

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/11
Core Studies 1

Key messages

- 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.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts can be answered.
- Candidates should answer *both* parts of a question where there are two components and ensure both parts are then answered. **Question 6(b)** is a perfect illustration.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

This is the final time a November report will be written on this current syllabus. The revised syllabus is examined for the first time in June 2012 and crucially some of the core studies are different and the format of the **Section B** question is different. The revised version of the specification should be consulted for full details of what has changed.

Although the comments on specific questions below are written with this examination in mind, and so are the Key Messages, the comments generalise to all future examinations.

If there is one weakness in a significant majority of candidates it is that there is insufficient detail in their **Section A** answers. A little more detail across all questions in this section would increase the overall mark quite significantly. Questions asking for 'two things for 2 marks' and which begin with the word 'Identify' can have short answers, for example, **Questions 4(a), 5(a), 5(b), 6(a)** etc. However, most other questions, those beginning with the word 'Describe', must have more detail to score both available marks. For example **Question 12(a)** was 'Briefly describe the quantitative results of the experiment by Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin on subway Samaritans'. A correct answer would be '62/65 helped' but this will not score 2 marks out of 2. More detail is needed, some elaboration. If instead the answer was 'For frequency of helping 62/65 helped the ill victim spontaneously' then 2 marks out of 2 could be awarded without hesitation and this additional detail does not mean that answers will be too long and cause time pressures.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Candidates were asked, from experiment 1 by Loftus and Palmer, what the conditions of the independent variable were. Two aspects were crucial for full marks to be awarded here. Firstly, awareness was needed that it was the verb that was being manipulated, and secondly a knowledge of what two or more of those verbs actually were. Most candidates were able to do this successfully and achieve full marks.
- (b) From the same study the question asked: What was the dependent variable? As with question part (a) two features were required for two marks and these features could include 'estimation', 'speed' and 'miles per hour'. Again, most candidates were able to score full marks. Some candidates

confused experiment 1 and experiment 2 and referred to broken glass which earned them no marks.

Question 2

- (a) This question asked candidates: What is a cross-cultural study? This is where psychological phenomena are compared in people from more than one cultural background. 1 mark was given for a partial definition, whilst 2 marks were given for any expansion e.g. inclusion of the word 'comparison'.
- (b) This question asked candidates to describe the findings of one study included in the Deregowski review on picture perception. The answer could be anecdotal evidence (and include): Robert Laws, Mrs Fraser and 'other reports', all of which found cultural differences in the perception of pictures. The answer could be empirical: all the studies by Hudson (cube, two-pronged trident) and again all of which found cultural differences in the perception of pictures.

Question 3

This question provided candidates with a table of data and asked them to draw two conclusions from it. Some candidates were unable to do this, others rewrote the numbers in the table and yet others were able to provide two appropriate conclusions and provide the numbers to support their conclusions. Generally, all children answered the naming question correctly, all children answered the memory question correctly and all children answered the reality question correctly. Most autistic children answer the belief question incorrectly and most normal and Down Syndrome children answer the belief question correctly. This means that autistic children do not have a theory of mind.

Question 4

- (a) This question asked candidates to suggest two generalisations that could be drawn from the findings in the study by Samuel and Bryant on conservation. The three most logical generalisations were: the ability to conserve improves with age; asking only one question confuses children less than asking two questions; children conserve number and mass before volume. Whereas many candidates could provide two generalisations with little difficulty, other candidates did not know what a generalisation was and so scored no marks at all.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to suggest an implication that the findings (of the Samuel and Bryant study) have for teachers. Any appropriate suggestion arising from the study received credit. Some candidates suggested that a teacher should only teach particular things at particular ages (based on the number and volume findings) and other candidates suggested that a teacher should not ask the same question twice (because it might confuse a child).

Question 5

- (a) Candidates were asked to identify two items of equipment needed by Bandura et al. to conduct the study in the aggressive model condition. As this is a 'two things for two marks' type of question, answers could be brief with candidates having simply to identify correct items. Most candidates scored both available marks and typically included a 5' Bobo doll, a mallet, a table and chair and a tinker toy set.
- (b) Candidates were asked to identify two *different* items used to test the children in the observation room. Some candidates did not read the question and simply rewrote the part (a) answer, whilst others read the question and identified two different items from the following list of possibilities: a 3' Bobo doll, a mallet and peg board, two dart guns (or a dart gun), and a tetherball with a face painted on it. Also present in the observation room were non-aggressive items including a tea set, three bears, cars and trucks, plastic farm animals, a ball, crayons and colouring paper. One mark was allocated to each item correctly identified.

Question 6

- (a) This question part asked for, from the study by Freud, an outline of two features of little Hans' everyday environment. As two marks were allocated to the two features, each could be brief. For example, creditable answers included: little Hans was in his own home; Hans would do everyday features of normal life: eat, sleep, etc. and Hans would have around him his family: mother, father, sister, maid (and Dr A.).
- (b) This question part invited candidates to suggest one feature that may be an advantage for little Hans but a disadvantage for Freud. Many candidates answered only the first part (and occasionally only the second part) of this question. Maybe some candidates forgot that there were two components to be answered. Many candidates did score full marks and mentioned features like: Freud was not part of the normal everyday environment and any visit to the house could create demand characteristics, or that Freud could only talk to the father so information was not first hand and may have contained biases.

Question 7

- (a) From the study by Schachter and Singer on emotion the request was to give an example of the observation data that was gathered for the anger condition. This question required candidates to have a knowledge of the response categories of which there were six, and included: agrees, disagrees, neutral, initiates agreement or disagreement, watches or ignores. Some candidates wrote perfect answers and provided an example in addition to identifying a category. Other candidates appeared not to know that observation was involved in this study.
- (b) From the same study candidates had to give an example of the self report data that was gathered for the anger condition. As with part (a) some candidates appeared not to know that a self report was involved. Others quoted the question posed in the study 'How irritated, angry or annoyed would you say you feel at present?' They then went on to outline that a five-point scale was used ranging from 'I do not feel at all irritated or angry' through to 'I feel extremely irritated and angry'. Candidates with both these components scored full marks without any doubt.

Question 8

- (a) This question part required an outline of one way in which the self report method was used in the study by Dement and Kleitman on sleep and dreaming. One candidate provided the perfect answer when writing 'The self report method was used when the participant was awakened by the door bell and they had to state into a tape recorder whether they had been dreaming or not and, if they had, to recall the content of the dream. The self report could also involve the estimate of how long they had been dreaming for.'
- (b) Question part (b) required one way in which the observation method was used. The correct answer to this question was that when the participants are asleep the observers watched the EEG and when a participant is in REM or NREM they wake up the participant. There were also observations of vertical, horizontal eye movements.

Question 9

- (a) This question part wanted to know why the participants in the Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse study were asked to remain medication free for two weeks before the scan. Most candidates were able to score one mark by stating that any participant taking medication may produce an abnormal scan. Only a few went on to elaborate that the effect of taking any medication may confound the result of the study.
- (b) This question part wanted to know how Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse checked to see if the participants were medication free. The simple answer to this question was that, to quote the study, "urine screens at the time of PET scanning were negative for every murderer referred for study". As this was the only possible answer, two marks were awarded for stating 'urine test'. Many candidates scored 2 marks but many others scored no marks by suggesting that it was done by taking a sample of blood or by asking them.

Question 10

- (a) Candidates were invited to identify two features of the experimenter, from the study by Milgram, which may have led to obedience. Any two features were acceptable and each scored a single mark, meaning that identification was needed rather than a description. One feature was that the experimenter wore a grey laboratory coat to make the study appear more scientific. Another was that his manner was impassive and he was stern throughout. A third was that he tried to prevent withdrawal from the study by giving verbal prods. Any other appropriate answer received credit.
- (b) For this part candidates had to identify two features of the setting that may have led to obedience. Candidates found this question part to be slightly more difficult, but most were able to suggest that it was done at Yale University. Some candidates correctly suggested that there was more obedience because the teacher and the learner were in different rooms.

Question 11

- (a) From the study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo (prison simulation) candidates had to identify two features of the induction procedure that were true to real life. Candidates provided a very long list of different features and most of these answers scored two marks.
- (b) Candidates had to identify two features of the induction procedure that were **not** true to real life. As for part (a) candidates suggested a wide range of possibilities. Included were that the participants were deloused; made to wear a smock and no underwear; made to wear a stocking cap; and they had a chain attached to their ankle.

Question 12

- (a) Part (a) asked candidates to describe briefly the quantitative results of the experiment by Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin on subway Samaritans. The better answers gave a category and the result of it, such as the frequency of helping: spontaneous helping was given on 62/65 for the ill condition and on 19/38 occasions for the for drunk condition. An alternative way to score full marks was to give the data for more than one category. Any category of behaviour, for which there were numbers (i.e. quantitative data), was accepted.
- (b) Part (b) asked for a disadvantage of quantitative results. As always, those scoring just one mark wrote nothing more than 'it does not say why' when a little expansion could easily have led candidates to score both available marks.

Question 13

- (a) Following a quote, candidates were asked a question about what was found out about the children in relation to their friends. Quoting from the original study "even for these children there appears to be no relationship between doll preference and race of friends" – in other words whereas the black children chose the white dolls in preference to black dolls, 87% of them had black friends. Furthermore, 60% of white children had black friends. This finding appeared not to be known by most candidates.
- (b) This part asked for a suggestion of why Hraba and Grant looked at the relationship between children and their friends in addition to doll choice. They did this because doll choice is artificial (low in ecological validity) and may be due to the demand characteristics of the experiment. Friends are what the children may have in real life, so this provides a check on the results of the experiment. Whilst some candidates answered this correctly many candidates appeared not to know that any work had been done on friends of the children.

Question 14

- (a) From the Gould study, candidates were invited to outline one of the 'facts' that resulted from the testing. There were only three facts so marks were allocated according to the accuracy and amount of detail included in the answer. The three 'facts' were: the average mental age of white American adults was moron at 13; European immigrants could be graded by country of origin; and the Negro was at the bottom with an average mental age of 10.41.

- (b) Candidates were invited to give one example of social control that followed the testing. Social control is usually applicable to a whole society and the United States government introduced three policies. They introduced the first immigration restriction act in 1921 allowing 3% entry from any nation. Then the immigration restriction act of 1924 allowing 2% entry and finally Jewish refugees and others during the 1930s were barred from entry. This is a good illustration of partial mark scoring because many candidates wrote nothing more than 'immigration restriction' when a little more detail would have resulted in full marks.

Question 15

- (a) Candidates were asked to describe briefly *how* the pseudo-patients attempted to gain admission to the mental hospitals in the study by Rosenhan. Most candidates scored two marks by describing the procedure of how access was gained. This involved the pseudo-patients telephoning the hospital for appointment and on arrival claiming they could hear voices.
- (b) Candidates were asked to describe briefly what happened *after* the pseudo-patients were admitted to the mental hospitals. Candidates could answer this in a number of different ways. One way was for the pseudo-patients to 'try to escape'; another was that they began their observations of 'life on the ward'. Either type of answer, or indeed any other appropriate answer, scored full marks when a little elaboration was added to the basic point.

Section B

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe the sample of their chosen study and say how the participants were selected. Whilst there were some excellent answers which addressed the question specifically, there were others which merely referred to the procedure of the study without even considering the question itself. Candidates must answer the questions that are set rather than what they have been prepared for. As this question wanted an answer on sampling, then that is the aspect of the chosen study that should have been answered.
- (b) This part asked candidates to describe the main findings of their chosen study. Many candidates did precisely this and wrote some impressive answers. Other candidates wrote a few numbers or some general sentences and as a consequence scored no more than bottom band marks.
- (c) This question part asked candidates to describe the advantages and disadvantages of using restricted samples of participants in psychological studies. Quite a number of candidates had chosen this question to write about their favourite study and many wrote very good part (a) and part (b) answers. However, there is no point in doing this if nothing is known about the advantages and disadvantages of using restricted samples. Many candidates scored very few and sometimes no marks at all for this question part. It is worth choosing a question where marks can be maximised across all four question parts.
- (d) This part asked for a different sample for the chosen study. This question part also caused problems for candidates who were not prepared. Many choosing the Tajfel study wrote 'use girls instead of boys' and then realised that there was not a lot more to say. As this is a known question candidates should have thought about possible alternatives for all core studies in advance of the examination. If all question parts cannot be answered then a different study should be chosen or even a different question should be considered. This is why the paper has so much choice. Candidates writing no more than a few lines of answer did not progress beyond bottom band marks.

Question 17

- (a) This question part invited candidates to outline the main findings of their chosen study. Generally candidates answered this question part very well, and particularly those choosing the Thigpen and Cleckley study presented a wide range of different findings.
- (b) This part asked candidates to describe the procedure of their chosen study, explaining how it is a longitudinal study. This was the question part where candidates could provide details of the procedure, but many candidates did not address the 'longitudinal' component of the question and as a result their mark was no better than a mid-band mark. As has been stated already, candidates

must answer the question to access the full range of marks. Many other candidates answered the question perfectly and provided superb answers.

- (c) Candidates were asked for the advantages and disadvantages of using longitudinal studies in psychological research, using examples from their chosen study. Several components are required here to score a top-band mark. Firstly there have to be strengths (plural) and weaknesses (also plural). Secondly these strengths and weaknesses must be supported with examples from the chosen study. In other words, candidates need to answer the question set. Many candidates did include both these components, but many others offered no more than a partial answer.
- (d) This question as always asked for a different method that could be used to investigate the chosen study. As with **Question 16(d)** many candidates did not address the second part of the question and as a consequence were restricted to a maximum of six marks. To address the second part of the question all candidates are required to do is to suggest how the results of the study might be different. This depends on the suggestion made for the first part of the question, but here candidates score marks not for recalling information, but for writing their thoughts on how things might be different, whatever the effect on the results might be.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/12
Core Studies 1

Key messages

- 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.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts can be answered.
- Candidates should answer *both* parts of a question where there are two components and ensure both parts are then answered. See **Questions 5(a), 5(b), 12(b)** for example.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

This is the final time a November report will be written on this current syllabus. The revised syllabus is examined for the first time in June 2012 and crucially some of the core studies are different and the format of the **Section B** question is different. The revised version of the specification should be consulted for full details of what has changed.

Although the comments on specific questions below are written with this examination in mind, and so are the Key Messages, the comments generalise to all future examinations.

If there is one weakness in a significant majority of candidates it is that there is insufficient detail in their **Section A** answers. A little more detail across all questions in this section would increase the overall mark quite significantly. Questions asking for 'two things for 2 marks' and which begin with the word 'Identify' can have short answers. For example, **Question 6(a)** asked for a description of little Hans. However, most other questions, those beginning with the word 'Describe' for example, must have more detail to score both available marks. **Question 1(b)** was 'Give one example from another core study that may have involved leading questions. A correct answer would be 'the Freud study' because it did involve leading questions and this answer would score 1 mark rather than 2 marks out of 2. More detail is needed, some elaboration. If instead the answer was 'A leading question in the Freud study was "Did you think of your daddy when the horse fell down"' then 2 marks out of 2 could be awarded without hesitation. This additional detail does not mean that answers will be too long or cause time pressures.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) From the study by Loftus and Palmer on eyewitness testimony, candidates were asked to suggest an implication the findings have for real life. Some candidates did not answer the question at all, instead making a comment about leading questions in the study itself. Other candidates went on to consider the implication leading questions have for the police and the legal system; a few candidates even mentioned the use of leading questions in classrooms.
- (b) This question asked candidates to give one example from another core study that may have involved leading questions. Most candidates were able to score one mark by giving an example, but some candidates gave examples from studies where there were no leading questions at all.

Just because participants in studies are asked questions it does not automatically mean that they are leading questions. Very few candidates scored both available marks because they rarely wrote more than “the Freud study” or “the Deregowski study” rather than going on to give an example from the study.

Question 2

- (a) This question part asked candidates to suggest why a repeated measures design was **not** used in the study by Baron-Cohen et al on autism. Many candidates provided a perfectly correct answer, saying that it is impossible for one participant to be autistic, Down syndrome and ‘normal’ at the same time. Other candidates appeared not to know what a repeated measures design was.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to suggest one problem with an independent groups design. Again many candidates knew the answer and scored full marks whilst many others scored zero because they could not provide an answer at all. One of the main problems with an independent groups design is that participant variables cannot be controlled.

Question 3

- (a) This question part invited candidates to suggest one ethical issue that applied to Washoe in the study by Gardner and Gardner. As the question asked for an ethical issue, candidates had to identify an ethical issue and give an example of it in order to score full marks. Although many candidates did just that, many did not. For example many wrote that Washoe would be in an artificial environment without stating that this might cause Washoe psychological harm.
- (b) This question part required candidates to suggest why psychologists have ethical guidelines for animals. Most candidates scored full marks here by suggesting that animals should not be harmed either physically or psychologically or that animals have rights too.

Question 4

- (a) Candidates had to give one reason why Samuel and Bryant conducted the study on conservation. Despite being an obvious question to ask, some candidates failed to provide an answer that was worth credit. On the other hand many candidates correctly identified a reason and those given included: that Rose and Blank had raised questions about asking one question rather than two; to see if pre-operational children as young as five years of age could conserve; and to see which type of material children find easiest/hardest to conserve.
- (b) This question part invited candidates to describe one finding that justified the reason for conducting the study. Answers ranged from those who just gave a partial answer such as “children did better with one question” to those who added “compared with the two question format” or those who added some numbers to support the description of a finding.

Question 5

- (a) This question invited candidates to give one advantage of collecting qualitative data in the study by Hodges and Tizard on social relationships. Many candidates could give an advantage, such as the collection of in-depth detailed data but many candidates did not relate the advantage to the Hodges and Tizard study as the question required. This meant that a partial rather than full mark was awarded.
- (b) This question part invited candidates to give one disadvantage of collecting qualitative data in this study. The answer to this question mirrored that of part (a) with many candidates giving a disadvantage but not relating it to the study. Such candidates were awarded one mark for a partial answer. An example from the study would have scored the second available mark.

Question 6

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe the participant in the study by Freud, i.e. little Hans. Any two different features scored the marks available and candidates correctly included things like him being male, aged between 3 and 5 years, that Hans was considered not to be a normal child (according to Freud) and some candidates even said that he was called Hans!

- (b) This question part invited candidates to give one limitation when generalising from a small sample of participants. Whereas weaker candidates provided a partial answer that lacked elaboration and/or understanding, better answers showed wider psychological knowledge by writing things like: it may not be representative of wider population; generalising does not take into account individual differences; and that the original sample may be different from those in the wider population.

Question 7

- (a) Candidates were asked to give one piece of evidence which supports the view that dreaming occurs during REM sleep. Candidates could either describe the number of instances of dream recall from the different types of rapid eye movements, or they could describe the data from the number of dreams recalled.
- (b) Candidates were asked to give one piece of evidence which challenges the view that dreaming occurs during REM sleep. In response to this question most candidates referred to the number of dreams that were recalled during NREM sleep, or they referred to the number of dreams that were not recalled during REM sleep.

Question 8

- (a) Candidates were invited to explain what would happen if an image was presented to both *visual fields* of the participants in the study by Sperry on split brain patients. The simple answer is that if the image were presented to both visual fields it would be seen by both hemispheres and thus the image would be correctly identified. A correct answer like this would show understanding of the study and score full marks.
- (b) This question part extended from part (a) and rather than focusing on visual fields asked candidates more generally to explain what would happen if the image was presented to both eyes. The correct answer here is that the image would be seen by both eyes and so both visual fields and so it would be seen by both hemispheres and the image would be correctly identified.

Question 9

- (a) Candidates were asked for the overall conclusion of the study by Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse on brain scans. Some candidates quoted directly from the article “These preliminary findings provide initial indications of a network of abnormal cortical and sub-cortical brain processes that may predispose to violence in murderers pleading NGRI” and scored both marks. Note that quotes are not needed for full marks, and an ‘in your own words’ is sufficient. Other candidates gave a number of findings rather than a conclusion. A finding should be used to support a conclusion.
- (b) This question part invited candidates to give one reason why we should not assume cause and effect in relation to the overall conclusion. This question appeared to confuse some candidates who again just gave a finding. Other candidates impressed because they had read the article and gave one or more reasons which showed their understanding of the study. These reasons included: it may be the murder that has caused the abnormal brain processes; it may be some other factor that has caused the abnormal brain processes (such as the time spent on remand); and that we should not generalise from the findings of one study with a limited sample size.

Question 10

- (a) This question part asked why Milgram’s study is described as snapshot rather than longitudinal. To achieve both marks a candidate had to show some understanding of what a snapshot study is and they had to relate this to the study by Milgram. Most candidates answered the question with little difficulty and some impressed by quoting directly from the study with “the study lasts for no more than an hour of your time”. Other candidates did not understand either the term snapshot or longitudinal and so scored no marks.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to give two disadvantages of snapshot studies. As two disadvantages were required for two marks, each answer needed no elaboration to score the marks. This question challenged many candidates who were unable to provide two disadvantages, the main one being that it is not possible to study how behaviour may change over time.

Question 11

- (a) From the study by Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin on subway Samaritans candidates were asked to give two examples of high ecological validity in the study. As each example carried one mark the examples did not need to be explained, merely identified. Many candidates did just this, writing that “the study was conducted on a real subway train” and “the victim smelled of alcohol like a drunk person would” for example.
- (b) Candidates were asked to give two examples of the way in which the study was unethical. Here candidates were awarded a mark for each example and the most common correct answers were that participants did not give consent to be part of a study and that participants were deceived as the victim was not really ill or drunk.

Question 12

- (a) This question from the Tajfel study on intergroup categorisation asked candidates to describe the terms maximum joint profit and maximum in-group profit. Whilst many candidates quoted a definition straight from the article itself, other candidates were also correct in describing the terms in their own words. Some candidates did not know the answer and could not even guess. Maximum joint profit is if the two groups of boys join together and gain most profit from the experiment as a whole. Maximum in-group profit is choosing the greatest amount but the out-group boys would receive quite a high amount too.
- (b) This question part asked candidates that, of the three choices available, which did the boys make and what did this choice tell us about the behaviour of the boys. The correct answer is that the boys chose maximum difference. This scored one mark and for the second mark candidates had to answer the second part of the question. Surprisingly many gave an incorrect answer because this is the whole point of the study. What it tells us is that the boys showed in-group favouritism and out-group discrimination and preferred to maximise the difference between groups even though they could have had a greater reward.

Question 13

- (a) This question asked what Hraba and Grant were trying to measure with the questions they asked about doll choice. There were two types of answer that were credited here. The first type allowed marks for identifying any two of racial preference, racial awareness or knowledge and self-identification. The second type allowed one of these three types to be identified followed with an explanation of it. These options allow a wider range of answers to be credited and this meant that more candidates scored full marks.
- (b) This question part asked how Hraba and Grant measured the children’s everyday ‘behavioural consequences of racial preference and identification’. The correct answer, direct from the article itself is “the children were asked to name and indicate the race of their best friends. We also asked the teachers for the same information”. Although as always reproducing the quote is not needed for full marks a small number of candidates did so.

Question 14

- (a) Candidates were invited to suggest why Rosenhan did not use a self report interview or questionnaire to gather data. The most commonly correct answer that was quoted was that if an interview or questionnaire were used then the participants would know they were taking part in a study and may respond to demand characteristics. A few candidates impressed when they went on to write that this would result in false results and the study would not measure what it was claiming to measure.
- (b) Candidates were invited to suggest one advantage of the method Rosenhan did use to gather data. Again some candidates gave a brief or partial answer and scored one mark and others gave that little extra detail that guaranteed both marks. For example, some candidates wrote that the participants did not know they were being observed and that this meant their behaviour was true and natural.

Question 15

All studies raise some ethical issues. This question has been asked about many studies and this time it was applied to the study of multiple personality disorder by Thigpen and Cleckley. Two ethical issues were required. Many candidates did not score full marks because although they gave a relevant example they did not identify the associated ethical issue. Other candidates assumed that broken ethical guidelines had to be written about but this was not the case. Some candidates also made errors. For example one issue is confidentiality. No participant was identified by Thigpen and Cleckley and it was Christine Sizemore who later identified herself.

Section B

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe the procedure of their chosen study. There were some excellent answers here which addressed the question specifically, and impressed with the depth of knowledge about their chosen study.
- (b) This part asked candidates about the generalisations that could be made about human behaviour and experience from the findings of their chosen study. This caused many candidates problems because they apparently did not know what a generalisation actually was. Quite a number of candidates had seemingly chosen this question to write about their favourite study, that of Haney, Banks and Zimbardo. However, there is no point in writing an excellent part (a) if nothing is known about generalisations and no marks can be scored in part (b).
- (c) This question part asked candidates to describe the advantages and disadvantages of making generalisations. The same applied here as for part (b). Again, there is no point in choosing this question if nothing is known about the advantages and disadvantages of generalisations. If some question parts cannot be answered then a different study should be chosen or even a different question should be considered.
- (d) This part asked for a change that would allow generalisations to be made. This question part also caused problems for candidates as many suggested that the Haney et al. study be done in a real prison with real prisoners. This is an inappropriate suggestion because it could not possibly test the dispositional hypothesis that was proposed by Zimbardo.

Question 17

- (a) This question part invited candidates to describe the main findings of their chosen study. This seemed to throw a number of candidates who wanted to begin by describing the procedure, and they did just that, ignoring the question altogether.
- (b) Those candidates who did describe the findings then struggled a little in part (b) because they wanted to describe the procedure rather than answering the question about the experimental method. Candidates must answer the questions that are set rather than what they have been prepared for. If the 'experimental method' part of the question was not included in the answer, then candidates could not score more than six marks.
- (c) This question part asked candidates for the strengths and weaknesses of using the experimental method. Many candidates could make simple points such as 'assume cause and effect' but then often struggled to elaborate on this or to give an example. Other candidates wrote superb answers where their understanding was evident.
- (d) This part asked for an alternative way of gathering data to investigate the chosen study. As with **Question 16(d)** many candidates did not address the second part of the question, the 'effect on results' and as a consequence were restricted to a maximum of six marks. To address the second part of the question all candidates are required to do is to suggest how the results of the study might be different. This depends on the suggestion made for the first part of the question, but here candidates score marks not for recalling information, but for writing their thoughts on how things might be different, whatever the effect on the results might be.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/13

Core Studies 1

Key messages

- 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.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts can be answered.
- Candidates should answer *both* parts of a question where there are two components and ensure both parts are then answered. **Question 6(b)** is a perfect illustration.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

This is the final time a November report will be written on this current syllabus. The revised syllabus is examined for the first time in June 2012 and crucially some of the core studies are different and the format of the **Section B** question is different. The revised version of the specification should be consulted for full details of what has changed.

Although the comments on specific questions below are written with this examination in mind, and so are the Key Messages, the comments generalise to all future examinations.

If there is one weakness in a significant majority of candidates it is that there is insufficient detail in their **Section A** answers. A little more detail across all questions in this section would increase the overall mark quite significantly. Questions asking for 'two things for 2 marks' and which begin with the word 'Identify' can have short answers. However, most other questions, those beginning with the word 'Describe', must have more detail to score both available marks.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Part asked candidates what an independent groups design is and what a repeated measures design is. Many candidates answered clearly and unambiguously and scored both marks whilst other candidates appeared to have no idea at all what the terms meant. An independent groups design is where participants perform in different conditions of the independent variable. A repeated measures design is where the same participant performs in all the conditions of the independent variable.
- (b) This part invited candidates to suggest why a repeated measures design was not used in the Loftus and Palmer study. Again there were extremes of answer with some candidates answering that the study would have been impossible if participants were given all five verbs, and so scored full marks, compared with those candidates unable to even begin to form an answer because they knew nothing about experimental designs.

Question 2

This question asked candidates to outline two controls that were applied in the study by Baron Cohen et al. on autism. As a control is applied to ensure that as much is standardised as possible for all participants then any mention of such things by candidates earned credit. Some candidates wrote generally that the procedure was the same for all the children whilst others were more specific, referring to the use of the dolls (Sally and Anne) and the equipment (e.g. marble and basket) being the same for every child.

Question 3

- (a) This question part asked candidates to suggest why the study by Gardner and Gardner on Washoe was not done as a field experiment. The most obvious answers were that it would have been nearly impossible to teach Washoe sign language in a natural environment and further it would be extremely difficult to record anything accurately. As one candidate put it, Washoe may have got bored and swung off through the trees!
- (b) This question part was a logical follow-on from part (a) by asking candidates to suggest one problem with studying animals in a laboratory. The most obvious and correct answer would be that the behaviour of the animal can be controlled and that this is not natural. Many candidates appreciated this and scored full marks.

Question 4

- (a) This question part asked candidates to give one assumption made by Bandura, Ross and Ross about *all* behaviour. Many candidates wrote correctly that Bandura et al. believed that all behaviour is learned rather than inherited, whilst many others provided incorrect answers. As always, candidates should read the whole question before beginning to answer and if question part (b) had been read then it would have made the answer to part (a) even more transparent.
- (b) This part asked about the extent to which the findings of the study supported this assumption. Those candidates who had stated 'all behaviour is learned' in the first question part stated that the assumption was supported because Bandura showed that children did imitate the model and so learned the aggressive behaviour. Those candidates who had not read part (a) thoroughly and had given a finding in part (a) found themselves confused as to what to do, or simply wrote the same as they had in part (a).

Question 5

- (a) Candidates were asked what the difference was between what the children said and what their parents said about having a special friend in the Hodges and Tizard study. Some candidates gave very precise answers including numbers (16 children said they had a definite special friend; 10 parents said the children had a special friend) whilst others just stated that there was a difference. Some candidates incorrectly stated that there was no difference and some candidates believed that parents said that the children had a special friend when the children said that they did not.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to give an explanation for this difference, again showing that if the whole question had been read, no candidate should have stated that there was no difference in question part (a). The main reason for the difference in answer was that the child may not be telling the truth because they do not want others to think that they do not have a special friend and for the parent, they may not know who the special friend is or whether the child actually has a special friend.

Question 6

- (a) This question part, based on the study by Dement and Kleitman, asked what they used the electroencephalogram to measure. Candidates who wrote that an EEG measures the electrical activity of the brain scored 1 mark whilst those candidates who wrote this and then went on to write that Dement and Kleitman used the EEG to measure eye movements, or REM and NREM scored 2 marks.

- (b) This question part asked candidates to suggest one advantage of using scientific equipment in psychological experiments. There are many advantages that could be included in this answer such as: it allows precise and accurate measurements not otherwise possible; it allows quantitative data and so replication and comparison; it means that recordings are reliable.

Question 7

- (a) This question part asked why the experiments performed by Sperry were not true to real life. There were two possible answers here and both were given credit. Firstly that all the experiments conducted by Sperry were artificial because of the tasks he asked participants to do in a laboratory situation. The second possibility is that he isolated eyes and he isolated visual fields and this would not happen in real life.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to explain how split brain patients would behave in real life. Some candidates believed that the participants would struggle with a number of different things: that their memory would be impaired or that they would always see a double image. Actually participants would have no problems at all because they could look at any object with both eyes and so use both visual fields which meant that they would behave as a 'normal' person would.

Question 8

- (a) This question wanted candidates to suggest, from the study by Schachter and Singer on emotion, one generalisation that can be made about emotion for *all* people. Some candidates took the question to mean describe one emotion (one candidate wrote that one emotion is crying) which was not answering the question. For many candidates an appropriate generalisation, and the perfect answer, was that any emotion is made up of two components, a physiological component and a cognitive component. In other words the two factors in Schachter and Singer's two factor theory of emotion.
- (b) This question part wanted candidates to suggest why generalisations about physiological processes are more likely to be true than generalisations about social behaviour. There were many interesting answers written in response to this question, some of them correct and some not. The correct answer is that physiological processes happen in all people, except for rare abnormalities, whereas social processes are often learned and there is much more cultural variation.

Question 9

This question asked for an outline of two ethical issues in the study by Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse on brain scans. Two marks were allocated to each different issue. This was an interesting question because all ethical guidelines were maintained and none were broken. For example, none of the participants were identified and so confidentiality was maintained. No participant was harmed and no participant was deceived. All the participants had the right to withdraw and they were debriefed at the end of the study. They all had to give consent to be injected with FDG and be placed in the scanner. Many candidates assumed that the question was only referring to ethical guidelines that were *broken* and so struggled to score any marks at all.

Question 10

- (a) This question part wanted candidates to give one reason why some participants continued to 450 volts in the study by Milgram on obedience. Nearly all candidates provided an appropriate reason although some answers were far too brief or too vague to be awarded full marks. The most common answers were that it was due to the pressure of situation (such as being in a laboratory, the university; or that they received payment). Other candidates mentioned the pressure of experimenter (a scientist, an authority figure, or giving prods).
- (b) This part asked candidates to give one reason why some participants stopped before 450 volts. Most answers to this question part mentioned that the moral conflict was too strong and may have been too much to cope with or that despite the pressures on them some people have a dispositional tendency not to harm other people.

Question 11

- (a) Candidates were asked what the dispositional hypothesis was that was proposed in the study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo. Although some candidates described this perfectly, others appeared unable to even guess at the answer, despite this being the most important part of the whole study. The dispositional hypothesis is, quoting from the study, “the deplorable condition of our penal system (and its de-humanising effects upon prisoners and guards) is due to the *nature of the people* who administrate it or the *nature of the people who populate it*, or both. Nothing is wrong with the prison itself” (i.e. a situational attribution).
- (b) Part (b) asked the extent to which the results of the study supported the dispositional hypothesis. As for part (a), some candidates did not provide an answer or guessed incorrectly that it was supported so showing that they did not understand what the study was about. Other candidates scored full marks by writing that the dispositional hypothesis was **not** supported because ‘normal’ participants (the prisoners and guards) behaved as they did because of the **situation** they were in.

Question 12

- (a) This part asked candidates to give one advantage of snapshot studies using the Piliavin study as an example. There were three types of answer written here: where candidates did not know what a snapshot study was and so scored no marks; where candidates knew what a snapshot study was and scored 1 mark, but did not provide an example from the study; and where candidates answered the question fully by providing an advantage and relating it to the study.
- (b) This part asked candidates to give one disadvantage of snapshot studies using this study as an example. The types of answers provided by candidates in this question part matched the types of answers provided in part (a).

Question 13

This question part asked candidates to describe briefly two types of question from the army beta test that were given to the recruits, giving an example of each. Many candidates gave two descriptions and examples without any difficulty. Other candidates could identify the ‘what is missing’ test and many candidates provided a drawing of an appropriate example. However some candidates gave two examples of this test rather than describing two different types of test. The Army beta actually had seven parts which were: Test 1: running a maze; Test 2: count the number of cubes; Test 3: find the next in the series; Test 4: translate the numerals into symbols; and Test 5: identify what is missing.

Question 14

- (a) Candidates were invited to outline one advantage of using observation to gather data in the study by Rosenhan. The usual 1 mark answer “it is more naturalistic” was seen many times when a little more elaboration would score 2 marks. Candidates who scored 2 marks mentioned some psychological jargon or made it clear how the point related to the study itself.
- (b) Candidates were invited to outline one disadvantage of using observation to gather data in the study by Rosenhan. This required a different type of answer from that in part (a). The two most common disadvantages written about were that (i) Rosenhan could not find out the reasons for behaviour (unless he asked) and (ii) that his observation was unethical because he was deceiving participants into thinking he was ill when he was not.

Question 15

- (a) Candidates were invited to identify **one** psychometric test and **one** projective test that were used in the study by Thigpen and Cleckley. All candidates had to do was identify or name a test to score the marks. Some candidates identified an IQ test for a mark and others identified the test itself, the Wechsler-Bellevue Intelligence Scale, but this still only received one mark. The second psychometric test used was the memory test (or fully the Wechsler memory test). For the projective test naming either the Rorschach or the drawings of human figures received marks. Some candidates mentioned the EEG test but this is neither projective nor psychometric.
- (b) This question part wanted a description of the findings of **either** the psychometric **or** the projective test. For two marks many candidates stated that for the IQ test Eve White scored 110 and Eve

Black 104, whilst others gave the outcome of the memory test. Those choosing to answer about the findings of the projective test answered that the Rorschach record of Miss Black was far healthier than that of Mrs White. Some even mentioned that Miss Black had a hysterical tendency, while Mrs White showed anxiety, obsessive-compulsive traits, rigidity and an inability to deal with her hostility. Such a full and detailed answer as this scored full marks.

Section B

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe the self report measures used in their chosen study. Many candidates wrote superbly detailed answers which scored them maximum marks and answered the question set, but many others did not address the 'self report measure' part of the question, instead describing the procedure of the study and so failing to score more than mid-band marks.
- (b) This part asked candidates to outline the main findings of their chosen study. Most candidates could answer this with little difficulty, often describing the findings in detail and with impressive accuracy.
- (c) This question part asked candidates to describe the advantages and disadvantages of using self report measures using examples from their chosen study. Several components are required here to score a top-band mark. Firstly there have to be strengths (plural) and weaknesses (also plural). Secondly these strengths and weaknesses must be supported with examples from the chosen study. In other words, candidates need to answer the question set. Many candidates did include both these components, but many others offered no more than a partial answer.
- (d) This part asked for a different method for the chosen study. As this is a known question candidates should have thought about possible alternatives for all core studies in advance of the examination. Whilst many answers showed evidence of this, and top marks were awarded, many other candidates appeared to be making up answers on the spot that were not thought through at all and such answers scored bottom band marks only.

Question 17

- (a) This question part invited candidates to describe the main findings of their chosen study. This seemed to throw a number of candidates who wanted to begin by describing the procedure, and they did just that, ignoring the question altogether.
- (b) Those candidates who did describe the results then struggled a little in part (b) because they wanted to describe the procedure there. Candidates must answer the questions that are set rather than what they have been prepared for. Some candidates had prepared for a 'describe the procedure' question followed by a 'describe the findings' question. Sometimes questions do have these questions in that order but sometimes they are in a different order and sometimes questions, such as on this occasion, focus on a slightly different aspect. In **Question 17(b)** the emphasis was on controls and the equivalent **Question 16** was on self reports.
- (c) This part asked candidates for the advantages and disadvantages of applying controls in psychological studies. Many candidates could make simple points such as 'lower the ecological validity' but then often struggled to elaborate on this or to give an example.
- (d) This part asked for a different method that could be used to investigate the chosen study. As with **Question 16(d)** many candidates did not address the second part of the question, the 'effect on results' and as a consequence were restricted to a maximum of six marks. To address the second part of the question all candidates are required to do is to suggest how the results of the study might be different. This depends on the suggestion made for the first part of the question, but here candidates score marks not for recalling information, but for writing their thoughts on how things might be different, whatever the effect on the results might be.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/21

Core Studies 2

Key messages

- **Section A** responses need to give clear and relevant details from the core study mentioned in the question rather than just a general point.
- In **Section B**, candidates must focus their answer on the question asked in part (a) of the essay rather than writing lots of detail of the studies. Evidence must be given in part (c) to achieve above 4 marks.

General comments

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

Time management for this paper was good for the vast majority of candidates. Many candidates spent an appropriate amount of time on each section and fewer candidates 'over-wrote' for part (a) of the **Section B** essay. This left more time for part (b) and part (c) which enabled the candidates to achieve higher marks overall. Some candidates continued to show poor time management and achieved less well overall in **Section B**. This was most evident for the candidates who gave very long details of the studies in part (a) of the **Section B** essay and this left less time for the other two parts of the essay. Candidates should aim to spend half an hour on **Section A** and an hour on **Section B** as this is worth more marks. Candidates should spend 20 minutes on each part of the essay. It is pleasing to see that the majority of candidates did write something for every question on the paper. Very few candidates attempted all three essays. When this did happen the candidate was awarded the mark for the best of the three questions (**Question 6**, **Question 7** or **Question 8**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This question wanted the candidate to describe two ethical problems with the Bandura, Ross and Ross study. The majority of candidates identified the ethical issues raised but did not put this into the context of the study.

Question 2

- (a) This was well answered by many candidates. They were often able to identify both features of the participants that were matched in the study. Some candidates incorrectly believed the participants were matched whether or not they were a murderer. This type of response was not creditworthy.
- (b) It was pleasing to see so many candidates make a very good attempt at this question. Many candidates were able to put their response into context and explain the purpose of matching. Weaker responses were where candidates briefly discussed the problems that not matching participants could have on the results but this was either too surface an explanation or not in context of the Raine study.

Question 3

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to achieve full marks by giving a clear example of a finding from the study. Weaker responses named a finding without making a clear comparison. A minority of candidates gave a finding from the Clark and Clark study believing it was from the Hrabka and Grant study.
- (b) This was also well answered by candidates who were able to explain (even if quite briefly) the link between the results and the nurture side of the nature/nurture debate. A significant number of candidates referred to cultural changes in the USA that would have influenced the child's doll choice since the original Clark and Clark study in the 1930s.

Question 4

- (a) Many candidates named and described one of the three psychometric tests used and achieved full marks. Some candidates simply named the test and were awarded one mark.
- (b) A wide variety of responses were given to this question. Many candidates focused their responses on the immediate problems of the test (e.g. cultural bias, badly organised, etc.) whereas others focused on longer term problems such as Eugenic movement and the Immigration Restriction Act.

Question 5

- (a) There were some very good answers from candidates who offered a well explained reason for the behaviour of the hospital staff. Many focused on stickiness of labels and situational explanations of behaviour. Those who achieved less well did so, on the whole, because the answer was either very brief or the explanation was confused.
- (b) This part was answered well by the majority of candidates. Many different problems were discussed but the most popular was the difficulty in making generalisations. Many gave examples from either Rosenhan or another individual differences study although this was not necessary to gain full marks on this question.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) There were some very good answers to this part question. Some candidates achieved full marks in this question by describing the cognitive processes in each study. A number of responses focused on simply describing the study and achieved less well due to the lack of focus on the question.
- (b) In this part some candidates focused on the strengths and weaknesses of cognitive processes and were able to give evidence to back up their answers. Candidates mainly focused on usefulness, ecological validity and ethics in their responses. Some candidates just gave strengths and weaknesses of the studies and achieved less well as this was not focused on cognitive processes.
- (c) In this part there were a few insightful answers and some brought in evidence to back up their points. The majority of candidates were able to discuss the similarities and differences between the human mind and that of a computer. Many responses were either quite brief or did not mention any evidence and therefore achieved less well.

Question 7

- (a) This part question was well answered by many candidates who identified and described what each study tells us about everyday life. Some candidates were confused about the focus of the question and often overwrote their answers. They gave very long detailed descriptions of the studies rather than just focusing on everyday life.
- (b) Most candidates were able to discuss both strengths and weaknesses of studying behaviour in everyday life and brought in some evidence to back up their points. Candidates discussed issues such as ecological validity, ethics, demand characteristics and practical issues. Many found it difficult to come up with four separate points.
- (c) There were some good answers to this part by some well-prepared candidates. Similar to the other part (c) answers in this examination, evidence again was often lacking resulting in the mark being limited to 3 or 4 marks.

Question 8

- (a) There were some good answers for this question with candidates describing how each study was useful. Some mentioned the usefulness in schools of Samuel and Bryant and therapies for Freud. Some candidates were unsure of the focus of this question and gave long descriptions of the studies and results which were only able to achieve one mark per study.
- (b) Many candidates kept their answers focused on the problems with conducting useful studies. In order to improve, candidates need to make sure each point refers back to usefulness rather than just doing this at the start of their response. Most candidates did attempt to describe problems with examples from the studies.
- (c) There were some good responses to this part question and a few extended beyond the studies to give a really well thought out and argued response. Some candidates referred to evidence to achieve 5-8 marks. Many still omitted any evidence and could not achieve more than 4 marks for their response as a result.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22

Core Studies 2

Key messages

- **Section A** responses need to give clear and relevant details from the core study mentioned in the question rather than just a general point.
- In **Section B**, candidates must focus their answer on the question asked in part (a) of the essay rather than writing lots of detail of the studies. Evidence must be given in part (c) to achieve above 4 marks.

General comments

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

Time management for this paper was good for the vast majority of candidates. Many candidates spent an appropriate amount of time on each section and fewer candidates 'over-wrote' for part (a) of the **Section B** essay. This left more time for part (b) and part (c) which enabled the candidates to achieve higher marks overall. Some candidates continued to show poor time management and achieved less well overall in **Section B**. This was most evident for the candidates who gave very long details of the studies in part (a) of the **Section B** essay and this left less time for the other two parts of the essay. Candidates should aim to spend half an hour on **Section A** and an hour on **Section B** as this is worth more marks. Candidates should spend 20 minutes on each part of the essay. It is pleasing to see that the majority of candidates did write something for every question on the paper. Very few candidates attempted all three essays. When this did happen the candidate was awarded the mark for the best of the three questions (**Question 6, Question 7** or **Question 8**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

Compared to previous years, candidates were well prepared for the content required in the exam. Many did show good understanding of the details of the core studies and this was most evident in **Section B** of the examination. Candidates seemed to struggle with some of the terminology used in **Section A**. Some candidates did include evidence in part (c) of the **Section B** essay and were able to achieve well. Candidates who included no evidence could not achieve further than the 3-4 mark band. **Question 8** was the most popular question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Some candidates knew the precise reward offered to the participants in the Schachter and Singer study and described it in sufficient depth to be awarded full marks. Many just mentioned the participants received extra credits and were given one mark. A number of candidates incorrectly believed that money was given to the participants as a reward.
- (b) A number of candidates focused on harm caused to participants by the pressure of being in the study and other candidates considered the difficulty felt by participants in terms of withdrawal from the study. Some candidates focused on the reward leading to demand characteristics but as this is not an ethical issue no marks were awarded to these candidates.



Question 2

- (a) This was well answered by most candidates. Most focused on the fact that the participants all watched the same film clip of a car accident. A few did mention other features such as the questions asked.
- (b) Many candidates were able to achieve one mark in their response to this question by identifying that the reliability increased due to standardisation. A few did manage to link this to the study and some even discussed the ease with which replications in the future could be done due to this standardisation. However, a number of candidates discussed ecological validity which did not address reliability and these responses were awarded no marks.

Question 3

- (a) This was well answered by many candidates who were able to give an accurate finding from the Baron-Cohen study. A number did confuse findings and conclusions and put the conclusions, particularly in terms of theory of mind, in their response which was not creditworthy.
- (b) A wide variety of problems were described in response to this question. Many did clearly link the problem to the symptoms of autism but candidates who just identified the problem without explaining it were awarded one mark.

Question 4

- (a) The more popular answers were about Type 2 errors or the voices in the head which gained maximum marks when expressed well. Some candidates thought the staff admitted them as they knew they were part of a study to observe how each hospital worked and this was not creditworthy. Many candidates described how the patients displayed symptoms of schizophrenia. As this is not directly from the original key study this type of response was awarded one mark due to lack of clarity.
- (b) A number of candidates gave excellent responses that clearly outlined the usefulness of the Rosenhan study. A number of responses were brief or not linked to Rosenhan so were awarded one mark.

Question 5

- (a) This was well answered by many candidates who achieved full marks by identifying two features of the sample. Popular answers were boys and same school but many kept mentioning the under-estimator and over-estimator groups, etc. which achieved no marks.
- (b) The vast majority of candidates were able to outline a problem in terms of lack of generalisability of the study. Few were able to put this into the context of the Tajfel study.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) In this part question there were some very good answers that focused on the nature/nurture debate in each study. Most responses correctly described which side of the debate each study supported. A few did get this the wrong way round. A number of candidates did not give any clear evidence from the study so could only achieve 2 marks out the available 3 marks for each study.
- (b) In this part most candidates did focus on the strengths and weaknesses of investigating the nature/nurture debate and were able to give evidence to back up their answers. Popular points included difficulties in separating the debate, ethics and usefulness. Some candidates just gave strengths and weaknesses of the studies and achieved less well as this was not focused on the nature/nurture debate.
- (c) In this part there were a few insightful answers and some did bring in evidence to back up their points. A number of candidates described how each study supported one or both sides of the debate rather than addressing the question. Some responses were either quite brief or did not mention any evidence and therefore achieved less well.

Question 7

- (a) In this part question there were some good, concise and direct answers for this question with candidates describing how each study used the longitudinal method. However, quite a few struggled to answer the question and gave lengthy descriptions of the studies without reference to the longitudinal aspects. These types of responses were only able to achieve one mark per study.
- (b) In this part most candidates were able to discuss both strengths and weaknesses of the longitudinal method and some did bring in some evidence to back up their points. Candidates discussed issues such as depth, change over time and subject attrition. A number of candidates did not use the evidence and achieved less well.
- (c) There were many good answers to this part by some well-prepared candidates. Similarly to the other part (c) answers in this examination, evidence was sometimes lacking resulting in the mark being limited to 3 or 4 marks.

Question 8

- (a) This part question had a mixture of responses. There were some very impressive answers that focused on how the data was collected for each study and these achieved full marks. Some candidates did not really understand what the question was asking and simply described what happened.
- (b) In this part many candidates did keep their answers focused on the problems with carrying out ecologically valid research. Popular problems included practical issues, ethics, lack of control and researcher bias.
- (c) In this part there were some good responses to this question and a few did extend beyond the studies to give a really well thought out and argued response. Some candidates did refer to evidence to achieve 5-8 marks. Many still omitted any evidence and could not achieve more than 4 marks for their response.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/23

Core Studies 2

Key messages

- **Section A** responses need to give clear and relevant details from the core study mentioned in the question rather than just a general point.
- In **Section B**, candidates must focus their answer on the question asked in part (a) of the essay rather than writing lots of detail of the studies. Evidence must be given in part (c) to achieve above 4 marks.

General comments

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

Time management for this paper was good for the vast majority of candidates. Many candidates spent an appropriate amount of time on each section and fewer candidates 'over-wrote' for part (a) of the **Section B** essay. This left more time for part (b) and part (c) which enabled the candidates to achieve higher marks overall. Some candidates continued to show poor time management and achieved less well overall in **Section B**. This was most evident for the candidates who gave very long details of the studies in part (a) of the **Section B** essay and this left less time for the other two parts of the essay. Candidates should aim to spend half an hour on **Section A** and an hour on **Section B** as this is worth more marks. Candidates should spend 20 minutes on each part of the essay. It is pleasing to see that the majority of candidates did write something for every question on the paper. Very few candidates attempted all three essays. When this did happen the candidate was awarded the mark for the best of the three questions (**Question 6**, **Question 7** or **Question 8**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

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

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Responses to this question focused on either the speed of the car in mph or the number of participants who reported broken glass. Many just mentioned the speed of the car without operationalising this and were awarded one mark. Some gave results which were also creditworthy.

- (b) The vast majority of candidates were able to achieve one mark in their response to this question by stating that comparisons can be made or statistical analysis can be done on the results. To improve, candidates need to put their responses into the context of the Loftus and Palmer study in order to achieve full marks.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates achieved one mark in their response by stating that the participants in the Dement and Kleitman study were asked to state the content of their dream. Some achieved the second mark by either mentioning the direction of eye movement **or** an example of the content of one of the dreams (e.g. throwing tomatoes). Some candidates did refer to quantitative data and these type of responses achieved no marks.
- (b) This question was well answered by the majority of candidates who were able to describe the problems with the validity of the data. Popular responses included social desirability and participants lying due to embarrassing dreams.

Question 3

- (a) Most responses correctly identified the snapshot method. Many candidates struggled to explain why it is snapshot in the context of Raine's study. There were some very clear responses explaining the length of time participants were tested for in the PET scanner.
- (b) Many candidates achieved well in their response to this question. They clearly identified and explained the problem of snapshot studies not showing development over time.

Question 4

- (a) Most responses were able to achieve at least one mark for this question by suggesting something about the lack of learning of the African participants of 3D depth cues. Candidates did struggle to provide a sufficient explanation to achieve full marks.
- (b) Many different types of uses were suggested by candidates. Many focused on the lack of a lingua franca although only some were then able to extend this to a specific use in terms of using pictures to communicate messages. A number of responses gave conclusions from the study and these were awarded one mark.

Question 5

There were many good responses to this question. The vast majority of responses were able to give a reason why the study supported the idea that intelligence is due to nurture although many struggled to identify how the study supported nature.

Section B

Question 6

- (a) In this question part there were some very good answers that focused on what each study tells us about development. Some responses were very brief and these achieved less well.
- (b) In this part most candidates did focus on the strengths and weaknesses of investigating development and gave evidence to back up their answers. Popular points included ethics, practical difficulties in studying children and usefulness. Some candidates just gave strengths and weaknesses of the studies and achieved less well as this was not focused on investigating development.
- (c) In this part there were a few insightful answers and some did bring in evidence to back up their points. Some responses were either quite brief or did not mention any evidence and therefore achieved less well.

Question 7

This question was only attempted by a handful of candidates.

- (a) In this question part there were some good responses with candidates describing the overall conclusions of the studies and how these can be generalised to the wider population.
- (b) In this part most candidates were able to discuss some problems with making generalisations. Candidates discussed issues such as sample size and individual differences. Those who did choose this question found it difficult to raise four problems.
- (c) There were many good answers to this part by some well-prepared candidates. Similarly to other the other part (c) answers in this examination, evidence was sometimes lacking resulting in the mark being limited to 3 or 4 marks.

Question 8

- (a) This question part had some very detailed answers. Candidates usually focused on many ethical issues rather than just one issue per study. This often meant candidates overwrote for this part of the exam and had less time for part (b) and part (c).
- (b) In this part most candidates did keep their answers focused on the problems with carrying out ethical research. Popular problems included ecological validity, demand characteristics and difficulties in studying some types of behaviour.
- (c) In this part there were some good responses to this question and a few did extend beyond the studies to give a really well thought out and argued response. Some candidates did refer to evidence to achieve 5-8 marks. Many still omitted any evidence and could not achieve more than 4 marks for their response.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/31
Specialist Choices

Key Messages

- Candidates should read all parts of the question, **(a)**, **(b)** and **(c)**, before beginning to write an answer.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus.

General comments

This is the final time a report will be written on this syllabus. The revised syllabus is examined for the first time in June 2012 and crucially some of the topic areas are different and the format of the examination paper is slightly different. The revised version of the specification should be consulted for full details of what has changed.

A significant number of candidates do not show psychological knowledge in their answers. Many candidates write anecdotally about their own life experiences without including any psychological knowledge (theory and/or evidence) which supports what is being written. This is a psychology examination and so candidates must show evidence of the psychology they have learned.

Some candidates assume that evaluation is an extension of the part **(a)** description and they simply describe more which doesn't score high marks. Other candidates make general evaluation comments and when the 2 marks allocated to this skill have been awarded, no further marks can be awarded for repetition of the same thing. This is also not the best way of scoring marks. To access all evaluation marks candidates should consider evaluative issues as detailed in the mark scheme. This comment applies to this paper and to papers assessing the new syllabus. Indeed on the new examination paper candidates are forced to address a named evaluation issue. All the evaluation issues are introduced at AS Level and are merely carried forward into Paper 3.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a)** This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'special educational need'. Most candidates scored both available marks. Special educational need is where a child has a significantly greater difficulty in learning than most children of the same age or it applies to the educational ability of those who are statistically at the top end of the normal distribution curve (gifted).
- (b)** Here candidates had to describe one type of giftedness and one type of learning difficulty or disability. Some candidates only answered the first half of the question and perhaps forgot to address the 'learning difficulty' part. For giftedness some candidates seemed to think that there is just 'giftedness' with no specific type, whereas other candidates considered mathematical giftedness or musical giftedness or giftedness in information processing. For the learning difficulty dyslexia was most prominent followed closely by 'low intelligence'. Very few candidates mentioned a physical disability, that of partial sightedness for example.

- (c) This part required candidates to describe one strategy for educating gifted children. There were some excellent answers here with many candidates writing about an appropriate strategy such as enrichment or through acceleration. A small number of candidates impressively mentioned names (and dates) of research to support their suggested strategy.

Question 2

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'corrective strategy' for disruptive behaviour. Many candidates confuse corrective and preventive from the outset and many candidates begin to describe a term but then give examples that do not match it. Seemingly only a few candidates gave the perfect answer throughout this entire question. A corrective strategy is the modification of the behaviour of children that has already happened (rather than trying to prevent a behaviour from happening).
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one type of disruptive behaviour and one cause for the type of disruptive behaviour. Answers ranged from 'out of seat' behaviour through to various forms of attention seeking; bullying was also included now and then. The cause of disruptive behaviour ranged from the appropriately psychological (or medical) such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) to the anecdotal 'problems at home' type of answer.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one way in which a disruptive behaviour may be corrected. Following on from the comment in part (a) above, some descriptions were based on corrective strategies, but many were preventive with quite a few candidates being unable to distinguish between the two.

Question 3

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe ways in which educational performance is assessed in schools. There were many superb answers written in response to this question. A small number of candidates went for the IQ test approach but others considered quite a range of different things which were appropriate for different ages. Some candidates mentioned formative and summative assessment and assessments such as essays and 'short-answer questions' were thrown in here and there. Some candidates wrote anecdotally, but others had the psychological evidence to support what they wrote.
- (b) This part asked candidates to evaluate ways in which educational performance is assessed in schools. Although there were many 'general evaluation' answers which scored no more than bottom-band marks there were others who considered a range of appropriate issues. Many candidates wrote about labelling although often the comment was made that it is bad to be labelled with a grade E and good to be labelled with a grade A without the realisation that it is all labelling. Some candidates brought in the issue of reductionism, suggesting that other forms of assessment should be done, such as an assessment of emotional intelligence, which would give a much more rounded view of an individual.
- (c) This part asked candidates to suggest how the educational abilities of children of different ages could be assessed. There were many different answers here, simply because candidates often wrote about what happens in their country to assess children at different ages. Some candidates simply took the IGCSE at 16 years and A Levels at 18 years approach and one candidate congratulated Cambridge on providing the opportunity to be assessed in comparison with others all over the world.

Question 4

- (a) Although candidates could choose any psychological perspective to apply to learning, not one candidate chose the humanistic approach and very few chose the cognitive approach. The behaviourist approach was therefore very popular. However, many candidates did not read the question. They described classical conditioning, operant conditioning, observational learning and then for some candidates their answer ended without even a mention of how it all applied to learning. The question emphasises 'applied to learning'. Candidates not addressing this could not score full marks. Candidates who did score full marks gave an introduction to the basics then went on to consider various applications.

- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate how one psychological perspective has been applied to learning. Comparing and contrasting approaches was the main issue here, followed closely by the reductionist nature of behaviourism. Answers scored marks at the extreme ends of the mark scheme.
- (c) Candidates were asked here to suggest how one psychological perspective could be used to teach very young children. Many candidates answering this question part simply extended their answers to part (a), and those candidates who just mentioned the perspective in part (a) rather than the applications took their opportunity here to mention a few relevant applications.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 5

No candidate answered this question.

Question 6

No candidate answered this question.

Question 7

No candidate answered this question.

Question 8

No candidate answered this question.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 9

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'sources of stress'. Most candidates scored full marks for this question part by mentioning that a source of stress is any stressor that is placing demands on an individual who perceives that he or she cannot cope.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two ways in which stress can be measured. Any two ways of measuring stress were acceptable. Some candidates scored no more than 1 mark when writing that "a person can be asked" and showing no psychological knowledge. Others scored more marks when referring to an appropriate type such as the Holmes and Rahe Social Readjustment Scale and whether 2 or 3 marks were given depended on the level of accuracy and detail included in the answer. Some candidates went for a physiological approach and what really impressed were answers that wrote about the measure, such as recording GSR (galvanic skin response), and then supported it with an appropriate study (such as that by Geer and Maisel).
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one way in which stress can be managed. This was quite a straightforward question for most candidates and many took full advantage in describing a measure in detail. A wide range of different strategies were written about, ranging from medications to cognitive strategies and different ways of coping.

Question 10

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'gender differences in health behaviour'. Two components were required here: some mention of gender and some mention of a health behaviour that is different for each gender. Most candidates managed to score both available marks by providing some explanation and a little expansion or an example.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one developmental difference and one gender difference in health behaviour. Some candidates struggled to answer this question part. It is worth restating that all parts of a question should be read before beginning an answer and if a question part is unlikely to score many marks it may be worth doing a different question. One of the main developmental differences is foetal alcohol syndrome. This is where newborn babies are deformed and have

various abnormalities due to the mother drinking alcohol during pregnancy. One gender difference is lupus because in the UK for example 90% of sufferers are women.

- (c) This part required candidates to describe one cultural difference in health behaviour. If lupus was not used as a gender difference in part (b) it could be used here instead because there are also cultural differences in the number of sufferers. Some candidates chose to look at cultural differences in schizophrenia because not only are there significant differences in the number of people in different countries diagnosed with schizophrenia, it does not even exist (or no-one is diagnosed as having it) in others.

Question 11

- (a) Candidates were asked to describe what psychologists have learned about the patient-practitioner relationship. As with other essay questions there were many candidates who described in part (a) and then added more description to part (b) rather than evaluating. Some candidates wrote anecdotally about “my visit to see a doctor” and such approaches never score more than bottom band marks. Other candidates impressed by organising their answers, into verbal and non-verbal interactions for example, quoting a range of relevant psychological studies (e.g. McKinstry and Wang; Ley; and McKinlay) and showing that they understood what they were writing about.
- (b) Candidates were asked to evaluate what psychologists have learned about the patient-practitioner relationship. Essays for this option are no different from essays in any other option and answers here follow the same pattern: those who do not know how to evaluate; those who do nothing more than what is referred to as ‘general evaluation’ and those who follow the requirements of the mark scheme and base their answers on evaluation issues. The latter type will always score significantly high marks than the former types.
- (c) Candidates were asked to suggest how the patient-practitioner relationship can be improved. Continuing from the pattern mentioned above there were those who merely wrote “send doctors on training courses” (which is correct and would actually score 1 mark) to those who added details of an appropriate piece of psychological knowledge (e.g. Inui et al, 1976) to those who made a number of suggestions targeting what both the practitioner and the patient could do to improve the interaction.

Question 12

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about adherence to medical advice. Some excellent answers were observed in response to this question (as well as some poor ones). Better answers considered a range of factors such as types of non-adherence, measures of, and reasons for, non-adherence. Measures consisted of a range of objective measures such as ‘pill counts’ and biochemical tests, and some subjective ones. Reasons for non-adherence also covered a range of factors from psychological ones (Bulpitt’s rational non-adherence for example) to those who wrote “people cannot afford treatment”.
- (b) This part invited candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about adherence to medical advice. Those using evaluation issues wrote some really good answers and included issues such as subjective versus objective measures, the reliability and validity of various measures, the use of physiological measures and the reductionist nature of some explanations when there could be several reasons for non-adherence. Candidates not evaluating by issues often made relevant points, but without comparisons and contrasts they could not access marks from some parts of the mark scheme.
- (c) Here candidates were invited to suggest ways in which a medical practitioner can measure adherence to medical advice. Some answers were disappointing because of a lack of understanding as to what would work. Other candidates suggested that a medical practitioner could do a pill count or even take a blood sample pretending that it was part of the treatment!

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'abnormality'. Most candidates had little difficulty in scoring maximum marks for this question part. Candidates chose one or more of the typical four definitions (as detailed in (b) below) or referred to abnormality as assigned to those with rare or dysfunctional conditions.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two types of abnormality. Most candidates had little difficulty in describing two types, and the only difference between three marks and two marks was the amount of detail and accuracy in answers. Some candidates wrote about the same explanation of abnormality as they did in part (a) and other candidates chose two different ones. The typical four are: deviation from statistical norms; deviation from social norms; deviation from ideal mental health; and failure to function adequately.
- (c) This part required candidates to classify an abnormality of their own choice. This question part caused problems for a number of candidates. The question was asking them to choose an abnormality, such as depression, and to classify it as a neurotic rather than psychotic disorder and then to further classify it into unipolar rather than a bipolar disorder. A mention could also be made of the DSM (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual).

Question 14

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'reducing the effects of trauma'. There were two parts required here to obtain full marks. Firstly, a mention of trauma was required, for example that a traumatic experience sets off a reaction that can last for a few days, many months or years. Secondly, any answer must also have addressed the 'reducing' part and acknowledge some form of overcoming, controlling or managing.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two types of trauma. Some candidates misinterpreted the question and wrote about two causes of trauma (e.g. rape and a car crash) but most candidates focused on types such as amnesia, fugue and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Some answers showed clear evidence of understanding and thorough preparation and indeed some answers on the types of amnesia were very impressive.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one way in which a type of trauma described in part (b) could be reduced. Those candidates choosing to write about two different types of amnesia realised that reducing amnesia is not an easy thing to do, and if they had chosen a different type of trauma, such as PTSD then answering this question part would have been very much easier. Those including PTSD in (b) ran through systematic desensitisation or cognitive behaviour therapy in this question part and overall provided a coherent and organised answer.

Question 15

- (a) This part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about schizophrenia. This is a favourite topic area and some candidates wrote significant amounts of accurate and appropriate detail in their answers would have been awarded more than maximum marks if it were possible. The best answers impressed with the range of things included such as a distinction between positive and negative symptoms, the different types of schizophrenia, the different explanations of schizophrenia and different treatments for the disorder. Some answers focused just on one or two of these features but had so much depth to what they wrote this was worth just as many marks as those going for breadth.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about schizophrenia. Answers at the top end of the mark range considered a number of appropriate evaluation issues such as nature versus nurture, determinism, reductionism, comparisons of different approaches and even debates within approaches such as the chemical versus genetic debate. As always some candidates did not evaluate at all and some made a few appropriate comments.

- (c) Candidates were asked to suggest, as a medical practitioner, how they would treat a person with schizophrenia. This question may have been a little more challenging than usual because it focused on just one type of treatment rather than allowing the candidate to choose from a range. That said, medical treatments are by far the most common and by the quality of some answers the medical approach would be the one chosen by most candidates anyway. A few candidates did not read the question and wrote out a range of treatments including medical, behavioural and even psychodynamic.

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about abnormal avoidance and need. Candidates could focus on either avoidance or need or both. Abnormal need includes problems such as compulsive gambling, pyromania and kleptomania but any other abnormal need is legitimate. Abnormal avoidance includes any phobia such as agoraphobia, social phobia or any other specific phobia. Following a run-through of the types of avoidance and need more able candidates then went on to consider explanations by both the behavioural and psychodynamic approaches.
- (b) This part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about abnormal avoidance and need. Many very good part (a) answers continued to be very good in part (b) in that they considered an appropriate range of psychological issues though there were a few that did not evaluate and just continued with even more detail that should really have been included in part (a).
- (c) This question part invited candidates to suggest ways in which abnormal avoidance may be treated. A few candidates mistakenly looked at abnormal need and a few candidates suggested the use of drugs but they were not convinced of which were appropriate. The use of antidepressants is often the suggestion irrespective of what the disorder actually is. Most candidates correctly suggested cognitive-behaviour therapy which aims to influence dysfunctional emotions, behaviours and cognitions through a goal-oriented, systematic procedure.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'reward systems'. Most candidates were able to provide a basic explanation of a reward system which was sufficient to score both of the available marks.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two reward systems. Those at the top end of the mark range distinguished between intrinsic rewards which emphasise challenge, achievement and success and extrinsic rewards where the focus is on pay, promotion and fringe benefits. A few candidates really impressed by quoting psychological studies such as those of Maslow and McGregor and how they view reward systems.
- (c) This part required candidates to outline one problem with a reward system. This question was a challenge for some candidates, but again those at the top end of the range impressed because they made a distinction between the individual and the company. For example, rewards may or may not improve motivation in an individual and rewards may or may not improve production. Finally there was the comment that financial rewards may not improve job satisfaction.

Question 18

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'physical conditions of work environments'. Most candidates listed appropriate physical conditions of work environments and scored both the available marks.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe briefly two physical conditions of work environments. In this question part candidates expanded on the list provided in (a) and really provided quite an extensive range. However, the use of psychological evidence was clearly absent. Many detailed answers referred to not a single study or theory on lighting, noise, temperature, etc.

- (c) This question asked for one way in which the physical conditions of work environments could be improved. Most candidates just referred back to their part (a) answer. This was perfectly legitimate but still had the absence of psychological evidence. Some answers stated the obvious, that lighting should not be too bright or dim, but just right.

Question 19

No candidate answered this question.

Question 20

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about motivation to work. This was a popular choice, indeed no-one chose **Question 19**, and most candidates usually quoted the work of at least one theory of motivation which is usually that of Maslow. Many candidates provide a list of theorists, and mention each in detail, but the better answers stand out when they impose some understanding onto the list. This would include, for example, categorising the theories into types, such as need theories, job design theories and rational or cognitive theories.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about motivation to work. Many answers in part (a) were well-prepared and so were many answers in part (b), covering a range of appropriate issues supported with good examples to illustrate the points.
- (c) This part invited candidates to suggest what the management of any company could do to motivate employees through non-financial reward. The usual question focuses on financial rewards, but there is more to life than money! The more able candidates realised this, began with an outline of intrinsic rewards and then went on to write about job satisfaction, job rotation and job enrichment and a range of other factors. There were some excellent answers here, deserving of full marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/32
Specialist Choices

Key Messages

- Candidates should read all parts of the question, **(a)**, **(b)** and **(c)**, before beginning to write an answer.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus.

General comments

This is the final time a report will be written on this syllabus. The revised syllabus is examined for the first time in June 2012 and crucially some of the topic areas are different and the format of the examination paper is slightly different. The revised version of the specification should be consulted for full details of what has changed.

A significant number of candidates do not show psychological knowledge in their answers. Many candidates write anecdotally about their own life experiences without including any psychological knowledge (theory and/or evidence) which supports what is being written. This is a psychology examination and so candidates must show evidence of the psychology they have learned.

Some candidates assume that evaluation is an extension of the part **(a)** description and they simply describe more which doesn't score high marks. Other candidates make general evaluation comments and when the 2 marks allocated to this skill have been awarded, no further marks can be awarded for repetition of the same thing. This is also not the best way of scoring marks. To access all evaluation marks candidates should consider evaluative issues as detailed in the mark scheme. This comment applies to this paper and to papers assessing the new syllabus. Indeed on the new examination paper candidates are forced to address a named evaluation issue. All the evaluation issues are introduced at AS Level and are merely carried forward into Paper 3.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

- (a)** This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'individual differences in educational performance'. The term individual difference refers to any difference in the performance of an individual which differs from the norm. Most candidates scored full marks for having an explanation along these lines.
- (b)** Here candidates had to describe one cultural difference and one gender difference in educational performance. There were many 'common-sense' answers here and because these were correct a single mark was awarded. However, as will become apparent in this report, full marks can only be awarded if there is evidence of psychological knowledge present in the answer.
- (c)** This part required candidates to give one explanation for either a cultural difference or a gender difference. Answers to this question part followed the same format as for part **(b)** and the same comment applies about the type of answer needed for full marks. Although it is not always the

case, the quoting of an appropriate name (and date) usually guarantees at least 2 of the available 3 marks.

Question 2

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'preventive strategy' for disruptive behaviour. Many candidates confuse corrective and preventive from the outset and many candidates begin to describe a term but then give examples that do not match. Seemingly only a few candidates gave the perfect answer throughout this entire question. A preventive strategy is the preventing of a disruptive behaviour from happening before the event rather than correcting it after the event.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one type of disruptive behaviour and one cause for the type of disruptive behaviour. Answers ranged from 'out of seat' behaviour through to various forms of attention seeking; bullying was also included now and then. The cause of this ranged from the appropriately psychological (or medical) such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder to the anecdotal 'problems at home' type of answer.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one way in which a disruptive behaviour may be prevented. Following on from the comment in part (a) above, some descriptions were based on preventive strategies, but many were corrective with quite a few candidates unable to distinguish between the two.

Question 3

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about teaching and learning styles. As is usual when a question is set on this topic area candidates focus often exclusively on learning styles and ignore teaching styles altogether. To consider teaching styles would lead to good evaluation of the match between them and learning styles in question part (b). Answers focusing on learning styles looked at the work of Kolb (1976) and his learning 'kite', Curry's onion model (1983) and Grasha's (1996) six categories for learning.
- (b) This part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about teaching and learning styles. Throughout this report there will be a mention of three types of candidate: those candidates who have still not learned how to evaluate; those who make a few generalised comments, and those who evaluate fully through psychological issues, methods and debates as appear on the mark scheme. This topic area was no exception and whilst there were some very poor answers there were others that were excellent.
- (c) This part asked candidates to suggest how a teacher can improve the learning effectiveness of psychology candidates by using study skills. Many candidates knew quite a lot about study skills and described various mnemonic techniques such as the pegword technique in addition to McCarthy's (1990) 4-MAT system, PQRST, and Mulcahy's (1986) Strategies for Effective Learning and Thinking.

Question 4

- (a) This part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about the design and layout of educational environments. Most candidates provided a long list of appropriate physical conditions of educational environments. However, the use of psychological evidence was absent in many answers. Many detailed answers referred to not a single study or theory on lighting, noise, temperature, etc. The same was true when considering the use of colour or the layout of seating.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about the design and layout of educational environments. With an absence of studies in part (a) many evaluation issues resulting from studies cannot be used in part (b). For example, there can be no comments about sample size, place from where the evidence was gathered or even the method. Most answers reflected this and on the whole answers here were not very impressive.
- (c) Candidates were asked here to suggest a suitable design to create a suitable learning environment. This question part too revealed many obvious comments like "it should not be too noisy", and "the room should be comfortable" compared with those answers making suggestions that were supported with the appropriate psychological knowledge.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 5

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'controlling crowds'. There are definitions of crowds but the emphasis of this question was on how crowds could be controlled, meaning that a simple definition of what a crowd is was insufficient to score both marks.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one type of crowd. Brown (1965) outlines a number of different types of crowd: acquisitive crowd, apathetic crowd, expressive/peaceful crowd, baiting crowd, aggressive, and escaping crowd (which can be panicky or non-panicky). Expansion on one of these types scored either one or two marks more depending on the detail and the accuracy of the answer.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one way in which problems may be prevented in emergency situations and one way in which crowds can be controlled in emergency situations. A perfect answer would be to consider the work of Loftus for example on evacuation messages and then to consider the work of Waddington on recommendations for the control of crowds. No candidate had this combination or any other combination with similar focus and so the awarding of full marks for this question part was rare.

Question 6

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'environmental cognition'. According to Gifford (1997) environmental cognition is the way we acquire, store, organise and recall information about locations, distances and arrangements of the great outdoors. Although a formal definition never needs to be quoted, the sentiment behind it does; "processing the environment" is just too vague.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one way in which cognitive maps can be measured and one type of error commonly made when drawing cognitive maps. This question was answered by very few candidates and those attempting it did not impress. There were many guesses and psychological knowledge about measures and errors when drawing cognitive maps was largely absent.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one individual difference in environmental cognition. One of the main individual differences is a gender difference, but this question requires much more than stating "there is a gender difference". It is often argued that 'women cannot read maps' but that may be the fault of the type of map itself which is based on survey knowledge and males are generally much better at systemising type things of which survey knowledge is one.

Question 7

- (a) This question asked candidates to describe what psychologists have learned about density and crowding. A small number of candidates read the question as crowds (and collective behaviour) rather than crowding and density. 'Crowds' is the wrong topic area and as a 'crowds' question appeared in **Section A (Question 5)** no marks could be given to these incorrect answers. Those answering on crowding and density often impressed with the range of different aspects included in answers. Not only were there definitions, there were animal studies, and human studies looking at social behaviour, performance and health.
- (b) This part invited candidates to evaluate what psychologists have learned about density and crowding. Evaluations here often consisted of issues different from those in many answers because of the inclusion in this topic area of animal studies. For example candidates compared and contrasted animal studies in the natural environment (e.g. Christian et al.) with those done in a laboratory (e.g. Calhoun). Another issue considered was the extent to which animal studies can be generalised to humans.
- (c) This question asked candidates to suggest what may be done to cope with the effects of crowding. A small number of candidates misinterpreted the question and looked at ways in which crowding can be prevented, such as the raising of ceiling height. Candidates focusing correctly on coping often focused on increasing cognitive control or on some relaxation or attention diversion strategy.

Question 8

No candidate answered this question.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 9

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'improving adherence to medical advice'. Adherence is the extent to which people carry out the instructions given to them by a medical practitioner. This question also concerns improving this process, so full marks were awarded only if improvement was also acknowledged.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two reasons why people may not adhere to medical advice. Answers to this question covered the whole mark range. Some candidates knew no studies at all and made anecdotal comments instead, although some of these were correct and scored a mark. Other candidates knew studies but could not recall more than a sentence about them. The best answers came from candidates who knew two studies and could describe them in sufficient detail to score full marks. Such impressive answers chose the Bulpitt rational adherence explanation or wrote about Becker and Rosenstock's health belief model.
- (c) This part required candidates to suggest one way in which adherence to medical advice could be improved. Most candidates suggested at least one reason and although the question did not require it, some candidates provided a long list of improvements. Most common was to change to a patient-centred style and another was to improve the way medical practitioners communicate with patients by reducing the amount of medical jargon, for example, and simplifying instructions.

Question 10

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'measuring stress'. Rather than simply define stress, candidates were asked to explain the term measuring stress which is a 'bullet point' of the syllabus. Most candidates addressed this with little difficulty and scored full marks.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two studies where stress was measured psychologically. Many candidates decided to give anecdotal answers rather than ones based on psychological knowledge. Some suggested that stress could be measured simply by asking them. For other candidates very detailed and impressive answers were written using the three classic studies by Holmes and Rahe, Friedman and Rosenman, and Kanner on daily hassles.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one study where stress was measured physiologically. This answer again revealed the difference between candidates who knew very little psychology and merely suggested recording blood pressure with no elaboration and those candidates who had studied some relevant psychology and could quote a relevant study in detail and with understanding. For example, Goldstein et al. (1992) measured blood pressure in paramedics, Geer and Meisel (1972) measured GSR in participants exposed to photographs of dead bodies and Lundberg (1976) measured corticosteroids in urine in crowded train conditions.

Question 11

- (a) Candidates were asked to describe what psychologists have found out about health promotion. An essay on health promotion has appeared on the examination paper a number of times before, so candidates should have been well-prepared. Many were and there were some impressive answers that included appropriate terminology and a range of evidence. There was structure and understanding in the answers with many answers based around the methods for promoting health with a review of studies done in schools, worksites and communities.
- (b) Candidates were asked to evaluate what psychologists have found out about health promotion. As with all essay evaluation sections, marks covered the range from those who did not evaluate through to those who had a range of evaluation issues, made appropriate and valid generalisations, cross referenced and structured their answers appropriately. Reference to the mark scheme will enable anyone to see how to maximise marks.

- (c) Candidates had to suggest a health promotion campaign to overcome a health problem of their choice. There was a wide variety of answers to this question, but most candidates identified a problem and then proceeded to suggest how they would attempt to improve, change or resolve it. The fear arousal technique featured prominently and certainly from this sample of candidates it appears that this is how we should get people to change their health behaviour for the better.

Question 12

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have learned about health and safety. Many candidates began what were very good answers by making a useful distinction between theory A and theory B, also known as the systems or individual approach and then gave examples of each. Some candidates considered the illusion of invulnerability, moved on to consider different personality types and often looked at cognitive overload. On the other hand there were those who had a little knowledge of this topic area who wrote nothing more than a few anecdotal assertions.
- (b) This part invited candidates to evaluate what psychologists have learned about health and safety. The excellent answers of part (a) more often than not converted into excellent part (b) answers and these impressed with the range of issues included. A popular issue was reductionism and many compared and contrasted theory A with theory B.
- (c) Here candidates were invited to suggest ways in which safety behaviours can be promoted in schools. As usual there were anecdotal answers, with candidates writing things like “tell the children to be more careful”. At the other end of the mark range there were those who used evidence from the health promotion topic area such as providing information or fear-arousal approaches. In such answers theory, evidence and understanding was clearly evident.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the ‘medical model of abnormality’. There are a number of models of abnormality of which the medical model is one. Candidates generally answered the question well and showed good knowledge of the principles underlying this model.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe the assumptions of the medical model of abnormality. Most candidates had little difficulty outlining some assumptions. Some focused on chemical imbalances, others on genetics and some a combination of the two. Some candidates mentioned the assumption that this approach sees physical and mental illnesses as the same. Overall there were some excellent answers with maximum marks in abundance.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe two medical treatments for abnormalities. Most candidates began with drug treatments and some candidates went through a range of different types, such as anti-depressants and anti-psychotics. A small number of candidates went for anti-depressants as one medical treatment and anti-psychotics as the other. These are not two types of treatment. Some candidates correctly opted to describe electro-convulsive therapy and a few even mentioned psychosurgery.

Question 14

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term ‘kleptomania’. Kleptomania is an impulse control disorder where a person has a need to take something that does not belong to them to gain euphoria or relieve tension and typically it includes feelings of gratification or relief afterward. Nearly all candidates scored full marks.
- (b) Here candidates had to outline the characteristics of one abnormal need. Some candidates chose to continue with kleptomania and extended the answer they had begun in part (a). Other candidates chose to write about pyromania and yet others, who understood the term abnormal need, included gambling or other impulse control disorders.
- (c) This part required candidates to give one explanation for, and one way of overcoming, kleptomania. At a basic level, a few candidates suggested that people steal because they have

been brought up to steal and are criminals, but this shows a lack of understanding for the nature of the disorder. There are many psychological explanations. Behaviourists suggest the reward of not getting caught, and there is the physiological sensation of excitement. The cognitive approach suggests there must be faulty thought patterns and the psychodynamic approach suggests it is the inability of the ego and superego to suppress the 'I want' urges of the id. Some candidates forgot to address the second part of this question, whilst others spent just as much time as they considered the best ways in which kleptomania could be overcome.

Question 15

- (a) This part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about schizophrenia. This is a favourite topic area and some candidates wrote significant amounts of accurate and appropriate detail in their answers and would have been awarded more than maximum marks if it were possible. The best answers impressed with the range of things included such as a distinction between positive and negative symptoms, the different types of schizophrenia, the different explanations of schizophrenia and different treatments for the disorder. Some answers focused on just one or two of these features but had so much depth to what they wrote this was worth just as many marks as those going for breadth.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about schizophrenia. Answers at the top end of the mark range considered a number of appropriate evaluation issues such as nature versus nurture, determinism, reductionism, comparisons of different approaches and even debates within approaches such as the chemical versus genetic debate. As always some candidates did not evaluate at all and some made a few appropriate comments.
- (c) Candidates had to imagine they were a behaviourist and, giving reasons for their answer, suggest ways in which the behaviour of a schizophrenic can be modified. Some candidates still opted for a 'treat with drugs' answer and either did not read the question or misunderstand what behaviourism is about. Other candidates provided excellent answers and quoted the work of Sensky (2000) who has used cognitive-behavioural therapy in the treatment of schizophrenia and Paul and Lentz (1977) who found that the use of tokens was successful in reducing bizarre motor behaviours and in improving social interactions with staff and other patients.

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have learned about abnormal affect. Abnormal affect relates to the disorder involving moods which may range from the highs of mania to the lows of depression (bipolar disorder) or it could be just one of these and be unipolar. Seasonal affective disorder (SAD) is also relevant in this category. There were many brilliant essays that were detailed and covered anything and everything relevant to the topic area that were clearly written by well-prepared psychology candidates. As always a few candidates wrote about the depression they had last week assuming that their story would receive credit. It never does.
- (b) This part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have learned about abnormal affect. Many very good part (a) answers continued to be very good in part (b) though there were a few that did not evaluate and just continued with even more detail than that included in part (a). As always, time spent consulting mark schemes is time well spent.
- (c) This question part invited candidates to suggest ways in which abnormal affect may be treated in non-medical ways. As medical/drug treatments are the major source of reducing abnormal affect, candidates had to think about the question and consider alternatives. Some candidates did not and merely wrote about anti-depressants anyway. Others wrote a pre-prepared answer covering a range of both medical and non-medical possibilities. The best answers were those that focused just on seasonal affective disorder and wrote about the use of a light box, or those who wrote about cognitive-behavioural therapy. These candidates addressed the question specifically and everything they wrote received credit.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the term 'theory of leadership'. Most candidates were able to provide a basic explanation of leadership and many described an actual theory. What was lacking in most answers was an understanding of the term theory. This is an analytic structure designed to explain a set of empirical observations.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one theory of leadership. Most candidates scored full marks here and often wrote answers that were significantly more detailed than they needed to be to achieve 3 marks. Appropriate examination technique always maximises marks. Universalist theories, such as McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y, were most prominent.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one management style and one leadership style. This question often confuses candidates because they are often confused with the difference between the two terms. The biggest difference between managers and leaders is that a manager manages workers whereas a leader has followers. Many people are both. Another way of looking at this is to use Lewin et al.'s leadership styles of autocratic and democratic. A manager, depending on the team being managed may simply be unable to apply a democratic style.

Question 18

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'theory of motivation'. Most candidates were able to provide a basic explanation of motivation and many described an actual theory. As with **Question 17**, what was lacking in most answers was an understanding of the term theory, which as mentioned above is an analytic structure designed to explain a set of empirical observations.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe one theory of motivation and to suggest one way in which motivation at work can be improved. Most candidates opted to describe Maslow's theory despite there being many alternatives. Some candidates did write about alternatives and went for that proposed by McClelland or Herzberg's two-factor theory. For the second part of the question, which a few candidates forgot to write about, some candidates went for a 'pay more' basic approach, but others were more sophisticated in suggesting that intrinsic rewards were often much better motivators than money.
- (c) This part required candidates to give a reason why motivation and performance are not always related. There were some interesting answers written here, because sometimes there was some evidence of 'thinking outside the box'. For example it was suggested that workers new to a job may be very motivated but not very productive and another candidate suggested that individuals in a team may be motivated, but be unable to work together as a team to be productive.

Question 19

- (a) This part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about group behaviour in organisations. Many candidates wrote excellent answers which covered a wide range of evidence. Some focused on group processes such as cohesiveness, co-operation, and competition; others looked at group decision-making and deciding what action a group should take. Another aspect considered was that of group error which includes groupthink and group polarisation. Many candidates considered all these aspects and impressed with the depth of detail in their answers.
- (b) Here candidates were required to evaluate what psychologists have found out about group behaviour in organisations. Evaluation here followed the same pattern as for all other evaluation answers with many evaluating competently, for example comparing and contrasting different theories. Others made a few generalised comments and scored low marks.
- (c) This question asked candidates to suggest ways in which team roles and team building could be improved. All candidates could make a suggestion, and so scored some marks, but only the most able candidates included psychological knowledge and most apposite here is the work of Belbin or the work of Tuckman.

Question 20

- (a)** This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about interpersonal communication systems. This question appeared to attract candidates who knew very little about communication systems but thought that mentioning letter writing, email and similar things would score good marks. Such anecdotal answers may score a few marks, but with no psychological knowledge answers will often score no marks at all. There is nothing wrong with writing about email (and similar), all that is needed to access higher mark bands is a piece of associated psychological research.
- (b)** This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about interpersonal communication systems. As candidates more often than not described very little or no psychological knowledge in part **(a)** they were not able to evaluate it in part **(b)**. There were some comments along the lines of ‘email is good because’ and ‘email is bad because’ but there was very little to show knowledge of psychology. That said, there were many very good answers, and in part **(a)** too, showing a very good knowledge of relevant theories and research.
- (c)** This part invited candidates to suggest how communication flow from workers to management could be improved. Sending email was again a main feature for some, whilst others went through a whole range of possibilities including employee suggestion systems; grievance systems; open-door policies; employee surveys; participative decision making; corporate hotlines; brown bag meetings; skip-level meetings.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/33
Specialist Choices

Key Messages

- Candidates should read all parts of the question, **(a)**, **(b)** and **(c)**, before beginning to write an answer.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus.

General comments

This is the final time a report will be written on this syllabus. The revised syllabus is examined for the first time in June 2012 and crucially some of the topic areas are different and the format of the examination paper is slightly different. The revised version of the specification should be consulted for full details of what has changed.

A significant number of candidates do not show psychological knowledge in their answers. Many candidates write anecdotally about their own life experiences without including any psychological knowledge (theory and/or evidence) which supports what is being written. This is a psychology examination and so candidates must show evidence of the psychology they have learned.

Some candidates assume that evaluation is an extension of the part **(a)** description and they simply describe more which doesn't score high marks. Other candidates make general evaluation comments and when the 2 marks allocated to this skill have been awarded, no further marks can be awarded for repetition of the same thing. This is also not the best way of scoring marks. To access all evaluation marks candidates should consider evaluative issues as detailed in the mark scheme. This comment applies to this paper and to papers assessing the new syllabus. Indeed on the new examination paper candidates are forced to address a named evaluation issue. All the evaluation issues are introduced at AS Level and are merely carried forward into Paper 3.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

No candidate answered this question.

Question 2

No candidate answered this question.

Question 3

No candidate answered this question.

Question 4

No candidate answered this question.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 5

No candidate answered this question.

Question 6

No candidate answered this question.

Question 7

No candidate answered this question.

Question 8

No candidate answered this question.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 9

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'theory of pain'. Nearly all candidates scored a mark here because they know what pain is and could define it. What many candidates struggled with was the term 'theory' and only a few could say what a theory actually was. A theory is an analytic structure designed to explain a set of empirical observations.
- (b) Here candidates had to outline one theory of pain. A few candidates chose specificity theory, but most chose to describe the gate control theory proposed by Melzack and Wall. These descriptions were often excellent with clear understanding that pain consists of both physiological and psychological components. Some candidates knew no theories at all and their guesses often scored no marks at all.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe two ways of measuring chronic pain. Some candidates opted for a simple 'you can ask them' which is true and scored one mark. But more is needed for three marks and the way to do this is to quote psychological knowledge. Many candidates wrote about the UAB pain observation system and others opted for the McGill pain questionnaire. Both these techniques are used for assessing chronic pain rather than acute (short-term) pain.

Question 10

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain the difference between 'substance use' and 'substance abuse'. Most candidates scored full marks here and many provided 'dictionary definitions' when correctly stating that substance use is 'normal' regular use where the person has not become physically or psychologically dependent on the substance. Substance abuse is defined as the existence of a clear pathological use; heightened problems in social or occupational functioning; and existence of pathological use for at least a month.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe two theories of substance abuse applied to a substance of their choice. Many candidates could describe two theories with little difficulty but others could only manage anecdotal guesses. For smoking, for example, there are a number of theories such as the nicotine regulation model, the bio-behavioural model and the opponent process model which were described well.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe one difference between physical dependence and psychological dependence to a substance. There were some superb answers written here too, meaning that many candidates scored either very close to or full marks. As these candidates stated, physical dependence is a state in which the body has adjusted to the presence of a substance and incorporated it into the 'normal' functioning of the tissue of the body. This state has two characteristics: tolerance and withdrawal. On the other hand psychological dependence is a state in which people feel a compulsion to use a substance for the pleasant effect it produces (without necessarily being physically dependent).

Question 11

- (a) Candidates were asked to describe what psychologists have learned about lifestyles and health behaviour. This question (and **Question 12**) saw two types of answer: those who knew very little about psychology and just wrote about lifestyles and health behaviour as anyone would who had not studied psychology, and those who had been superbly prepared and brought a wide range of apposite evidence into a competently written psychological answer.
- (b) Candidates were asked to evaluate what psychologists have learned about lifestyles and health behaviour. Many candidates were able to include a number of evaluation issues in their answer and this automatically placed them in the mid-band range of marks. Only a few scored top marks because often there was a lack of clarity when relating evidence to the issue.
- (c) Candidates were asked to suggest ways in which people can be encouraged to improve their lifestyle and health behaviour. A number of candidates went for the simple eat less, drink less and exercise more approach and scored some marks. However, the better answers went on to add psychological knowledge to this by suggesting the raising of awareness of self-efficacy, or by conducting a fear-arousal promotion campaign.

Question 12

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about health and safety. Like **Question 11**, there were two types of answer seen: the anecdotal (which scores very few and often no marks at all) and the competently prepared impressive answer which scores very high if not full marks. Many candidates started by making a useful distinction between theory A and theory B, also known as the systems or individual approach and then gave examples of each. Cognitive overload featured prominently although the evidence presented was quite wide-ranging.
- (b) This question part invited candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about health and safety. As with **Question 11**, there were many candidates who wrote very detailed answers which covered a range of appropriate issues. The issue of reductionism was mentioned by most candidates who applied it well to the evidence.
- (c) Here candidates were invited to suggest how accidents in the home could be reduced. As usual there were anecdotal answers, with candidates writing things like “tell people to be more careful”. At the other end of the mark range were those who brought in evidence from the health promotion topic area such as providing information or fear-arousal approaches. Such answers included theory and evidence; understanding was clearly evident.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by the ‘behavioural model of abnormality’. There are a number of models of abnormality of which the behavioural approach is one. Candidates generally answered the question well and showed good knowledge of the basic principles of behaviourism.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe the assumptions of the behavioural model of abnormality. Most candidates chose to begin with the comment that behaviourists believe that all behaviour is learned and then went on to support this with a description of classical and operant conditioning. Some candidates even threw in a little observational learning. Those scoring maximum marks then applied these principles to the learning of dysfunctional behaviour such as a phobia.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe two behavioural treatments of abnormality. Most candidates opted to describe systematic desensitisation and often mentioned aspects like an anxiety hierarchy in detail and with very good accuracy. The technique of flooding also featured and it was good to read that many candidates mentioned how unethical it is and how infrequently it is now used. Also featuring, and appropriately so, was cognitive-behaviour therapy with candidates making the comment of how this has progressed beyond a purely behavioural approach.

Question 14

- (a) This question part asked candidates to explain what is meant by 'overcoming anxiety disorder'. An anxiety disorder is a general feeling of dread or apprehensiveness accompanied by various physiological reactions such as increased heart rate, sweating, muscle tension, rapid and shallow breathing. Most candidates scored 1 mark for mentioning one or more aspects of this definition. However, to score full marks candidates must also have addressed the 'overcoming' part and acknowledged some form of overcoming, controlling or managing.
- (b) Here candidates had to describe the characteristics of generalised anxiety disorder. In writing a very detailed answer to question part (a) many candidates had already addressed most of this part (b) question. In addition to the above physiological features generalised anxiety disorder also has psychological features such as excessive, uncontrollable and often irrational worry about everyday things that is disproportionate to the actual source of worry. This often interferes with daily functioning and there are many other accompanying physical features beyond the immediate anxiety response.
- (c) This part required candidates to describe two ways in which generalised anxiety disorder may be treated. At the bottom end of the mark range some candidates suggested giving anti-depressants (even though those with generalised anxiety disorder are not depressed) or some other drug, whilst better answers suggested behavioural or cognitive behavioural techniques. Systematic desensitisation featured prominently although this is more applicable when the source of the anxiety is known. Some candidates suggested psychoanalysis but often did not go into very much detail about how this would be applied.

Question 15

- (a) This part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have discovered about classifying and diagnosing abnormality. There were generally three main features that could be considered in this answer. Firstly the defining of the term abnormality itself, including the 'deviation from statistical norms' approach, and the 'failure to function adequately' definition, amongst others. Secondly there could be a consideration of the historical 'definitions' leading to the birth of DSM (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual) and thirdly there could be a consideration of how different psychological approaches perceive abnormality such as the medical, behavioural and psychoanalytic approaches. Some candidates included just one of these three and some candidates wrote in detail about all three and even more.
- (b) This question part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have discovered about classifying and diagnosing abnormality. Evaluating different approaches is relatively easy whereas bringing in more issues than this is much more challenging (to evaluate historical approaches or DSM, for example). Many candidates rose to the challenge and looked at nature-nurture, the physiological approach and reductionism. Others evaluated DSM itself and often wrote very impressive answers that were a pleasure to read.
- (c) This part asked candidates to suggest a treatment for a classified abnormality. This question required little effort for those who had superb part (b) answers but was a little more challenging for those who struggled with evaluation issues. The treatment suggested depended on the classified abnormality chosen, and schizophrenia, depression, and anxiety disorders were prominent. Treatments included were medical, behavioural such as systematic desensitisation, cognitive behaviour therapy, and token economy; and some candidates considered alternative approaches such as psychotherapy.

Question 16

- (a) This question part asked candidates to describe what psychologists have found out about somatoform disorders. Somatoform disorders are where physical symptoms are prominent but no cause can be found. Most typical examples, which many candidates described very well, include hypochondriasis, conversion disorder, somatisation, psychogenic pain and body dysmorphic disorder. There were no bottom band answers presumably because those not knowing what this topic area was about could not even guess at the term somatoform.
- (b) This part asked candidates to evaluate what psychologists have found out about somatoform disorders. This was again challenging for some candidates who either could not go beyond

general evaluation points or those who tried to apply the same issues as for most other topic areas that really did not fit this topic area. A few candidates were able to think 'outside the box' and really impressed with their ability to think beyond the obvious.

- (c) This question part invited candidates to suggest ways in which somatoform may be treated with non-medical approaches. This question confused a small number of candidates who seemingly want to treat everything with drugs and such candidates either wrote nothing or they went ahead with drug treatments anyway. Marks will only be awarded if the question is answered. Some candidates did answer the question and included treatments based on the behavioural and/or psychodynamic approach which were entirely appropriate.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

No candidate answered this question.

Question 18

No candidate answered this question.

Question 19

No candidate answered this question.

Question 20

No candidate answered this question.