem. Here the 'specific problem' was irrelevant because the focus of the question was about two methods. Some candidates wrote about "educating the public" for the first and for the second. Other candidates referred to both psychological jargon and studies, quoting for example 'appeals to fear' and 'providing information' as done by Lewin et al and by Flay.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one worksite health promotion study. A number of candidates achieved very low marks because they could not describe a study as the question required. Other candidates showed their knowledge and described either the Johnson and Johnson 'Live for Life' programme of the Fox et al safety programme.



Question 11

- (a) Part (a) asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about pain. This question gave candidates the opportunity (like all other *Section B* essay questions) to show the extent of their psychological knowledge and understanding. Many candidates did exactly that and impressed with the depth, detail and quality of answers. Also impressive was the range of material covered and many included a definition, the different types of pain, ways to measure pain, different theories. Candidates also looked at ways in which pain can be managed.
- (b) Here candidates had to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about pain. Given the range of material included in part (a) many candidates had little difficulty in providing an impressive range of issues where each was debated using the material described in part (a).
- (c) This question part invited candidates to suggest how acute pain could be measured in a person who cannot speak. This question forced candidates to think about the range of possibilities and to select those measures that were appropriate to the question. Whilst many candidates were able to think and provide apposite answers, some candidates did not think at all because they answered on how psychologists can manage rather than measure pain.

Question 12

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have learned about lifestyles and health behaviour. The crucial wording of the question, missed by many candidates, were the words “what psychologists have learned” instead being interpreted as “write what you know”. This misinterpretation resulted in many basic answers covering anything from diet and exercise to not getting drunk and having safe sex. That said, there were many good answers that considered what psychologists have learned and included a range of studies and models, with the health belief model featuring prominently.
- (b) This part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have learned about lifestyles and health behaviour and again extremes of the mark range were awarded to the various answers that were written. The crucial message is that candidates must evaluate if they are to score marks in this evaluation section.
- (c) Here candidates were to suggest how lifestyles could be assessed or measured. Many candidates based their work on that of Harris and Guten or that of Turk and scored high marks. Other candidates did not know any work on which to base their answers and so they lost marks for this part of the mark scheme.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by ‘types of abnormal affect’. Here candidates had to mention both abnormal affect and what is meant by a ‘type’ to score both available marks. Typically a type is a kind or category into which various forms are placed. Abnormal affect concerns disorders of mood and emotion, usually depression and mania or manic depression (bipolar disorder).
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two types of abnormal affect. There were a number of variations possible in answer to this question. Candidates could choose depression and mania or they could group these into bipolar and unipolar disorder; candidates could even include seasonal affective disorder as one type and one of the aforementioned for the other. Answers including abnormal affect due to trauma could also receive credit.
- (c) This part required candidates to outline one way in which a type of abnormal affect may be treated. Many candidates scored full marks here because treatments for abnormal affect are well known. Some candidates focused on drug treatments, others on electro-convulsive therapy, yet more on cognitive-behavioural treatments and some even mentioned ‘light box’ treatment for seasonal affective disorder.

Question 14

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'types of somatoform disorder'. As with **Question 13**, candidates had to refer to both somatoform disorder and what is meant by a 'type' to score both available marks. As mentioned above, a type is a kind or category into which various forms are placed and types of somatoform disorder include hypochondriasis, conversion disorder, somatisation (Briquet's syndrome), psychogenic pain and body dysmorphic disorder.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe the characteristics of hypochondriasis and the characteristics of body dysmorphic disorder. Most candidates did this very successfully, scoring all the available marks with often clear and accurate descriptions.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one non-medical treatment for somatoform disorders. It was good to see that a few candidates chose to mention psychoanalytic therapy although the vast majority wrote about cognitive-behavioural treatments. A few candidates still wrote about medical treatments despite the question stating non-medical treatments.

Question 15

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about abnormal affect due to trauma. Some candidates misinterpreted this as an 'abnormal affect' question and wrote about unipolar and bipolar disorder rather than the very different syllabus topic of abnormal affect due to trauma. Whilst one could in theory become depressed after a trauma, one would certainly not develop mania. For candidates focusing on the correct topic area some impressive answers were read which looked at psychogenic fugue, psychogenic amnesia and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD).
- (b) Evaluate what psychologists have found out about abnormal affect due to trauma was the question part here. As usual candidates divided themselves into two categories: those who knew some methods, issues and debates and could apply them to the question; and those candidates who could not evaluate beyond a few generalised comments.
- (c) Here candidates were invited to suggest ways in which the effects of trauma such as post-traumatic stress could be reduced. Most candidates went for systematic desensitization which is the most recognised treatment. A few candidates described the relatively new eye movement and desensitization and reprocessing (EMDR) which was also given appropriate credit.

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about anxiety disorders. Some candidates opted for a basic overview of generalised anxiety whilst those achieving top marks made a distinction between generalised anxiety, phobias, obsessive-compulsive disorder and post-traumatic stress disorder and also considered some of the explanations such as those provided by the behavioural and psychoanalytic perspectives.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about anxiety disorders. Those adopting the generalised approach struggled to mention any evaluative issues whilst those describing different perspectives in part (a) were able to compare and contrast them in this section. Such candidates often went on to evaluate more issues relevant to anxiety disorders.
- (c) This question part focused on one aspect of the syllabus for anxiety disorders, obsessive-compulsive disorder, and candidates were asked to suggest how obsessive-compulsive disorder may be treated. Like **Question 15** most candidates opted to describe cognitive-behaviour therapy although a number, legitimately, suggested the use of medication or of psychodynamic psychotherapy.



PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'selection interviews'. Most candidates scored full marks here by writing that a selection interview is the choosing from a sample of job applicants the individual(s) best suited to the job(s) available.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one type and one pitfall of selection interviewing. As mentioned in the 'Key Messages' at the beginning of this report, not all candidates addressed both parts of this question. There are various types of interviews and those candidates who thought about the question before writing realised that there are more pitfalls for informal or unstructured interviews than there are for structured or formal interviews. Some candidates opted for a minimalist approach by writing nothing more than "they are biased" and this approach will never be sufficient for full marks.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one way in which personnel selection decisions are made. This question distinguished between those who gave an anecdotal answer showing no psychological knowledge such as "the boss chooses" and those who described multiple regression, multiple cut-off or multiple hurdle technique whose psychological knowledge was appropriate and answered the question perfectly.

Question 18

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'human resource practices'. Most candidates knew that this was "the department that looks after the employees" and the better answers went on to mention that human resource management is concerned with performance appraisal, reward systems and personnel selection processes.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two reasons why performance is appraised. The best answers made a distinction between the organisation and the individual. For the organisation it helps to decide on promotions, demotions, bonuses and firing. It gives information on training needs, validates employee selection and evaluates effectiveness of organisational change. For the individual it can be the basis of career advancement and give feedback on improving performance and recognising weaknesses.
- (c) This part required candidates to outline one weakness of a performance appraisal technique. Any appropriate comment was acceptable here. Candidates could focus on methods of rating, e.g. comparisons, checklists or rating scales. Weakness could be with an assessor being too lenient/severe; or showing a halo or recency effect.

Question 19

- (a) This part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about motivation to work. Without a doubt candidates know about Maslow's hierarchy of needs and can describe this in detail. What they know less well is that there are other need theories, such as those by Alderfer and McClelland or that there are types of theories other than need theories including job design theories, rational theories and goal setting theories amongst others. That said there were a few candidates who provided excellent answers that covered a range of theories and in detail too.
- (b) This part invited candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about motivation to work. Evaluations varied between those who did not know how to evaluate, those who offered a few general comments and those who considered a number of issues, debates and approaches.
- (c) This question part asked candidates, using their psychological knowledge, to suggest how the management of any company could increase performance through team building. Many candidates in suggesting nothing more than "have a team meeting" did not use their psychological knowledge whilst others did and based their answers on the work of Tuckman, Belbin or Woodcock.

Question 20

- (a) Here candidates were asked to describe what psychologists have discovered about organisational work conditions. Answers to this question were often nothing more than a list of common-sense factors such as the temperature being too hot or cold, or the lighting being too bright or dim, and answers like this scored very few marks. At the top end, answers referred to psychological studies on a range of physical work conditions but also, crucially, considered a range of psychological factors in work conditions.
- (b) Here candidates had to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about organisational work conditions. A number of issues could be debated here such as the methods used to gather evidence. For example, was the evidence gathered in a laboratory and applied to the work setting (and so related to the issue of ecological validity) or was evidence gathered by observation (and so increasing the risk of the Hawthorne effect)? These are just two methods that could be applied to this topic area and many more issues could also be applied.
- (c) This question part asked about how the temporal conditions of work environments could be improved. A number of candidates still insist that this is all about temperature, when it is not. Temporal relates to time. Indeed the syllabus lists various shiftwork patterns which should be a very big hint as to what temporal conditions refer to. Those in the know often wrote superb answers which included a mention of a 'slow rotation' theory rather than a 'rapid rotation' theory and a number considered compressed work weeks and flexi-time which were also relevant.

