

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/11

Core Studies 1

General comments

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as experimental design, data collection, procedure, results, conclusions and various aspects of ethics and evaluation.

In **Section A** of this paper some simple questions, such as **Questions 8(b), 9(a) and 12(b)**, were well answered. However, candidates found many of the other questions challenging, notably questions about experimental design and those requiring elaboration rather than two facts in order to gain full marks. From their understanding of the studies, candidates should have developed a basic knowledge of methodology in psychology, covering such aspects as research methods, experimental designs and basic descriptive statistics (for example), just as they should know about independent and dependent variables, controls and the advantages and disadvantages of quantitative and qualitative data. This is an area where many candidates could improve, as knowledge gained in one context is often required to understand, interpret or evaluate another.

Although the majority of candidates have learned the correct studies, a minority appear to be writing about studies that are not on the specification (such as a different Maguire et al. study than the one required).

In **Questions 16 and 17**, many candidates focused on description of the study itself, which was not required, rather than focusing on the task specified by the question. Candidates need to be aware that the task is to discuss or evaluate the topic set, and this is not necessarily the study itself, but often a debate, research method or approach. Responses focussing purely on the study will gain limited marks.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Performance on this question was variable, and few candidates gained full marks. Some candidates ignored the reference to “self-manipulations’, ‘illustrators’ and ‘pauses’” and wrote the behaviours exhibited by liars in the study, for which they were awarded no marks. To improve the better answers, candidates needed to address the meaning of ‘pauses’, i.e. gaps in speech, and those candidates who answered this well also gave examples of why, such as to think of what to say next, or indicated the duration that counted (half a second).

Question 2

- (a) Only a minority of candidates were aware of the meaning of a repeated measures design. A common incorrect answer was ‘repeating the procedure in the same way’, which is an aspect of standardisation rather than experimental design. It is important that candidates understand basic methodology such as experimental designs and are able to apply and explain them. This should be done in terms of allocation of participants to conditions or levels of the independent variable.
- (b) Many candidates gave limited answers here, e.g. saying that ‘more words were used for true memories’. Those who were able to quote data generally did so accurately. Some candidates appeared to be guessing and gave the difference the wrong way round.

Question 3

- (a) This question part was generally well answered, with many responses gaining full marks. Where candidates gained limited marks they typically had not responded to the second part of the question and did not give a reason why the difference they had given was expected.
- (b) Some candidates were able to identify that the difference between males and females was not big enough to reach significance, but few were able to gain full marks by observing that differences are harder to detect in small samples.

Question 4

- (a) Most candidates gained limited marks for identifying that there was a deep and a shallow side. A common error was to confuse the apparatus for the visual cliff test with the kitten carousel itself (or test for paw placement), or to provide an inaccurate description of the correct apparatus. Errors included suggesting the horizontal surfaces were sloping and omitting the bridge, the clear covering or the patterned surface (although not all of these were required for full marks). Candidates may have benefited from including a diagram, but those that did attempt to draw the apparatus were unable to do so accurately, even in cross section.
- (b) This question was not well answered. Few candidates were able to demonstrate the knowledge that there was more than one trial with each kitten.

Question 5

Although many candidates gained some marks here, fewer gained full marks. Most candidates described the high levels of obedience, and stronger answers went on to identify that this occurred despite the participants' distressed reaction towards their own obedience. A small number of candidates confused the study with Haney, Banks and Zimbardo.

Question 6

- (a) Although many candidates gained full marks, there was some confusion over those behaviours identified as imitative and as non-imitative aggression. Incorrect answers included that non-imitative aggression was 'not being aggressive' or suggested that the children were having tea parties or hugging the Bobo doll. The most common correct answers were mallet aggression for imitative and gun play for non-imitative. The most common error was believing that punching the Bobo doll was imitative.
- (b) The question part was very well answered, with many candidates gaining full marks. Common errors were to give conclusions rather than results or to give results that did not relate to imitative aggression.

Question 7

- (a) This question was well answered, with candidates offering the full range of possible answers. A small number of candidates repeated 'fussing'.
- (b) This question was answered well, with candidates demonstrating a good understanding of the implications of removing this group for reducing generalisability.

Question 8

- (a) Few candidates answered that there had been a pilot study, and that this was necessary to find an act that was considered by children as 'neutral' (and was thus an appropriate starting point for designing a story for the study). Many candidates guessed and simply suggested that the chosen story was 'easy to understand'.
- (b) This question was generally answered well. A minority of candidates simply repeated the question, saying that the good motive story was where there was a good intention and a bad motive story was one with a bad intention without saying what those intentions were, others describe the stories in terms of outcomes instead of motives and yet others simply gave a lot of detail of the study but motive was not explicitly stated.

Question 9

- (a) This question part was answered very well.
- (b) Strong answers gave excellent explanations contextualising the need for deception appropriately. Common errors were to state 'to reduce demand characteristics', for example, without linking back to the study, which limited the marks available, or to give insufficient answers such as 'to test the aim'.

Question 10

- (a) This question was not well answered. Some candidates were able to gain full marks, with some of these offering the use of EEG to measure brain waves and others its use to measure eye movements.
- (b) Strong candidates explained that this allowed the researchers to know when to wake participants up, and why this was important. Some candidates gave generic answers relating to validity, for which marks were limited.

Question 11

Some candidates' answers suggested that they had learned about a different Maguire et al. study from the one indicated on the syllabus, care should be taken to ensure that the correct study is used.

- (a) Some candidates demonstrated excellent knowledge of the role of the MRI scan in this study and the way it adds to information from a PET scan by allowing detail of the precise structure to be mapped onto the area of activation identified. Many candidates were only able to identify that an MRI scan helped the researcher to identify which part of the brain was active.
- (b) Although candidates successfully identified the role of the hippocampus in 'route' or 'semantic-topographical' information, they needed to extend this to include the learning and retrieval of such information in order to gain full marks.

Question 12

- (a) Some candidates were aware of the role of the pilot study in the identification of suitable smells, but many were not and suggested that they were acquired from a database or were selected by the equipment.
- (b) This part of the question was answered very well, although a small number of candidates seemed to be guessing, suggesting vanilla, ginger, baking, dirty nappies, garbage, etc.

Question 13

- (a) Whilst there were many good answers, some candidates' answers were purely descriptive rather than indicating how the interactions differed by comparison. Some answers described aspects of the study rather than focus on the interactions.
- (b) Strong answers used the conclusion of the study effectively to answer this question. Moderate answers gained limited rewarded for reference to labelling. Some responses did not demonstrate the link between the study's aims and conclusions or the difference between the pseudopatients' interactions with staff and real patients.

Question 14

- (a) Many candidates were not able to gain marks here because they did not provide any detailed evidence but merely repeated that females did better on the empathising test and males on the systemising test. Stronger responses referred to extreme E and S data. Some responses attempted to use the evidence from course choice to answer the question.
- (b) Answers showed a good understanding of the risks of generalising from small unrepresentative samples. Candidates typically made reference to averages and exceptions, backed up with an example, to gain full marks. There were also appropriate references to individual differences.

Question 15

- (a) Answers here were varied, with matched pairs (and matching by age and sex) being the most common correct answer. However, many candidates did not know what an experimental design was and referred instead to the research method (variously identified as case study, correlation, observation etc.). Many candidates who could name an experimental design identified it as repeated measures.
- (b) When candidates identified the design as matched pairs in (a), they were generally able to describe an appropriate weakness. However, when candidates correctly identified the experimental design as independent groups in (a) they would often incorrectly follow this by suggesting that the weakness was order effects.

Section B

Question 16

The most popular choices were Freud (little Hans) and Thigpen and Cleckley (multiple personality disorder), fewer candidates chose Rosenhan (sane in insane places).

Whilst there were some excellent, well informed, well constructed and well illustrated answers to this question, the majority were not strong enough to gain high marks. Candidates tended to evaluate the study rather than the research method of longitudinal studies, although when they chose Freud they tended to evaluate case studies.

It is important that candidates answer the question set, rather than write descriptively about the study. Even when answers are evaluative, if they do not answer the question set the marks available will be limited.

Question 17

The most popular choices were Haney, Banks and Zimbardo (prison simulation) and Piliavin et al. (subway Samaritans), very few candidates chose Tajfel (intergroup categorisation).

Answers here were slightly stronger than for **Question 16**, but the majority were not strong enough to gain high marks. Some answers were excellent, and appropriate responses were possible within the time and knowledge limits of candidates at this level. Many candidates were able to gain some marks by considering the strengths and weaknesses of the methods typically used in studying the social approach, such as ecological validity and ethics, but needed to relate their answer to a particular study to gain high marks.

As with **Question 16**, many candidates focussed on descriptive detail, and did not gain high marks because their answers had not discussed the social approach, and the study was described instead of used to illustrate their answer. Candidates needed to answer the question as set to access full marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/12

Core Studies 1

Key messages

- Candidates should write their answers in the order in which they appear on the question paper.
- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 10 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- For a Section A, 2 mark question that has the command 'describe', candidates should ensure they provide enough detail to score both marks, rather than a partial, very brief or vague answer. Detail is not required for questions with the command 'identify'.
- Candidates should read both parts of a question, **(a)** and **(b)**, before beginning to write an answer to ensure that the answers to both question parts are not the same.
- Candidates should read questions carefully ensuring their answers address the question. Some candidates scan the question and make an incorrect assumption about what the question is asking.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will achieve limited marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.
- Candidates should ensure they know which author(s) conducted which core studies.

General comments

Candidates should read each question carefully and ensure they follow the advice given in the key messages above. If this advice is followed it will result in marks being gained because of good examination technique.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates were able to achieve full marks for this question by identifying two of the crimes of which the suspects were accused. No more than a single word was required to gain credit, in this case theft, arson, (attempted) rape or murder. Candidates who wrote robbery instead of theft were given the benefit of doubt.
- (b) Some candidates misinterpreted the question and wrote about the inter-rater reliability between the two observers. This was a check of agreement concerning length of pauses, etc., not of whether the suspects were telling the truth or a lie. Some candidates mentioned that the suspect initially told a lie and later confessed, which scored limited marks. Answers that scored full marks had to refer to the forensic evidence or the substantial reliable independent witness statements that confirmed the instances of truth or lie.

Question 2

Marks covered the whole mark range with many candidates scoring high marks. Typical errors were not including four different features or describing features incorrectly (such as a man rather than a woman).

Question 3

- (a) There was a range of answers written in response to this question, some showed full understanding, some partial understanding and some showed candidates did not understand the term at all. Strong answers wrote that the ceiling effect is where all candidates score high marks at the top of the mark range, usually because the test is too easy. Partial answers suggested that it was where all scores were similar, but crucially without specifying where on the mark scale the answers were, and some candidates, again showing that they did not fully understand, suggested that it is where all marks are either at the top or at the bottom of the range. A number of candidates incorrectly suggested the ceiling effect is a problem with the words used in the eyes test, and many other incorrect guesses were also provided.
- (b) For those candidates who could not describe the ceiling effect in part (a), this question was also challenging. The correct answer is that if all the answers are at the top of the mark scale it narrows the range of results and makes it harder to discriminate between participants. This means that those with autism could not be distinguished from those who did not have autism. This makes the test invalid (it is not measuring what it claims). It does not lack reliability, as some candidates suggested, rather it is reliable because it produces a consistent result.

Question 4

- (a) Candidates were asked to describe two of the four verbal prods given to the teacher by the experimenter, which included: 'Please continue' or 'Please go on'; 'The experiment requires that you continue'; 'It is absolutely essential that you continue'; and 'You have no other choice, you must go on'. Exact wording was not needed (although many candidates did provide word-for-word answers), it being more important to show the increasing demand placed on the teacher (participant).
- (b) There were three types of answer to this question: those who were unable to provide an appropriate answer; those who gave a basic, correct answer, such as 'for standardisation between participants', that needed elaboration or expansion to gain higher marks; and those who gave a sufficiently detailed and correct answer explaining that the prods were to produce continued obedience when the participant showed signs of disobedience. Some candidates thought that the prods matched the increasing levels of voltage. This is incorrect because all four prods could have been given at any (or the same) voltage level if the subject showed signs of disobedience.

Question 5

- (a) Many candidates correctly *identified* a number of different aspects, with only a few candidates *describing* one aspect. The most typical answers focused on the three prison cells that were 6 x 9 feet and had bars on the doors; the small 2 x 2 x 7 closet (the 'hole') for solitary confinement; and the prison itself, a 35-foot section of a basement corridor in the psychology building.
- (b) A description of the least frequent behaviour caused problems for some candidates because they either described behaviour that happened more than once, or described behaviour for which Zimbardo provided no number of the times it happened. For example, 'wanting to leave' was a common answer, but this was not credited as it happened more than once. A perfect example, and one which scored full marks, is the one instance where a prisoner had a breakdown, suffered a psychosomatic rash, and had to leave the prison.

Question 6

- (a) In study 1 by Tajfel (not study 2 as some candidates mistakenly read), one reason the boys were given for being divided into groups is that they were divided into over-estimators and under-estimators of dots. This answer scored full marks. Some candidates wrote that the boys were told they were more accurate or less accurate, but the aim was to create two groups that are different from each other but who are equally right or wrong.

- (b) It was necessary to deceive the boys so that there were no actual differences between them that they brought to the study. By categorising them into over- and under-estimators a difference was created that was minimal or unimportant. Whilst many candidates answered this correctly, a number of candidates wrote about the deception reducing demand characteristics. Whilst the random allocation of the boys into the groups was not to avoid demand characteristics, the was given limited credit.

Question 7

- (a) Many candidates scored full marks for this question, accurately describing the 'granddaddy fantasy'. To confirm, this is where Hans's mother is the mother of his (Hans and not Freud, as a few candidates wrote) own children and his father is their granddaddy. A few candidates incorrectly described the giraffe fantasy and no marks were scored for this incorrect answer.
- (b) A number of candidates either did not understand the term *resolution* (of the Oedipus complex) or they did not read or think about the question carefully enough because many answers simply described the Oedipus complex. The 'granddaddy fantasy' showed resolution because by marrying his mother and promoting his father to a marriage with his grandmother, he overcomes the need to kill his father.

Question 8

- (a) Candidates could state that the research method used in the studies by Nelson was an experiment or a self-report but needed to add some additional detail to score full marks. A few candidates said that 'it is an experiment because it has an independent and dependent variable' but this needed to be related to this particular study in order to be credited. Those candidates opting to say that it is a self-report often added that the children were asked questions about the children in the pictures (and so relating it to the Nelson study) for full marks. A few candidates stated that the method was repeated measures. This answer scored no marks, because repeated measures is a *design*, a component of an experiment rather than an actual method.
- (b) The aim of the practice trial was to familiarise the children with the 'smiley faces' rating scale. The children were given two stories (very good - good motive and outcome and very bad - bad motive and outcome) to define the 'very good' and 'very bad' end-points of the scale. Many candidates described this accurately and scored full marks, whilst others presented a partial description or an answer that had inaccuracies for limited marks. A small number of candidates confused the practice trials in this study with the pre-existing levels of aggression in the Bandura et al. study.

Question 9

- (a) Most candidates scored full marks for their answers to this question. Answers typically included being woken up, stating whether they had been dreaming or not and describing the dream into the tape recorder if they had been dreaming.
- (b) Although many candidates scored full marks for this question part, many did not, mainly because many candidates assumed that a brief sentence would be sufficient. What was crucial about the loud doorbell was that the participants woke up *immediately* so they could report whether they were dreaming or not from the specific stage of REM or NREM they were in at that specific time.

Question 10

- (a) Candidates had to describe the baseline test used in the Maguire et al. study. A number of candidates incorrectly assumed that this was part of the experimental procedure itself, whilst others wrote about test items from the pre-study questionnaire. The baseline task was 'to control for speech output in which subjects repeated two four-digit numbers during scanning', which many candidates were able to describe accurately.
- (b) This question part asked *how* the baseline task acted as a control. Those candidates giving an incorrect answer for part (a) also gave an incorrect answer here. Correct answers scored limited marks for writing about 'how speaking affected brain activity' whereas full marks were awarded for those candidates writing about how the task allowed experimenters to see the difference between just talking and giving verbal responses to the experimental tasks.

Question 11

A significant number of candidates confused the study by Demattè et al. on facial stimuli and attractiveness with that of Langlois et al. on infant facial preference. No marks can be awarded if a candidate writes about the wrong study.

- (a) Candidates had to describe the stimulus materials (the faces) that were presented to the participants. Marks were awarded for correct features, so to answer that all the faces were male, there were 40 images, that they were of high attractiveness and low attractiveness, that the stimulus cards were 13 cm x 17 cm, received credit.
- (b) Some candidates misinterpreted the question and described a within-participants (repeated measures) design rather than explain why a within-participants (repeated measures) design was used in this study. This design was used in this study to reduce individual differences. This means that there may be individual preferences for particular smells or faces and so if every participant sees every face and smells every smell then individual preferences are controlled. A small number of candidates wrote that 'this design makes the study more reliable and valid' without any explanation of what this might mean. Such answers needed to be explained, or related to the study, to be credited.

Question 12

- (a) Some candidates described the voices heard by the pseudo-patients, but the question required lies other than these in order to be credited. Identification of lies about the pseudo-patients' name and occupation (also acceptable job, vocation or employment) scored full marks.
- (b) Most candidates scored limited marks when writing that the lies were told 'to protect themselves' and full marks where they had elaborated on this. Elaboration could be of two types: to protect the study so a pseudo-patient could not be identified from their job and secondly the pseudo-patients had the ethical right to confidentiality to protect their health records in the future.

Question 13

- (a) Many candidates wrote that hearing voices is not a symptom of schizophrenia. On one hand this is incorrect because hearing voices is an auditory hallucination and is a primary symptom of schizophrenia. Thigpen and Cleckley however diagnosed Eve differently. Eve did not have any other schizophrenia-like symptoms, she was aware that hearing voices was odd, and she knew that hearing voices was abnormal and she felt embarrassed by it. Eve showed no signs that she had an impaired sense of reality or schizophrenia.
- (b) This question was answered correctly by most candidates. Many wrote about the differences in Eve Black's liking for the company of strangers compared to Eve White, and also about Eve White being settled with a family compared to Eve Black who claimed she was not married and did not have a child.

Question 14

- (a) Some candidates confused what this test involved, most often candidates incorrectly believing it was a 'forced choice' *questionnaire* and so there were questions with only a yes or no choice to make. This test is where participants see a series of 12 pairs of diagrams and are required to find the small black and white shape in one of the two larger, more complex, diagrams. Some candidates did describe this test accurately and scored full marks, and some candidates were able to include additional details.
- (b) Quite a number of candidates made the false assumption that 'men are better than women' when on FC-EFT there is no difference between males and females. Such incorrect answers failed to show an understanding of the study: it is about systemising and empathising and the subject choice such cognitive types study at university. The FC-EFT showed that physical science candidates performed much better (because they are systemisers) than the humanities candidates (because they are empathisers).

Question 15

Some candidates mistakenly confused mirror avoidance with types of mirrors. For example, some candidates incorrectly wrote about avoiding looking into CDs, which are a type of mirror that those with BDD reported using rather than avoiding. Veale and Riley listed four types of mirror avoidance: looking only at specific defects; avoiding specific mirrors (those they saw as 'bad'); only using mirrors in private rather than public; and fourthly using an obscured mirror (those that were cracked, dusty or dirty). Any two from this list were credited, and elaborations, such as examples, were needed for full marks.

Section B

Question 16

There were four main types of answer which were seen in both this question and in **Question 17** (see below for details). Most candidates need to provide more evaluation (or discussion) to access higher marks. Candidates should follow this advice:

- Answers must evaluate, i.e. to consider the strengths and weaknesses of the approach or issue stated in the question.
- Evaluation must be based on the issue or approach specified in the question.
- Evaluative points must be given, typically two strengths and two weaknesses, and the chosen study used to support the strength or weakness being presented in the answer.

Some candidates answered in this way and scored very good marks. For such candidates, answers can be improved by thinking more carefully about the evaluative point they write about. Many candidates wrote that snapshot studies save time and cost less, but they often do not cost less and may cost more than a longitudinal study. These are not good evaluative points and are not supported by actual studies. For example, in terms of time, the Piliavin et al. study took 7½ minutes for each replication, but it took several months to complete all the participants. Similarly Bandura et al. sampled 72 children, each child being tested individually. It may not have taken much time for each individual child, but it certainly took time for every child to be tested. A simple 'saves time and effort' (or any other evaluative point) should be thought about carefully in relation to the chosen study to ensure it applies.

Question 17

Like **Question 16**, four types of answer could be identified:

(i) Some candidates did not answer the question about strengths and weaknesses, instead describing the study. Although some mention was made of the developmental approach this needed to be evaluative in order to be credited. Purely descriptive answers were not credited.

(ii) Some candidates evaluated the study but not in relation to the named approach. For example, some candidates would discuss the ethics of isolating kittens (in the Held and Hein study) but without mentioning the developmental approach.

(iii) Some candidates wrote about the strengths only, or the weaknesses only, but did not use any examples from the chosen study. Some candidates gave lots of examples from the chosen study but could not identify a general point about the approach. Such answers gained limited credit.

(iv) Some candidates gave both strengths and weaknesses and used examples from the chosen study, scoring at the top end of the mark range.

Candidates are reminded that **Section B** questions do not require description of a study, but the study should be used to support evaluative points. The evaluation and issue are of prime importance and the study should be used to provide illustrative examples only.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/13

Core Studies 1

General comments

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as aims, experimental design, procedure, results and various aspects of ethics and evaluation.

In **Section A** of this paper some simple questions, such as **Questions 8** and **13** were well answered. However, candidates found many of the other questions challenging. Candidates need to understand and learn the basic aspects of each study, namely its aim, procedure, results and conclusions. In addition, from their understanding of the studies, candidates should have developed a basic knowledge of methodology in psychology, covering such aspects as research methods, experimental designs, independent and dependent variables, controls and ideas about data such as descriptive statistics and quantitative and qualitative data. Candidates need to ensure they have this basic knowledge, in general and in relation to individual studies, to answer simple questions asking directly about a study, or ones which require knowledge gained in one context to understand, interpret or evaluate another.

In **Questions 16** and **17**, many candidates focused on description of the study itself, which was not required, rather than focusing on the task specified by the question. Such candidates need to be aware that the task is to discuss or evaluate the topic set, and this is not necessarily the study itself, but often a debate, research method or approach. Responses focussing purely on the study are likely to gain few, if any, marks.

Section A

Question 1

Candidates typically scored limited marks for each part of this question.

- (a) The answer to this question did not have to be contextualised, so candidates could simply have improved the simple answer 'it would have caused demand characteristics' by explaining what that meant, i.e. that they are features of the situation that indicate the aim to the participants. Alternatively, they could have suggested how demand characteristics would have been a problem in this study e.g. by saying that the coders might have become biased in their coding if they believed, for example, that a particular suspect was lying and that liars blinked more they might have counted more blinks.
- (b) To gain full marks here candidates did not need to know the data for reliability checks. A candidate with a partial response referring to checking that they had coded the same behaviour in the same way could have added that many such checks were done and the records of behaviours from each coder were correlated. Other candidates suggested that the coders were provided with operational definitions for behaviours to increase reliability, and to improve their answers they could have suggested what these definitions might have been.

Question 2

Some candidates were able to give clear, full mark answers, describing the booklets well. Many, however, were unable to say anything more than was already available in the question stem, i.e. that it was a booklet asking questions about their memories, which could not be credited. Candidates need to know about the booklet as this was the way the independent variable was manipulated (whether the stories were true or false) and the way that aspects of the dependent variable were measured. To earn full marks they did not need to identify these aspects, although to have been aware of them would have made the question easier.

Question 3

This question was not well answered. Some candidates described the AQ test rather than reporting its findings, others described the conclusions. Some candidates confused the eyes test with IQ tests.

Question 4

- (a) This was an important aspect of the study. By using kittens from the same litter for each pair Held and Hein were better able to test the influence of nature versus nurture. Similarly, by using kitten pairs from different litters, they could be more certain that any differences they found were generalisable. Many candidates were aware of some aspects of the procedure, e.g. that pairs of kittens were chosen and these were allocated one to each of the active and passive conditions. However, answers could have been improved with the inclusion of more details, and some answers needed more accuracy in the facts given.
- (b) Most candidates were aware that using similar pairs of kittens reduced the effects of individual differences but were unable to either expand on why (e.g. to be sure differences were due to nurture not nature) or to explain the importance of using kitten pairs from different litters (see above).

Question 5

- (a) Some candidates' answers were detailed enough to achieve high marks, others gave simple answers such as 'they behaved nervously' that needed elaboration to gain more marks.
- (b) While there were some strong answers, many candidates gave simple answers such as 'showed signs of relief' that needed elaboration to gain more marks.

Question 6

- (a) Although many candidates were aware that the median was a way of describing the 'average', only a minority could describe how it was worked out, some confusing it with the mean. It is important that candidates understand basic methodology such as simple descriptive statistics as they are used in the studies. This provides them with an underpinning knowledge which they can apply to other examples within the paper.
- (b) Where marks were gained they were for the simple statement that the time to help the 'cane' victim was shorter than for the 'drunk' victim. Few candidates were able to give specific data.

Question 7

The responses to this question were variable. Some candidates were able to give strong, insightful answers here, using the results of the study effectively to answer the question. Other answers reported relevant aspects of the results but needed to link these explicitly to the question in order to gain higher marks.

Question 8

- (a) This was answered well by many candidates, most choosing to describe the giraffe fantasy. Where full marks were not gained, the candidates had confused horse and giraffes, or gave very brief, incomplete accounts.
- (b) This was well answered by many candidates. In general those who had given sufficient detail in part (a) were able to explain this in part (b).

Question 9

- (a) There were few correct answers to this question, suggesting that candidates were unaware of this part of the study even though reversing the order of information (giving outcome information first and motive information last) was critical to interpreting the findings of the study 1. As few candidates knew what had been done, they were not able to access full marks.

- (b) Some candidates were able to identify the experimental design and describe or explain it. It is important that candidates understand basic methodology such as experimental designs and are able to apply them. This should be done in terms of allocation of participants to conditions or levels of the independent variable.

Question 10

- (a) Many candidates gained marks here, although some answers required more details and others gave confused answers e.g. suggesting that participants were told that the experimenter was held up.
- (b) Even candidates who had not earned full marks on part (a) were still able to give good answers here, referring to the opportunity for the effect of the angry stooge to influence the participant giving them the opportunity to label their physical arousal.

Question 11

- (a) Candidates made a range of suggestions here, commonly that REM periods are associated with dreaming. Stronger candidates were able to make more sophisticated comments and give accurate information about the frequency and duration of REM periods.
- (b) Although many candidates focused on the question set and gave good answers, for example referring to the universality of dreaming hence its generalisability, some did not. When candidates did not earn full marks they often talked about the overall generalisability of the study (e.g. based on the sample or controls). Such candidates needed to read the question carefully, as it asked specifically about generalising from interrupted sleep (to normal i.e. uninterrupted sleep).

Question 12

- (a) This question was very well answered, with candidates giving a range of appropriate details including age, gender and occupation.
- (b) This question was less well answered, but some candidates gave good responses about the need to be able to make generalisations. Some strong responses contextualised their comments within the examples they had given in part (a), for example suggesting how the age or occupation of a patient may affect the way they are treated.

Question 13

- (a) This question was well answered. Typically, candidates made reference to Eve Black's mischievous eyes and to Eve White's sadness or sweetness.
- (b) This question was also well answered. Typically, candidates made reference to Eve Black's coarseness and to Eve White's soft or feminine voice.

Question 14

This description question was not well answered. Few candidates were able to give any accurate details about the SQ-R. As one of the main tools in the study, it is important that candidates are aware of what the test is like (and the ways in which it differs from the earlier version).

Question 15

- (a) Few candidates were able to offer any of the key aims given by Veale and Riley, although a small number were able to identify important objectives of the study. Candidates should ensure they are familiar with the aims of a study, as they are a critical to their knowledge.
- (b) Few candidates were able to answer this question well and many answers simply repeated the stem, saying that in both mirror gazing and OCD there is a compulsion to perform the behaviour.

Section B

Question 16

The most popular choice was Bandura et al. (aggression) and, although there were some better answers, the majority were not well answered.

Candidates tended to focus on the study rather than the extent to which the study offered insight into the reductionism debate, even though the Bandura et al. study offers some interesting opportunities for such discussion.

It is important that candidates answer the question set, which is often to evaluate a study with regard to a debate, research method or approach, rather than write descriptively about the study. Even when answers are evaluative rather than descriptive if they do not answer the question set the marks available will be limited.

Question 17

The most popular choice was Haney, Banks and Zimbardo (prison simulation).

Although answers here were slightly better than for **Question 16**, many were not well answered. Some answers were very good, and appropriate responses were possible within the time and knowledge limits of candidates at this level. Many candidates were able to gain some marks by either identifying appropriate ethical issues or guidelines. Some candidates related these to the study, and the strongest answers indicated ways in which the study demonstrated both good ethics and ethical problems.

As with **Question 16**, many candidates wrote descriptively about the study rather than use it to illustrate their answer. Candidates need to be aware that their task was to discuss ethics in psychology and to use the study to support or illustrate this discussion.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/21
Core Studies 2

Key messages

Section A

Question 1

It is important that candidates are aware when the question asks for definitions, strengths and weaknesses will not be credited in **(a)**. Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in **(b)** and give clear details of the procedure followed. Extended evaluative points that make direct reference to the alternative idea are necessary in **(c)** to achieve full marks.

Question 2

Candidates would benefit from practicing writing these types of questions. Many did not structure their responses appropriately and this limited their marks. For example, if the question asks for strengths and weaknesses then four points must be made (two strengths and two weaknesses). Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

Section B

Candidates must write more extended responses in both **(b)** and **(c)** of the essay as many gave accurate responses that lacked depth. Evidence must be given in **(c)** to achieve higher marks.

General comments

Many candidates provided strong answers which showed that they were well prepared and consistently referred to the evidence in order to achieve high marks.

Time management for this paper was good for most candidates and most attempted all questions that were required.

A significant minority of candidates answered both questions in the **Section B** essay. When a candidate did this they were awarded the mark for the best of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**), but often did not score high marks. Candidates must ensure they answer the correct number of questions.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to the questions in **Section A** where there is no choice of question. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in the part **(c)** of their **Section B** essays to achieve higher marks. **Question 4** was the more popular choice of question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates achieved some marks for this question. A few did achieve full marks, very few candidates achieved no marks. Most were able to list the different features of qualitative and quantitative data, thereby obtaining high marks. Candidates could improve by making clearer reference to the research methods used to obtain the different types of data, in particular more clarity in references to qualitative data. Candidates need to ensure that examples used are appropriate.

No credit was given to strengths and weaknesses of qualitative and quantitative data.

- (b) Most candidates correctly described a study that collected qualitative data and also investigated theory of mind. Candidates need to ensure that they answer all the elements of the question set in order to gain high marks.

Many of the candidates designed a study that was very similar to the original Baron-Cohen et al. study but collecting qualitative rather than quantitative data. Many also thought of alternatives that involved using actors showing the emotions or the participants doing a field study where they judged emotions in everyday life. Many were able to achieve marks for their responses but had a number of minor omissions including full details of the sample and sampling method, where the study would be conducted and full details of the task (e.g. the number of eyes). Some candidates gave complicated descriptions of the samples which would have benefitted from simplification.

The vast majority of the studies were ethical.

Some candidates included evaluation of their idea, which could not be credited in this question.

- (c) The majority of candidates achieved marks by providing some evaluative points. Most were able to give practical and some methodological issues in their response.

Many discussed issues around the ethics of the study, problems with the representativeness of the sample, issues with qualitative data and demand characteristics. A number also discussed the reliability and validity of the data but often found these issues more difficult, their points would have benefitted from being explained more clearly.

Candidates often described many issues but these were usually done very briefly and did not refer directly to the alternative design they described in part (b) of their answer.

A few gave very well developed points that referred directly to their alternative idea, that achieved very high marks.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates achieved some marks. Most were able to mention that ecological validity refers to realism. A significant number gave more detailed responses and achieved full marks. There was some confusion by a minority of candidates with ethics and population validity.

- (b) Most candidates achieved some marks. Many were able to link their responses to the fact that the study was done with real suspects and real police officers. Many candidates could not explain clearly why the study had good ecological validity; a few did give strong responses where they explained why the testimonies given by the suspects were realistic. A few did not refer explicitly to the Mann et al. study and could not be credited.

- (c) The majority of candidates achieved some marks. Most were able to discuss a strength and a weakness of a study that has good ecological validity. Many referred to the realism of the study and its usefulness. Many could also discuss the issues with ethics and lack of controls as the weaknesses.

Candidates needed to refer to the Mann et al. study for each point to achieve high marks. They needed to refer to more than one strength and more than one weaknesses to achieve high marks. Those candidates who gave two strengths and two weaknesses with appropriate examples from the Mann et al. study and achieved in the higher band.

- (d) Many of the responses were very basic referring to the usefulness of the results to the police, court, judges and anyone working within the legal profession. Some candidates gave general answers, e.g. that it would be useful to parents in disciplining children or that anyone would find it useful. Better suggestions were more specific, e.g. how the nature of interrogations could change, with reference to the need to train police officers differently. Candidates need to refer to the extent to which the study would be useful to achieve higher marks.

Candidates that addressed the question set well, referred to the issues with the sample, problems with controls, issues with quantitative data. Some linked these points to the usefulness of the study and achieved high marks for their response.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates were able to give a brief definition of the developmental approach and achieved some marks. Most referred to the approach studying children and a number were able to discuss that the approach focused on change over time. Some were aware the approach could involve studying both adults as well as children.
- (b) Most candidates referred to all three studies in their answers. The responses related to the Bandura et al. study were stronger than those related to the other studies. Most were able to give some results of this study which showed the developmental process investigated by Bandura et al. Many struggled to identify these processes in the Freud and Nelson studies. Most gave quite detailed descriptions of the studies including the tasks and types of questions asked of the children but would have benefitted from a closer focus on the question set.
- (c) Almost all candidates could give some problems of working with children. Many focused on ethical issues and practical problems such as the language and concentration difficulties. A few gave examples from the studies to back up their responses and achieved higher marks. Candidates need to give clear examples from an appropriate study for each problem raised in order to achieve full marks.

Question 4

- (a) Most candidates could achieve some marks by making some reference to the situation or interactions with others. Some did achieve full marks with a clear description of situational explanations. Many contrasted the situational explanation with dispositional explanations and were able to achieve marks for this description.
- (b) Candidates answered this question well, demonstrating good knowledge of the three studies, and applying them appropriately. There were some concise responses that achieved full marks for describing how the data was collected. The strongest responses had a clear structure to their answer by stating that each of the studies collected both qualitative and quantitative data, then providing further description. Points related to the Piliavin et al. and Milgram studies often achieved high marks, whilst points related to the Thigpen and Cleckley study would have benefitted from mention of the psychometric tests or EEG.
- (c) Candidates needed to identify and discuss three advantages with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many were able to describe one or two advantages such as situational explanations offering insight into behaviour, usefulness and the frequent ecological validity of research into this area of psychology. Candidates needed to ensure their responses were linked to a study to achieve higher marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22
Core Studies 2

Key messages

Section A

Question 1

Candidates need to know each research method in depth (five points) to enable them to tackle questions in this section. They need to suggest simple alternatives to the original study in **(b)** covering what, how, who, where and when. Extended evaluative points linked to their own study from **(b)** are necessary in **(c)** to gain full marks. There were some examples of unethical studies for **1(b)**.

Question 2

It is important for candidates to know how each study is linked to the methodology and data presentation, in this case, how the situational explanation of behaviour can be applied to the results of Piliavin et al. For **(b)**, candidates need to demonstrate the link to the situational explanation of behaviour. For **(c)**, candidates need to evaluate the social approach using Piliavin et al. as an example throughout, rather than just an evaluation of Piliavin et al. To gain higher marks candidates need to write about at least two strengths and two weaknesses. For **(d)**, candidates need to be able to explicitly compare the social approach to any other different approach using studies as examples of their comparison points.

Section B

Candidates must focus their answers in **(b)** to what feature(s) set in the question (in this case data collection or the nature-nurture debate) rather than writing descriptively about the study. Candidates need to make three separate points in **(c)** and to include evidence from the studies for each to gain full marks.

General comments

Some candidates provided a range of strong answers to many of the questions and could explain psychological terminology well showing they had prepared well for this paper.

Time management was good for the majority of candidates. Some candidates wrote overly long answers to **Question 3(b) or 4(b)** and wrote much shorter answers for **3(c) or 4(c)** as a result. Candidates need to ensure they have enough time to answer all questions to the best of their ability.

Candidates are required to answer one of the two questions for **Section B**. When a candidate answered both question they were awarded the mark for the best of the two (**Question 3** or **Question 4**), but often did not score high marks. Candidates must ensure they answer the correct number of questions.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to **Section A** as there is no choice with these questions. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in **(c)** of their **Section B** essays to achieve the higher marks available. **Question 3** was more popular than **Question 4** and tended to be answered to a higher standard.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) The majority of candidates could access some marks for this question usually by stating one participant, longitudinal in nature and it being in depth. Candidates could access more marks by including additional features of a case study such as qualitative/quantitative data or that the participant may well be unique. However, a large minority of candidates wrote evaluation points here that could not gain credit or wrote about how the little Hans case study was run by Freud.
- (b) There was a wide variety of ideas given by candidates on how to examine the Oedipus complex using self report techniques. Many candidates appropriately chose a sample of males only although some chose to use mixed sex samples which could only gain partial credit. Candidates were able to outline the 'how' (questionnaire or interview) and the 'where' (e.g. home or school). Candidates needed to refer to the 'what' (the actual questions that could be asked) to gain marks in the top band. There were a minority of unethical studies (usually intrusive questions being asked of the children) that scored limited marks – candidates must think like a professional psychologist when designing these studies.
- (c) Many candidates could highlight one or two evaluative points about their own study from (b). Common points made were about the sample used, the unethical nature of a study about unconscious but personal information and how the data were collected. Some candidates made a series of brief points linked to their own design to gain more marks. Some candidates evaluated aspects generically they needed to link them specifically to their own study in order to gain higher marks.

Question 2

- (a) Some candidates were able to clearly describe the social approach and gained full marks. Other candidates needed to refer to the group/group interactions in order to gain higher marks.
- (b) Many candidates could provide a qualitative finding from the Piliavin et al. study. Common responses included detailed results about the frequency of helping in the two main conditions. Candidates would have benefitted from relating the finding back to a cost-benefit analysis of the situation that Piliavin et al. created in the carriage to gain higher marks.
- (c) Many candidates gained some credit. Some candidates evaluated the Piliavin et al. study in general terms and these answers needed to include clear points linked to the social approach in general in order to gain credit. Many candidates could give some strengths and weaknesses of the social approach but needed to use the Piliavin et al. study as examples of these strengths and weaknesses to gain credit.
- (d) Some candidates gave excellent answers comparing the social approach to another approach using examples of studies throughout, with clear comparisons, gaining high marks. Other candidates were able to describe the social approach and one other approach in some detail but needed to include direct comparisons for higher marks.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) Many candidates were able to make reference to at least one aspect of the cognitive approach (e.g. information processing) with an example, to score full marks.
- (b) This question was answered well, as candidates could pick out the necessary aspects of each study that showed how data were collected. Specific details about each study in terms of the actual data were needed to gain full marks per study. The responses related to the Loftus and Pickrell study were less strong than those related to the other studies. They tended to focus more on the initial set up of the study rather than the data collection from the interview onwards. Many candidates could name at least two of the tests that the kittens underwent in the Held and Hein study, showing very good knowledge of the study. The Mann et al. study was covered well with

many candidates being able to pick out three or four of the behaviours that were being observed. Some candidates gave very long answers here, covering all of the study, which would have benefited from a focus on the question set.

- (c) Some answers were brief which could indicate that candidates were not well prepared or that they had run out of time to write a more detailed response. Many candidates could outline some problems like ethics and ecological validity, and some then used a study to elaborate on the problem. A few candidates related studies to all disadvantages to gain full marks. Some candidates repeated the same points which limited the marks available. This was particularly common with ethical issues.

Question 4

- (a) Candidates appeared to know the nature-nurture debate very well.
- (b) Candidates appeared to know the three studies well, with Baron-Cohen et al. the least known of the three. A good proportion of candidates were able to demonstrate how each of these studies supported one side of the debate. For the Bandura et al. study, candidates were able to show how one side of the debate was supported using clear examples from the study itself. Candidates appeared well prepared for the Langlois et al. study too and knew which side of the debate was supported. Baron-Cohen et al. was the weakest for this question with many candidates simply writing out the whole procedure and then stating that it supported the nature side with little or no explanation. There are candidates who give very long answers here that cover all of the study rather than having a focus on the question set.
- (c) Some answers were brief which could indicate that candidates were not well prepared or that they had run out of time to write a more detailed response. Many candidates could outline at least one advantage and this tended to be about usefulness. Only a minority of candidates could make three separate points and fewer could relate all to a study in order to gain full marks per point made. As with 3(c), some candidates made the same point several times using different studies (especially about usefulness) but this could still only score full marks for one well made point with evidence.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/23
Core Studies 2

Key messages

Section A

Question 1

It is important that candidates are aware of the issues in psychology as some were unable to define the observation method in **(a)**. Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in **(b)**. Extended evaluative points that make direct reference to the alternative idea are necessary in **(c)** to achieve full marks.

Question 2

It is important that candidates practice answering these types of questions. Many did not structure their responses appropriately and this limited their marks. For example, if the question asks for strengths and weaknesses then four points must be made (two strengths and two weaknesses). Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks.

Section B

Candidates would benefit from writing more extended responses in both **(b)** and **(c)** of the essay as many gave accurate responses that lacked sufficient depth. Evidence must be given in **(c)** to achieve higher marks.

General comments

Some candidates provided good answers which showed that they had prepared well and they consistently referred to the evidence in order to achieve high marks.

Time management for this paper was good for most candidates and most were able to finish the paper.

Only one or two candidates answered both questions in the **Section B** essay. When a candidate did this they were awarded the mark for the best of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**), but often did not score high marks. Candidates must ensure they answer the correct number of questions.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to the questions in **Section A** where there is no choice of question. In addition to this, candidates must include evidence in **(c)** of their **Section B** essays to achieve higher marks. **Question 3** was the more popular choice of question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a)** Most candidates could achieve marks for this question. Many described the Veale and Riley study instead of the observational method. A number of candidates believed this study had observations in it when it is a self report study where the participants describe their mirror gazing sessions.

No credit was given to strengths and weaknesses of the observational method.

- (b) Most candidates correctly described an observation. Some chose to do their study in the lab and many chose to do this study in the field.

There were many interesting and creative alternative ideas given by candidates for the Veale and Riley study. Many described research where some type of interaction was going on that involved looking in mirrors. Some set up cameras in the home or filmed participants getting ready for a night out. Most candidates focused their response on briefly describing how the observation would be carried out and what data would be collected. Most did not include the other details required such as where the study would take place and who the participants would be. In addition, the candidates need to ensure the 'what' and 'how' for the procedure are sufficiently clear. A tally chart of observed behaviour would have been helpful.

Some candidates included evaluation of their idea, which could not be credited in this question.

- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved marks by providing some evaluative points. Most were able to give practical and some methodological issues in their response.

Many discussed issues surrounding whether the participants knew they were being observed and some described issues with the sample or practical problems in setting up the study.

A few gave well developed points that achieved very high marks as they referred directly to their alternative idea. A few candidates could have improved their responses by identifying issues in further detail and referring back to the context of their own study.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates achieved some marks. Most were able to define both nature and nurture although some candidates needed to label their definitions.
- (b) Most candidates achieved some marks. They were able to give a general conclusion from the study about imitation of aggression and some were able to give a specific example of a result that showed nurture. Candidates needed to explain why this finding supported the nurture side of the debate to achieve higher marks.
- (c) The majority of candidates achieved some marks. Some evaluated the Bandura et al. study but needed to link this to the nature-nurture debate. Many were only able to describe one appropriate strength and weakness so limited marks were available. Some did not refer to the Bandura et al. study or needed to expand the detail given. Candidates need to describe two strengths and two weaknesses to achieve the higher marks.
- (d) This question was not answered well. Most candidates gave a purely descriptive answer of the finding of the study. They needed to link this to understanding everyday life and the applications of the research to achieve higher marks.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates were able to give a brief definition of the social approach and achieved some marks.
- (b) All candidates achieved some marks but needed to increase the level of detail to gain higher marks. Some candidates gave a strong description of the procedure of the study but needed to expand on how the data was collected. Most were able to describe the Piliavin et al. study and the observers on the train. Some were also able to describe the types of behaviours that were measured by these observers (e.g. time taken to help, gender/race of the helper, etc.). Candidates were able to gain some marks for the Milgram study by describing the measure of how far up the shock generator the participants went before they withdrew. Some were also able to describe the qualitative data of the participants' behaviours during the study. Candidates were less able to describe the Tajfel study well but a few gave a brief description of the matrices completed by the boys in the study.

- (c) Many candidates could identify at least one advantage of the social approach. Some were able to identify two or three ideas but needed to provide evidence to consolidate their points.

Question 4

- (a) Fewer candidates attempted this question than **Question 3**. Some candidates would have benefitted by expanding their definition of the physiological approach or providing additional detail.
- (b) This question was not well answered. Many could give general descriptions of some of the procedures of the studies but needed to include description of the physiological processes investigated.
- (c) For this question, candidates need to identify and discuss three problems with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many were able to describe one or two problems such as the issues with generalisability and ecological validity. Many needed to link their responses to a study to achieve higher marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/31

The Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 8 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should appreciate that this is a three-hour examination and so it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (parts **(a)** and **(b)**) should take approximately 45–50 minutes and be at least four sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to respond to ensure that all parts of the question can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between describe and suggest for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will not achieve full marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for Papers 1 and 2 not only to studies learned for Paper 3, but also to form the basis of their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

Section A

A number of modifications to examination technique could improve marks:

- Writing an amount appropriate to the marks allocated. If a description of two studies is needed for 4 marks, the allocation of marks is 2 + 2, whereas if a description of one study is required for 4 marks, then the same amount in total should be written as for the 2 + 2 format.
- Writing an amount equivalent to 4 marks and not 8 or 12 marks. Although there were many answers that were too short, there were also many answers that were just as long as **Section B** essays.

Section B

Question **(a)**: There were some excellent summaries of content that covered an appropriate range of studies.

Question **(b)**: Candidates need to ensure they know the difference between 'describe' and 'evaluate'. **Section B** question **(a)** is 'describe' and question **(b)** is 'evaluate'. Evaluation is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about the evidence that has been described in **(a)**. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and apply rather than reproduce learning.

Evaluation by candidates can often be divided into three types:

- those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (these candidates score the highest marks);
- those who focus exclusively on the one named issue and gain limited marks, because one issue is not a range (as required by the mark scheme), and those who exclude the named issue altogether (who also gain limited marks);
- those who do not evaluate at all (and score no marks) merely describing more information.

For candidates of the first type, answers could be improved further by clarifying what they write. For example, a candidate might write 'disruptive behaviour is reliable' and 'disruptive behaviour is valid', both of which have little meaning. Explanation demonstrates understanding and that a candidate has taken time to think about what is written. This is preferable to reproduction of descriptive detail.

Section C

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. Candidates must know the difference between the two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. A suggestion is to go beyond description and to think about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. A suggestion is not something that can be learned beforehand. It requires candidates to think for themselves during the examination.

When a question asks candidates to use a specific method, then that method must be used. Some candidates start with 'I will conduct an experiment' and write nothing further about the IV or DV or controls or apply a design (repeated measures, for example). These are essential features of an experiment and should be included.

Candidates should show their methodological knowledge because many marks can be gained for application of this knowledge in this section.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a) Many candidates gave a common-sense explanation of the term 'need for achievement', but for higher marks needed to show evidence of psychological knowledge either by giving an explanation using psychological terminology or by giving an example of a study that has investigated need for achievement. The work of McClelland would have been appropriate.
- (b) Most candidates answers were not strong, despite the syllabus stating: 'McClelland (1953) need for achievement and need to avoid failure'. Candidates are advised to ensure that every aspect of the syllabus is covered because every aspect of it will appear on an examination at some point. What was most commonly written about was Maslow and his hierarchy of needs. In order to score any marks at all for this, candidates needed to relate it to education (as this is the education option) and they needed to focus on Maslow's 'esteem need' rather than writing about his physiological and safety needs.

Question 2

- (a) A wide range of answers was written. Stronger answers looked at the different types of intelligence such as the traditional 'IQ' type and alternatives such as those proposed by Goleman, Sternberg and Gardner. Also included was a description of the different ways in which intelligence has been measured and for some candidates, a brief history was added, going back to the first intelligence test devised by Binet. Some candidates included some of these features, but could have improved with additional detail and greater accuracy. A small number of answers were restricted to IQ tests and needed to be expanded to access higher marks.
- (b) The named evaluation issue here was reliability and candidates should have included this as one of their range of evaluation issues. Some of those who included this issue wrote answers that showed a lack of understanding. Inter-rater reliability applies to observations and not psychometric tests. Most applicable here is test-retest reliability. A number of candidates correctly considered other issues and these included nature-nurture, determinism and reductionism, for example.

Question 3

- (a) This question asked candidates to assess the reliability and validity of the Approaches to Study Inventory (ASI). Candidates need to ensure they understand the terms reliability and validity and know how they are used in research. In relation to a questionnaire (such as the ASI), reliability can be determined using test-retest where participants are tested and then tested again a few weeks later. If the result is the same or very similar then the test is said to be reliable. Inter-rater reliability applies to observations and is not applicable to a questionnaire. Validity can be assessed by comparing the measure to an existing measure and if the result is the same, then the test can be said to be valid, measuring what it claims.

- (b) Some candidates could say little more than 'it measures learning' while other candidates were able to demonstrate detailed knowledge and understanding, and were able to provide specific detail about the categories, the scales and the number of items the ASI has.

Question 4

- (a) Candidates needed to know about a behavioural technique that they could apply to a child failing to participate in a school activity. A few candidates made inappropriate suggestions, such as 'give antidepressants' or 'use flooding', but most made appropriate suggestions based on either classical conditioning (such as systematic desensitisation) or operant conditioning (such as use of effective praise).
- (b) This question part asked candidates to describe the psychology on which their part (a) answer was based, and many candidates were able to describe mainly classical but also operant conditioning. The case of little Albert featured prominently as Albert formed associations (as in the case of the fear of swimming) which led to the avoidant behaviour.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

- (a) Most candidates scored full marks. Answers often included a mention of measurement, and of children, and most gave an example to support their answer. An explanation was required, and candidates could have demonstrated this by giving a supporting example. This need not be detailed; a sentence can be sufficient to show that the candidate has appropriate psychological knowledge. Many candidates used the Varni and Thompson study as an example.
- (b) Most candidates scored full marks. Candidates chose to describe one of two types of measure: the 'choose a face' approach to describe the amount of pain a child has (e.g. the Children's comprehensive pain questionnaire); or the 'colour a box' approach such as done in the Varni and Thompson Paediatric Pain Questionnaire. Candidates could improve the strength of their answer by the amount of detail and the accuracy of the description.

Question 6

- (a) Many candidates could have improved their answers by using theory and knowledge rather than common sense. Some good answers began with a look at definitions and causes of accidents. Following this many candidates considered different explanations such as the illusion of invulnerability, cognitive overload, and various 'personality' features such as age, introversion/extraversion and the concept of accident prone personality. A number of candidates completed the range of syllabus bullet points by writing about how accidents could be reduced and safety behaviour improved.
- (b) A small number of candidates approached the named issue well, contrasting not only the theory A/theory B explanation but also the introvert versus extrovert difference. Some candidates only considered the named issue, but the majority attempted more than one issue, as needed to higher marks. Other issues included were reductionism, determinism and sometimes a consideration of different methodologies used to gain evidence was included.

Question 7

- (a) Most candidates decided to give people already at a health centre or hospital a questionnaire, which was rewarded. However, answers needed to include the methodological knowledge involved with questionnaires and needed to follow the investigation through to its logical conclusion. Candidates often suggested questions that could be asked, but needed to specify what type of data would be gathered or how this data could be analysed to determine whether people have a good or a poor knowledge of medical terms.
- (b) A few candidates described a non-verbal study (such as that by McKinstry and Wang) in error, but most candidates correctly described a verbal study. Some candidates described the work of McKinlay in detail, others the work of Ley, and some candidates described the work of both. Any of these three strategies was acceptable. Strong answers, that showed good understanding and had sufficient detail, achieved full marks.

Question 8

- (a) Some candidates suggested giving out a questionnaire when a patient attends the heart clinic, and within such answers candidates realised that patients may not tell the truth and so started to criticise their own suggestion. Rather than the patient themselves completing a questionnaire, a member of the family who lives with the patient could do it, giving more insight and accurate information on the reasons for non-adherence.
- (b) A number of candidates gave anecdotal reasons, such as 'cannot afford the medicine', which gained limited marks. Other candidates gave reasons using psychological terminology such as rational non-adherence. Answers using terminology are preferable to anecdotal because such answers show the candidate's knowledge of psychology. Some candidates quoted appropriate studies, for rational non-adherence, most frequently the study by Bulpitt.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

- (a) Most candidates scored full marks. Candidates typically wrote that 'personal space is the invisible boundary that surrounds us'. Many mentioned Edward Hall's zones but crucial for invasion are the negative cognitions and affect experienced by an individual when space is invaded.
- (b) Most candidates scored very high marks. Descriptions of the study by Middlemist et al. were most common, with the study by Fisher and Byrne featuring too. Many candidates could have benefited from restricting the amount of detail in the description given, to give an amount appropriate for a 4 mark question.

Question 10

- (a) There were some strong answers and many achieved full marks. These answers included a range of information from different points of the syllabus, had depth, detail and showed organisation. Some candidates could have benefited from restricting the amount of detail in the description given, to give an amount appropriate for an 8 mark question. Many candidates could have gained more marks by summarising the detail in their answers allowing them to show more understanding of the topic area. Making the distinction between theory and evidence/study more explicit is also a desirable distinction to make.
- (b) Some candidates only considered the usefulness of laboratory experiments and needed to go beyond the named issue for higher marks. These answers showed ability and understanding when comparing laboratory with field experiments and simulations and strong answers commonly mentioned the laboratory experiment performed by Mintz. Strong answers also considered other issues which were dealt with in an equally effective and efficient way. Some answers could have benefitted from evaluating in a more effective way, rather than evaluating study-by-study or by only evaluating the named issue. The most effective strategy to maximise marks is to organise an answer by evaluation issues using studies as examples (see general comments).

Question 11

- (a) Many candidates wrote excellent answers, showing all the necessary skills and linking appropriate methodology with knowledge about the Mozart effect. Some candidates needed to address the specific factors that are included in a laboratory experiment and needed to use their knowledge of the experimental method, e.g. IVs, DVs and controls to gain higher marks.
- (b) Whilst many candidates knew about research on music and performance, most commonly illustrated by the 'Mozart effect', a significant number of candidates wrote about the effect of music on health or consumer behaviour. Candidates need to ensure they answer the question set, in this case to focus on the effect of music on performance, to gain marks. Candidates are advised to cover everything that appears on the syllabus because it will be examined at some point.

Question 12

- (a) Candidates needed to demonstrate experimental knowledge in their design of a field experiment to gain marks. One candidate proposed having coffee smells at the entrance for a week and then no smell at all for week (the IV). Controls included doing it for all seven days of the week and keeping other variables constant wherever possible. The DV would then be the number of people entering the researcher's shop during the 'coffee smell' week compared with the control week. This simple design answered the question well, used appropriate terminology and as a result the answer scored a high mark.
- (b) Research on shopping mall atmospherics is an increasingly popular area for research as more people are realising that small things can increase sales figures significantly. It includes lighting, smell, use of colour, design of shop, and also music that might be played. One such study that appears on the syllabus is that by Michon et al. who focused on ambient odour. Many candidates described the Michon et al. study very well, and a few others looked at the role of music which was also credited.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) Some candidates did not read the question and missed the word 'model' or they did not know what a model of abnormality was. Candidates need to ensure they read the question fully. A model of abnormality is a collection of assumptions about how abnormality is caused and treated, and examples are the medical, psychodynamic and behavioural models. Many candidates did address the question and scored full marks, but others wrote about definitions of abnormality such as 'deviation from social norms', 'deviation from ideal mental health', etc., rather than models.
- (b) Some candidates provided a description of a model rather than answering the question set, and need to ensure they read the question fully. Candidates providing correct answers wrote about the study by Rosenhan, or the Freud's little Hans study, and some candidates wrote about Thigpen and Cleckley's 'Eve'. The study by Watson on little Albert was not about defining or diagnosing because Watson caused a phobia in little Albert.

Question 14

- (a) This was not answered well by those candidates who gave purely common sense answers on knowledge of addictions. Strong answers began with a definition, most candidates using that by Griffiths. Explanations for addictions were considered, and a good range was evident, including genetic, biochemical and behavioural. Strong answers also included ways in which addictions and impulse control disorders can be managed. All of this was often supported with relevant psychological evidence.
- (b) A number of candidates only considered the named issue of 'nature versus nurture' and needed to consider other issues to gain higher marks. Other candidates mentioned a number of issues but repeated the same points because they took a 'study-by-study' approach. The best approach is 'issue-by-issue' with studies only being used to support evaluation issues. Strong answers considered a number of different issues (including the named issue), presented advantages and disadvantages of each and used studies to support the advantage or disadvantage being presented.

Question 15

- (a) Many candidates need to increase their knowledge of research methodology, and if the basics of the main five methods were covered, candidates would be able to apply that methodology whatever question is set and as a result score some good marks. In this instance candidates had to use an interview. Most candidates believed that simply 'talking to Joe' would be sufficient, without detail of the questions they might ask or how they might ask them. An ideal answer might be: 'I would use a semi-structured interview which would allow me to ask a number of important things but also the flexibility to ask questions as they arise'. This would show that a basic methodological knowledge is being applied to a specific situation and would improve the marks awarded.

- (b) There are a number of different explanations of phobias which include behavioural, psychoanalytic, biomedical and cognitive. This question focused on the cognitive explanation and the syllabus lists the study by DiNardo et al. This study highlights that the same behavioural experience (being bitten by a dog) results in different interpretations: 'all dogs will bite so I'll fear all dogs'; or 'this is a one off, and all other dogs are fine'. Strong answers showed good understanding of this cognitive explanation. A few candidates described a behavioural explanation and scored no marks.

Question 16

- (a) As compulsions are behavioural, observation is the most appropriate method to find out whether a person has compulsions. A participant observation would be a possibility or to use CCTV to gather data about the person. Most candidates needed to make sure they stated what they would be looking for as the observation took place. For example, was the compulsion about washing, checking or some other compulsion; what was the frequency of the behaviour and at what point would the frequency be categorised as compulsive. Candidates needed to include more detail about the methodology applied to a specific situation to access higher marks.
- (b) Most candidates wrote about the case of Charles, studied by Rappoport, as identified in the syllabus. There were many excellent descriptions and many candidates scored full marks. A small number of candidates thought that little Hans had OCD (obsessed with his mother), but he did not.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

- (a) Nearly all candidates scored marks, many scored full marks, explaining that the universalist theory of leadership is about leaders who are born rather than made, and the Great Man/Woman theory is about the personal qualities that make a person a leader.
- (b) A number of candidates could go no further than the common-sense 'it is about the interaction between a leader than followers', for which limited marks were available. Most candidates went beyond this, some describing 'vertical dyad linkage' and the 'individualised leadership model' showing a more thorough understanding of the relationships between a leader (or manager) and workers.

Question 18

- (a) Answers to this question were often nothing more than a list of common-sense factors, for example, writing that the temperature should not be too hot or cold, or the lighting being too bright or dim. These points needed elaboration and supporting evidence to access marks. Strong answers referred to psychological studies on a range of physical work conditions but the best answers considered a range of psychological factors in work conditions such as privacy and crowding. Temporal work conditions were also considered.
- (b) Evaluation and discussion could have included, for example, was the evidence about work conditions gathered in a laboratory and applied to the work setting (and so related to the issue of ecological validity) or was evidence gathered by field experiment and observation (as in the original study leading to the Hawthorne effect). Other issues needed to be considered in order for candidates to access higher marks, and strong answers did this, applying their discussion skills with good effect.

Question 19

- (a) Some candidates did not know what a performance appraisal was and so could not attempt to suggest how they could be improved. Performance appraisal is a syllabus bullet point and so candidates should have answers already prepared for this type of question. Many other candidates considered two of the large number of possible biases and suggested quite appropriately that the appraisal process could be improved by removing these biases.

- (b) Knowledge of the methodology of interviews was important here. For example, candidates needed to choose a structured, semi-structured or unstructured interview (or formal/informal), giving reasons for the choice. They also needed to outline where and how the interview would be carried out, for example, whether it should be face-to-face or not, and in what setting it would take place. A logical setting would be a manager's office to show the importance to a worker if a worker's performance needed to be improved. Having a basic knowledge of the most-used methods would improve candidates' answers.

Question 20

- (a) Candidates needed to use a questionnaire to address this question, and answers varied from those who knew nothing more than a questionnaire includes questions, to those who wrote about a full range of features of questionnaires. Such candidates mentioned the type of questionnaire (open or closed), examples of questions, how the questions were to be answered (forced choice or Likert-type scale), how the answers were coded and scored and some even wrote about the type of data gathered. Some candidate needed to demonstrate how happiness was to be assessed, and to include reference to job rotation as this was the question set.
- (b) Nearly all candidates scored some marks by identifying job rotation, enlargement or enrichment, and many scored full marks by providing more detail about two of these. A number of candidates made the useful distinction that job rotation involves no change in responsibility or involvement whereas enlargement and enrichment do.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/32

The Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth 2 marks should be short and an answer worth 8 marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should appreciate that this is a three-hour examination and so it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (parts **(a)** and **(b)**) should take approximately 45–50 minutes and be at least four sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts of the question can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between describe and suggest for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will not achieve top marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for Papers 1 and 2 not only to studies learned for Paper 3, but also to form the basis of their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

Section A

A number of modifications to examination technique could improve marks:

- Writing an amount appropriate to the marks allocated. If a description of two studies is needed for 4 marks, the allocation of marks is 2 + 2, whereas if a description of one study is required for 4 marks, then the same amount in total should be written as for the 2 + 2 format.
- Writing an amount equivalent to 4 marks and not 8 or 12 marks. Although there were many answers that were too short, there were also many answers that were just as long as **Section B** essays.

Section B

Question **(a)**: There were some excellent summaries of content that covered an appropriate range of studies.

Question **(b)**: Candidates need to ensure they know the difference between 'describe' and 'evaluate'. **Section B** question **(a)** is 'describe' and question **(b)** is 'evaluate'. Evaluation is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about the evidence that has been described in **(a)**. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and apply rather than reproduce learning.

Evaluation by candidates can often be divided into three types:

- those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (these candidates score the highest marks);
- those who focus exclusively on the one named issue and gain limited marks, because one issue is not a range (as required by the mark scheme), and those who exclude the named issue altogether (who also gain limited marks);
- those who do not evaluate at all (and score no marks) merely describing more information.

For many candidates of the first type, answers could be improved further by clarifying what they write. For example, a candidate might write 'disruptive behaviour is reliable' and 'disruptive behaviour is valid', both of which have little meaning. Explanation demonstrates understanding and that a candidate has taken time to think about what is written. This is preferable to reproduction of descriptive detail.

Section C

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. Candidates must know the difference between the two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. A suggestion is to go beyond description and to think about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. A suggestion is not something that can be learned beforehand. It requires candidates to think for themselves during the examination.

When a question asks candidates to use a specific method, then that method must be used. Candidates often start with 'I will conduct an experiment' and write nothing further about the IV or DV or controls or apply a design (repeated measures, for example). These are essential features of an experiment and should be included.

Candidates should show their methodological knowledge because many marks can be gained for application of this knowledge in this section.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a) Candidates needed to address the term 'cognitive application' rather than 'cognitive approach'. Those candidates who did address the question specifically frequently scored full marks with a brief explanation and a reference to an example to add to the explanation.
- (b) Many candidates were able to describe a cognitive application to education very successfully, scoring high marks. The work of Vygotsky was most commonly quoted, with good explanations of his zones and how scaffolding can help a child to learn. Some candidates mistakenly wrote about the humanistic co-operative learning and a few wrote about the behavioural applications. If the application was not cognitive then no marks could be awarded.

Question 2

- (a) A wide range of answers were written with marks covering the entire mark range. Better answers looked at the different types of disruptive behaviour, such as attention-seeking, being out-of-seat, bullying, and generally disrupting both the teacher and other candidates. Answers then considered the various reasons for such behaviours before writing about both corrective and preventive strategies for controlling inappropriate behaviour. Many answers were clearly based on psychological knowledge, evident by the names (and dates) quoted, whereas others were more anecdotal, with candidates describing what sometimes happened in their own classroom.
- (b) The named evaluation issue here was to contrast corrective with preventive strategies and candidates should have included this as one of their range of evaluation issues. A few candidates did not know the difference between description and evaluation and chose to *describe* the two strategies in this question part rather than in part (a). Candidates are reminded to ensure they know the difference between description and evaluation. Strong answers considered a range of issues, the more impressive ones comparing the different approaches to disruptive behaviour such as contrasting the humanist with the behaviourist.

Question 3

- (a) Candidates needed to demonstrate their knowledge of an experiment as a specific method. A simple experiment should have an independent variable, a design, controls and a dependent variable. Some candidates wrote very good answers that were full of appropriate methodological knowledge and which showed good understanding of how their suggestion would investigate the question posed.
- (b) Some candidates chose to describe the causes and effects of dyslexia and others chose attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Those choosing dyslexia focused more on the effects ('b' and 'd' being transposed, etc.) whilst those choosing ADHD often focused more on the causes (which may be genetic or due to chemical imbalance).

Question 4

- (a) Candidates here had to use a questionnaire, and answers varied from those who knew nothing more than this method included questions, to those who wrote about a full range of features of questionnaires. Such candidates mentioned the type of questionnaire (open or closed), examples of questions, how the questions were to be answered (forced choice or Likert-type scale), how the answers were coded and scored and some even wrote about the type of data gathered. A few candidates mentioned both reliability and validity, but candidates need to improve their use of these terms. The very best answers showed a good awareness of the different types of intelligence, often using Gardner's multiple intelligences for a basis to assess the most dominant intelligence.
- (b) Some candidates simply listed a number of different types of intelligences, but brief answers scored limited marks, further detail was needed for higher marks. Better answers included more detail, expanding on the basic type by describing 'intra-personal intelligence', for example, and covered the full range of different types.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

- (a) An 'individual' error results in an accident where the cause is the person themselves. This is different from where an accident results from a fault in a system. Reason (2000) distinguishes between Theory A (cause due to individual) and Theory B (cause due to system). Most candidates scored some marks by making a correct statement, but candidates needed to elaborate to score full marks.
- (b) Candidates should always seek to quote psychological knowledge in their answers. When asked to give an example of an 'individual' error many candidates gave a typical anecdote of 'when a person puts the brake on their car too late'. While this is correct, it will gain limited marks, and needs elaboration or evidence of psychological knowledge, to gain higher marks. Some candidates wrote about the illusion of invulnerability and after describing it, used the example of the captain of the Titanic who falsely believed that his ship was unsinkable. Answers like this scored the full marks. Similar answers and marks were given for the 'system' error.

Question 6

- (a) There was a significant number of excellent answers. Most candidates began with a definition and then considered the early work of Selye (which was often described in too much detail). Candidates then considered a range of different causes of stress, such as work, lack of control, life events, personality type and daily hassles. Often each of these was supported with a relevant study. Candidates then considered ways in which stress could be measured, with both physiological and psychological measures being considered. Some candidates then went on to look at ways in which stress could be managed. There were many answers that were very long and detailed.
- (b) A few candidates continued to describe stress, but needed to evaluate to gain marks. Some answers only evaluated self reports and some answers evaluated but did not mention self reports, for which limited marks were available. Strong answers considered a range of issues, such as reductionism, reliability, quantitative and qualitative data and determinism.

Question 7

- (a) Candidates must answer the question that is set. Some answers did not involve the use of a questionnaire, and some answers focused on adherence rather than delay in seeking treatment, which limited marks available. Other candidates correctly used a questionnaire and often showed good methodological knowledge in describing the type of questionnaire and giving examples of questions that could be asked. Strong answers showed good understanding when linking examples of questions to the topic area of delay in seeking treatment.

- (b) The syllabus includes two ways in which people who have hypochondriasis or Munchausen syndrome misuse health services, although candidates could use appropriate examples of their own. Descriptions of hypochondriasis and of Munchausen syndrome were often very good, and gained full marks. Often the study by Aleem and Ajarim was quoted in support of the answer. Some candidates wrote about Munchausen syndrome by proxy which was also acceptable.

Question 8

- (a) A number of candidates described the Tapper et al. study, which did not answer the question set and marks were not available for this. The best answers conducted a community study and used appropriate techniques such as fear arousal and providing information to get the message across. Some candidates referred to the Yale model of communication, but sometimes described it rather than applied it to this specific question.
- (b) Some candidates wrote about longitudinal studies instead of a snapshot study, for instance Tapper et al. or the study by Walters on diet in children. Similarly, most workplace and community studies such as the three community study by Farquhar et al., are longitudinal. Many candidates wrote about the Janis and Feshbach (1953) study or the Leventhal et al. (1967) study and some answers scored full marks for detailed descriptions and the quality of answer.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

- (a) Most candidates correctly wrote about urban living, but many failed to mention health. Candidates should ensure that they write about all aspects of the question, particularly when the syllabus makes the distinction between urban living and 'health' and 'social behaviour'.
- (b) Some answers stated the obvious, writing that 'we adapt' or 'we can get overloaded' whereas those candidates scoring higher marks simply described explanations using psychological terminology. Adaptation level for example, suggests that each individual can tolerate differing amounts of stimulation and so adapts to the environment by regulating the amount of stimulation he or she receives.

Question 10

- (a) There were some excellent answers on environmental cognition and many answers achieved full marks. Strong answers included a range of information from this topic area, including definitions and measures, animal studies and way-finding. These answers had depth and detail, and were very well organised. Some candidates were able to summarise information effectively and include a lot of creditworthy material without an overly long response.
- (b) Some candidates included excellent discussion on the issue of generalising from animals to humans, some even debating whether it is useful to study animals at all, and others showed thought when comparing animal studies with human studies. Strong answers correctly included this as just one of a number of issues, as required for higher marks. Some candidates did not include the animals issue and some did not include any evaluation. Candidates may benefit from spending more time thinking about and planning these evaluations.

Question 11

- (a) This question was misinterpreted by a small number of candidates who wrote about density rather than crowding. A number of candidates did not include details of the experiment as a method with variables and controls, more methodological knowledge needed to be shown. Some candidates did use a field experiment method appropriately and suggested two conditions where density was slowly increased in one group but not the other. Over a period of time the animals in both groups could be observed or tested to determine any differences between the two.
- (b) Candidates should read the question carefully and answer the question that is set, as a number wrote about the laboratory study by Calhoun and weren't able to score marks. A description of a non-laboratory study was required. The studies by Dubos on lemmings and by Christian et al. on deer are both non-laboratory and were often very well described by candidates.

Question 12

- (a) A number of candidates suggested using CCTV and then analysing the data. Other candidates suggested doing a covert observation and simply recording the number of people invading or respecting the territory. A detailed knowledge of observations would have improved some answers. For example, few candidates suggested using response categories, as used in the study by Bandura et al. for example, and applied here candidates could record different categories to the observations to determine individual differences. A number of candidates suggested that 'I would use inter-rater reliability' but were unable to give further detail to support this point.
- (b) Most candidates were able to describe the three types of territory outlined by Altman. Strong answers had a high level of detail and included the use of examples.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) Most candidates scored full marks for this question, by clearly explaining the term, and including an example. A few candidates mistakenly wrote about types of schizophrenia, such as catatonic, and did not answer the question set.
- (b) Most candidates were able to answer the question and score full marks. A few wrote unbalanced answers, describing one explanation in detail and with a lack of detail for the other. Candidates should aim to write two answers of appropriate length for this type of question.

Question 14

- (a) Some candidates achieved full marks, including a wide range of detail that demonstrated they were well prepared. Strong answers included definitions, variations of OCD (checking, washing, etc.), measures (such as the Maudsley Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory), explanations, treatments, and the case study of Charles by Rapoport. Candidates scored limited marks trying to distinguish between an obsession and a compulsion, and some points were generalised and anecdotal. Candidates needed to cover a wider range of information, with more detail, and to show organisation and understanding in order to gain higher marks.
- (b) Some candidates considered both advantages and disadvantages of case studies using examples from the case study of Charles by Rapoport to support the points. Candidates should consider a range of issues, some strong answers did include a number of issues and gained high marks.

Question 15

- (a) Candidates needed to address the specific factors that are included in an experiment, i.e. IVs, DVs and controls. Many candidates wrote excellent answers, showing all the necessary skills and linking their methodological knowledge with knowledge about the topic area of depression.
- (b) Most candidates chose depression and mania and often provided excellent descriptions of the characteristics of each. Unipolar can be depression *or* mania whereas bipolar is depression *and* mania.

Question 16

- (a) Most candidates suggested using applied tension, a technique that is specifically for a blood phobia. Answers differed in quality and length. Many candidates suggested more than one technique and whilst some of these were appropriate, many were not. It is not appropriate to apply all treatments for phobias to blood phobia. Candidates should think through what they write carefully.
- (b) Strong answers described both cognitive and physiological symptoms and gave illustrative examples.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

- (a) This question caused many problems for candidates. There were those who appeared not to have studied 'cognitive' theories at all, and some could not explain beyond 'it is where people think about what they do'. Few candidates mentioned the VIE theory of Vroom as an example, despite this being the following question (b). While candidates knew the theory proposed by Vroom, they did not appear to know that it was a cognitive/rational theory.
- (b) Most candidates scored high marks, many describing very precise and accurate details of Vroom's theory. In most cases V, I and E were defined and the formula quoted: $M = E \times I \times V$ or motivation = expectancy \times instrumentality \times valence. The best answers provided an explanation of how the formula worked to determine motivation and this was often supported with an example. Answers which gave the formula alone scored limited marks.

Question 18

- (a) Some candidates scored very high marks, making a distinction between theories and research, considered leaders and followers (i.e. a whole range of relevant aspects from the syllabus) and used terminology, quoted research, and showed understanding in their answer. There were those who knew the relevant aspects to include and wrote very good answers, but failed to use relevant terms or quote relevant psychological research, writing generalised answers instead. Some candidates wrote nothing more than the Lewin et al. autocratic and democratic styles. Some candidates weren't able to show sufficient knowledge about leadership, writing anecdotally about the processes that they thought could be involved.
- (b) Candidates are advised to consider a range of evaluation issues (in addition to the named issue) in order to gain higher marks. The issue named was 'individual versus situational explanations', allowing candidates the easy distinction between universalist theories and behavioural/situational theories. Many provided very good discussions. Others appeared to have learned the information, but could apply it to this issue. A small number of candidates only considered this issue, candidates need to consider a range of evaluation issues, including the named issue, to gain higher marks.

Question 19

- (a) A number of candidates scored marks because they applied an appropriate method to investigate the success of team building exercises. Some of these candidates scored top marks because they had studied and applied their knowledge of team building to the method. To achieve full marks in any 'Suggest' question candidates need to apply knowledge about the topic area in question to an appropriate method to fully answer to the question set.
- (b) Some candidates followed the syllabus for group development and described either the work of Woodcock or Tuckman, or both. Typically candidates described Tuckman's stages of forming, storming, norming, performing and adjourning, with detailed descriptions gaining higher marks. Some candidates included topics other than group development, i.e. information on groupthink and group conflict, and should take care to answer the question set.

Question 20

- (a) Most candidates suggested using several methods, often beginning with an investigation to determine the people who are absent and then giving them a questionnaire or interview to determine the specific reasons. Some candidates were able to link the questions into reasons for job dissatisfaction and some suggested using a variety of published (psychometric) tests.
- (b) Most candidates chose to describe Herzberg's two factor theory and candidates merely identifying motivational factors and hygiene factors scored limited marks, whilst those providing detailed descriptions with supportive examples scored higher marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/33

The Specialist Choices

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