

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/11
Core Studies 1

Key messages

- It is important that candidates refer to the correct study where a psychologist is named as the author or co-author in more than one study, e.g. Loftus, Baron-Cohen, etc.
- Candidates should clearly separate their responses in questions where there are two parts to be answered, as it can be difficult to mark the work of candidates who answer both parts together.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts can be answered.

General comments

This sitting of Paper 1 was the first for the new syllabus. There were two major changes to the paper: the inclusion of new studies and the change in essays in **Section B**. The essay format changed from a choice to two compulsory questions and from questions asking for description as well as evaluation/application to two questions requiring only the latter. With respect to the essays, the majority of candidates followed the instruction to answer both questions in **Section B**, and the majority also focussed on analysis rather than description in their answers. With regard to **Section A**, responses were more mixed. A minority of candidates were unable to attempt questions relating to the new studies, or responded with answers relating to an inappropriate study, such as Loftus and Palmer (1979) not Loftus and Pickrell. In contrast, some candidates had learned the new studies in detail and were readily able to answer questions about their content. The majority of candidates, however, could attempt the questions on new studies with varying degrees of success, as would be expected.

A minority of candidates had not separated their answers to parts (a) and (b) in **Section A**, e.g. only saying 'Question 8' and then answering both parts together. It is sometimes difficult to separate the parts and is consequently difficult to mark the work of these candidates.

There were a few Centres where many candidates only answered one question in **Section B**. It was not always easy to tell whether this was due to time constraints or not. For example, one candidate scored high credit in **Section A** and then full credit for **Question 17** but had not done **Question 16** suggesting that they believed they should only answer one question from **Section B**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Mann et al: This question, asking for two behaviours recorded by observers, was generally answered well, typically with reference to blinking and pauses, although some candidates gained only minimal credit per answer (as they only identified rather than going on to describe the factor). A few answers did not identify specific behaviours, referring only to the general idea of 'fidgeting', and others did not appear to be based on the study as they described behaviours not on the list.

Question 2

Loftus and Pickrell: Both parts of this question asked for the results for recall and clarity but part **(a)** asked in relation to *true* events and part **(b)** in relation to *false events*. Where candidates did not gain full credit, they tended to refer only to recall rather than to recall and clarity. Others responded with recall and confidence rather than recall and clarity. Most candidates achieved at least minimal credit per section. Such candidates could have improved their answers by including quantitative data. Some candidates also confused the findings for true and for false events, so it is important to learn both aspects of the results separately. A very small minority of candidates appeared to be writing about Loftus and Palmer's study about the estimation of speed in crashing cars, so it is essential that candidates learn about the exact study given in the specification.

Question 3

Baron-Cohen et al: Candidates who found this question difficult were typically unable to distinguish between the stages of theory of mind (understanding the emotions of others and responding) and the stages of attribution (identifying the mental state and making inferences from it). It is important that candidates are aware of the key aspects of the context of each study from the introduction of the paper. Some candidates wrote about the Eyes Test, and could have improved their answers by focusing directly on the stages of attribution theory. A very small minority of candidates appeared to be writing about Baron-Cohen's study about the Sally-Anne task. As with **Question 2**, it is essential that candidates learn about the exact study given in the syllabus.

Question 4

Held and Hein: The question asked candidates to describe two of the additional tests used. Where candidates chose additional tests they tended to describe them well. Where candidates used main tests they did not gain any credit so it is important that candidates can distinguish between the main tests used in the study and those which were additional – as stated in the question to check the status of peripheral receptors. Some candidates also confused the horizontal and vertical paw placement tests, so it could be useful for candidates to illustrate the difference between these tests visually.

Question 5

Milgram: This was often well answered with candidates illustrating their knowledge of the study and ability to apply it. The stem of the question told candidates that "In Milgram's study of obedience he says that we learn in childhood that it is a 'breach of moral conduct to hurt another person'". In part **(a)**, candidates were asked 'To what extent did Milgram's participants follow the moral conduct they had learned?' Some candidates did not appear to understand the word 'breach' in the quote from Milgram's study so gave ambiguous answers suggesting that moral conduct was to hurt another person. This question, like others in **Section A**, was asking about the context of the study but in this case, candidates needed to use this context to explain the results. In order to perform well in such questions, candidates must appreciate how the findings relate to the aim and context of the study. Part **(b)** of this question, which asked what Milgram concluded, tended to be answered well with a range of different expressions of the conclusion such as 'People will follow orders even when this hurts someone else'. A few candidates appeared to confuse the study with Tajfel's or Bandura's and wrote about children, so it is important that candidates can reliably identify the terms or short phrases used to identify each study.

Question 6

Haney, Banks and Zimbardo: This question asked for two factors contributing to pathological prisoner syndrome. There was a range of answers here, with many excellent ones which included good use of the terminology and specific examples or evidence. Where candidates did not score full credit, they often needed to offer more specific 'factors contributing', to describe them in more detail, or to focus on the factors rather than on describing pathological prisoner syndrome in general.

Question 7

Piliavin et al: Part (a) of this question was generally very well answered, with candidates giving both levels of one of the independent variables, such as the victim's race (black or white), the time of the model's entry (early or late) or the type of victim (drunk or ill) and only a few candidates misreported the cane-carrying confederate as 'blind', 'sick' or 'injured'. In part (b), asking about the DV, there were also many good answers. Some candidates answered in terms of results – so their responses had the DVs within them and could have been improved by presenting their knowledge as what was *recorded* in the study.

Question 8

Freud: Part (a) of this question, asking about two features that made this investigation a case study, was typically well answered, with the majority of candidates offering the key elements of case studies (that they are in-depth investigations conducted on a single individual). In part (b), candidates were able to suggest appropriate problems (typically lack of generalisability). Where candidates did not score full credit they could often have improved their answer by relating the problem they had identified to the study of little Hans.

Question 9

Langlois et al: This question asked candidates to describe two features of the sample. Candidates who did not score full credit sometimes appeared to have misunderstood the study and described the stimulus material (the faces) rather than the sample, or misunderstood the question and described the procedure. It is important that candidates learn the roles of different people in this study, in the way that they learn the roles of the teacher and learner in Milgram's study, or the participants and confederates in Piliavin et al.

Question 10

Nelson: Most answers identified motive and consequence and some identified mode of presentation. Many candidates were therefore able to gain minimal credit although fewer were able to describe the factors. A small number mentioned the age groups, and here they typically did gain further credit. Some incorrect answers suggested factors that the candidate appeared to believe might affect moral development but which were not tested in the study, such as upbringing.

Question 11

Dement and Kleitman: Answers here were generally good, typically answering with the 'tomatoes', 'baseball' or 'hoist' dreams in part (a), which asked for an example of a dream. Candidates could sometimes have improved their answers by giving more than just the 'topic' of the dream, as stated above, but going on to describe what the participants dreamed *about*. There were also many good answers to part (b), although some candidates only stated the relationship without giving details, so could only access minimal credit. A small minority appeared to have misunderstood the study as in part (b), they suggested that the existence of rapid eye movements causes a dream, or means that you will remember a dream, or that fast REM means a horrible dream and slow REM means a nice dream. Others simply explained that REMs meant you were dreaming, without describing what the relationship was. With each of these issues, candidates could have improved their performance by re-reading the question to ensure that they had answered the exact question being asked.

Question 12

Rosenhan: Candidates generally scored well on both parts of this question. In part (a), they were able to give accurate details of the way that the pseudopatients obtained an appointment, and of the symptoms they reported. Where candidates gave the inaccurate response that the pseudopatients "said they had symptoms of schizophrenia", they needed to be more precise in their answer to the question, which asked "What did the pseudopatients *do*...". This required accurate reporting of the way the pseudopatients claimed to hear a same-sex voice saying "empty, thud, hollow". In part (b), candidates typically gave accurate accounts of what the pseudopatients did after admission. Where candidates did not earn full credit, they needed to recognise that this question required 2 separate things to obtain full credit, rather than expansion so, for example, they needed to identify 'ceasing to show any signs of abnormality' and 'writing notes'.

Question 13

Thigpen and Cleckley: Candidates typically gave good answers to this question. In part **(a)**, they named the IQ test, Rorschach ink blots or the memory test, with a small number referring to the 'draw a human figure' test. Where candidates incorrectly responded with EEG or hypnosis they could have gained credit by attending to the word 'tests' in the question. Part **(b)** was correspondingly well answered, generally with either the IQ test results or a description of the findings of the Rorschach test. Where candidates did not earn full credit here, they typically needed to add either the numerical results for the IQ tests, or descriptive results from the ink blots.

Question 14

Billington et al: In part **(a)**, some candidates had the definition for 'empathising' almost word for word. Those who gave confused definitions or simply describing 'sympathy' could have earned full credit by learning key terms from the study. Although candidates were able to give precise evidence from tests in many studies, in part **(b)** of this question many candidates could have gained more credit by focusing on the evidence from the Eyes Test, FC-EFT or SQ/SQR rather than reporting differences between Humanities/Science or occupations. This was particularly so for candidates who gave anecdotal answers, such as responding in terms of mothering instinct.

Question 15

Veale and Riley: Part **(a)**, was very well answered with many candidates being able to give the two ways in which the samples were matched as age and sex. In part **(b)**, most candidates achieved at least minimal credit. To improve their answers, these candidates needed to be able to accurately recall specific behaviours rather than writing at length and including material that was irrelevant and therefore not creditworthy.

Section B

Although in **Section A**, the candidates' knowledge of the procedure and results of studies was good, with many being able to give some details of procedure and results, some candidates could have improved their performance by learning specific details of the procedure, such as how variables are manipulated, measured or controlled and quantitative/qualitative results, as appropriate, that are central to the aims of each study. An awareness of such details would enable candidates to improve their score in **Section A** questions and, here in **Section B**, would give them more detailed information about the study. Although some candidates were aware of the aims and contexts of the studies, this is also an area in which many could improve. The reasons for each study being done are described in the introduction to each paper and are important for understanding why each piece of research was conducted.

Question 16

Loftus and Pickrell/Bandura et al/Maguire et al: Candidates were generally able to identify two weaknesses but often struggled to elaborate or evaluate above the middle band. Better answers were able to describe appropriate elements of the chosen study but few were able to provide the depth or detail required for top band answers and use of terminology was often weak. Some lengthy answers included irrelevant description of the study so the material was not well shaped to the question.

Candidates chose from the full spread of studies. A very small number of candidates had written about the wrong study – confusion arose with Loftus and Pickrell and with Maguire et al. Overall there was a good range of awarded credit; some candidates wrote very little and others wrote two sides of detailed, accurate, relevant discussion, so there were some excellent answers.

Question 17

Tajfel/Schachter and Singer/Demattè et al: Responses included a good spread of studies. In a small minority of cases, candidates wrote about Milgram rather than Tajfel. There was again a full range of awarded credit. Candidates could typically identify relevant strengths and weaknesses but either appropriate contextualisation or depth and detail was lacking. The use of terminology was somewhat better than in **Question 16**. Some candidates did not answer the question, referring only to the strengths and weaknesses of the study rather than to the strengths and weaknesses of laboratory experiments.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/12
Core Studies 1

Key messages

- To gain maximum credit, candidates should be aware of the aims and contexts of the studies, as this is an area in which many could improve
- Candidates could have improved their performance by learning specific details of procedures such as how variables are manipulated, measured or controlled and quantitative/qualitative results, where such procedures are appropriate to the study.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will not achieve top marks.

General comments

This sitting of Paper 1 was the first for the new syllabus. There were two major changes to the paper: the inclusion of new studies and the change in essays in **Section B**. The essay format changed from a choice to two compulsory questions and from questions asking for description as well as evaluation/application to two questions requiring only the latter. With respect to the essays, the majority of candidates followed the instruction to answer both questions in **Section B**. With regard to **Section A**, the majority of candidates attempted the questions on both the old and the new studies with varying degrees of success, as would be expected.

The candidates' knowledge of studies, both new and old was impressive, with many presenting accurate details in **Section A** answers and, to a lesser extent, demonstrating depth of knowledge in **Section B**. In general, the candidates' knowledge of the procedure and results of studies was very good, with many being able to give specific numerical results. Some candidates could have improved their performance in **Section A** in this respect by learning specific details of the procedure, such as how variables are manipulated, measured or controlled and quantitative/qualitative results, as appropriate, that are central to the aims of each study. An awareness of such details would enable candidates to score full credit in questions where they are only gaining minimal credit because they have not elaborated their answer. Although some candidates were aware of the aims and contexts of the studies, this is an area in which many could improve. The reasons for each study being done are described in the introduction to each paper and are important for understanding why each piece of research was conducted.

In **Section B**, answers to **Question 16** were generally better than those for **Question 17**. This was because more candidates answered the question in **Question 16**, i.e. they used their chosen study to evaluate the nature-nurture debate. To improve here, candidates need to expand on their answers with more detail and to ensure that they considered and illustrated both sides of the debate. Although many candidates also focussed on analysis in **Question 17**, this was often misdirected; they provided irrelevant analysis of their chosen study, rather than using this to demonstrate the strengths and weaknesses of the psychology of individual differences. Here, candidates needed to apply their knowledge of the study they had chosen, which was often thorough, to the evaluation of the particular approach to psychology given in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Mann et al: Although there were many ways to answer the question 'Describe one individual difference in deceptive behaviour', there were also many candidates who did not score full credit in part **(a)**. The main mistake here was to give only a partial answer, for example, just saying 'less hand gestures' or not giving

numbers. Many candidates also answered part **(b)** well, although some candidates appear generally to have learned the aims/conclusions of studies less well than the procedure or results, so this may be an area for improvement.

Question 2

Loftus and Pickrell: Generally well answered, with candidates offering a range of explanations of what the participants in the study believed it was about, with few simply suggesting in part **(a)** that it was a 'study of memory'. In part **(b)**, the candidates needed to explain the reason for deception in the study. There were many good answers relating to validity and avoiding demanding characteristics or confounding variables.

Question 3

Baron-Cohen et al: The majority of candidates who had learned the correct study answered the question well, focusing on the details of any two of the four possible groups of participants. It is critical here that candidates have learned the correct Baron-Cohen study. A very small minority appeared to have been writing about Baron-Cohen's study regarding the Sally-Anne task. It is essential that candidates learn about the exact study given in the syllabus.

Question 4

Milgram: This question asked how the experimenter tried to stop the participants from withdrawing. It was often well answered with candidates illustrating their knowledge of the study and, in part **(b)**, of the reasons for ethical guidelines; although where candidates did not score full credit, this was generally because their understanding of the application of ethics was weaker in part **(b)**. A small number of candidates mistakenly referred to payment in part **(a)**.

Question 5

Haney, Banks and Zimbardo: Part **(a)** of this question asked for two features of the prisoners' uniforms and part **(b)** for the effect of the uniform on the prisoners' behaviour. There was a range of answers here, with many excellent ones which included good use of the terminology and specific examples or evidence.

Question 6

Piliavin et al: Candidates were generally able to give two appropriate behaviours of the 'drunk' victim as asked in part **(a)**, but a small number simply guessed at generally drunken behaviour, where they needed to give specific details from the study in order to gain credit. The majority were then able to go on to describe a difference between the results of the two conditions in part **(b)**.

Question 7

Tajfel: Generally candidates gave good answers to both part **(a)**, which asked for a key feature of ethnocentrism, and part **(b)**, which asked for the minimum conditions for ethnocentrism. A minority of candidates offered simplistic responses to part **(a)** or gave examples of the consequences of ethnocentrism.

Question 8

Freud: Part **(a)** of this question was typically well answered, with the majority of candidates offering the key elements of the Oedipus complex. In part **(b)**, candidates were also able to describe an appropriate piece of evidence for this in good detail.

Question 9

Langlois et al: There were some good answers here, especially relating to the aim of replication and to the extension of the investigation to males. However, some candidates referred to the aims of the third study, so could not gain credit. As in **Question 1**, some candidates' responses suggested that they had not learned the context of the study as well as the procedure or results.

Question 10

Nelson: In part (a), the majority of candidates were able to describe some aspects of the stimulus material in the implicit condition. In part (b), candidates could generally explain the ways in which the two conditions differed, such as by referring to 'thought bubbles', although a small minority mixed up the meaning of 'implicit' and 'explicit'. However, many candidates did not score full credit, even though this was a crucial aspect of the method of the study. To improve their credit here, candidates could have included a description of the story or the images in part (a) and explained that the motive was made obvious or clear in the explicit condition and given a description of how in part (b).

Question 11

Schachter and Singer: On the whole, this question was well answered, with accurate identification of the two factors in the two factor model as 'arousal' and 'cognition'. Some candidates, however, gave ambiguous answers in part (b), having used emotion/psychological in part (a). Again, this question asked about a central aspect of the context as well as the procedure of the study and candidates could improve their answers by being more familiar with the entire original study.

Question 12

Dement and Kleitman: Many candidates' responses in part (a), relating to how the self report method was used, were good but others gave vague answers which did not focus on 'how'. Here, candidates could have improved by reporting details such as the participants being woken by a bell to record their dream into a machine. Nevertheless, part (b), about possible problems with the self report data, was typically well answered with candidates suggesting problems such as lying or trying to please the experimenter and explaining why these are problematic.

Question 13

Maguire et al: Part (a) asked for a way in which experienced taxi drivers are unusual in their wayfinding. The study identifies several and although some candidates could suggest factors, such as their topographical knowledge, or specifically their knowledge of short cuts or minor roads, this could only earn them minimal credit, as other drivers have some such spatial knowledge too. Candidates could have improved their answers by saying that taxi drivers had *more extensive* knowledge, knew *better* short cuts, etc. This would have avoided answers which appeared to be based on guesswork, rather than based on facts from the study. In part (b), which asked for ways that taxi drivers and other people are similar in their wayfinding, candidates could again have improved their answers by giving fuller responses, such as by extending 'both use their hippocampus' to 'both use their right/posterior hippocampus' or by extending 'both use cognitive strategies' by giving an example, such as 'using land credit'.

Question 14

Demattè et al: This question was well answered, with most candidates clearly stating the four odour conditions. The rare error made by candidates was to include 'clean air' in place of one of the four test odours.

Question 15

Veale and Riley: Many candidates were able to give accurate answers about long mirror sessions in part (a), asking for two mirror uses by the BDD patients and in part (b), asking for two uses more common in the control patients. Some candidates responded with results relating to short sessions, gave beliefs about mirror use rather than actual uses or confused the results of the BDD and control participants. Candidates could improve their accuracy here by tabulating specific behaviours for each participant group for each type of mirror use to avoid errors.

Section B

Question 16

Held and Hein/Bandura et al/Nelson: There were some good answers which focused appropriately on the nature/nurture debate giving examples from the chosen study. Many candidates used their knowledge of the debate to draw out evidence from their chosen study, although some found achieving a balance difficult. For example, only a minority used their understanding of Held and Hein to expertly demonstrate support for nature by identifying the importance of the kittens being litter-mates, and thus developing in the same way until the study began and after they were given appropriate rehabilitative exposure, or the results of the candidate dilation and blinking tests. In addition, many candidates did not gain credit beyond the middle bands as they did not provide enough detail to relate their understanding of the debate to the study or only gave an account of method and/or results of the study itself, for which they could not gain credit.

Question 17

Thigpen and Cleckley/Billington et al/Rosenhan: Candidates typically focused on describing the procedure or results of the study, for which they could not gain credit, rather than answering the question. They needed to use the facts they reported about the study to illustrate the strengths and weaknesses of the psychology of individual differences.

Where candidates did include strengths and weaknesses, these often related to the study rather than the psychology of individual differences, so again they could not earn credit. For example, although from Rosenhan's study, candidates could report the finding that the sane pseudopatients were treated as if they were insane, they did not then use this to say that a strength of the individual differences approach is to demonstrate that people are 'more than just labels'.

Similarly with Thigpen and Cleckley, although candidates often described the method of the detailed case study, they did not then go on to identify this as an example of in depth data collection, which is a strength of the individual differences approach. The same problem arose in identifying weaknesses. Candidates again could identify that Eve was unusual, but rarely went on to evaluate the psychology of individual differences by saying that the sample in Thigpen and Cleckley (or in Billington et al's study) was unlike the majority of people, therefore the findings of such studies, unlike those from other areas such as social or cognitive psychology, cannot be widely generalised.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/13

Core Studies 1

Key messages

- It is important that candidates refer to the correct study where a psychologist is named as the author or co-author in more than one study, e.g. Loftus, Baron-Cohen, etc.
- Candidates should clearly separate their responses in questions where there are two parts to be answered, as it can be difficult to mark the work of candidates who answer both parts together.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts can be answered.

General comments

This sitting of Paper 1 was the first for the new syllabus. There were two major changes to the paper: the inclusion of new studies and the change in essays in **Section B**. The essay format changed from a choice to two compulsory questions and from questions asking for description as well as evaluation/application to two questions requiring only the latter. With respect to the essays, the majority of candidates followed the instruction to answer both questions in **Section B**, and the majority also focussed on analysis rather than description in their answers. With regard to **Section A**, responses were more mixed. A minority of candidates were unable to attempt questions relating to the new studies, or responded with answers relating to an inappropriate study, such as Loftus and Palmer (1979) not Loftus and Pickrell. In contrast, some candidates had learned the new studies in detail and were readily able to answer questions about their content. The majority of candidates, however, could attempt the questions on new studies with varying degrees of success, as would be expected.

A minority of candidates had not separated their answers to parts **(a)** and **(b)** in **Section A**, e.g. only saying 'Question 8' and then answering both parts together. It is sometimes difficult to separate the parts and is consequently difficult to mark the work of these candidates.

There were a few Centres where many candidates only answered one question in **Section B**. It was not always easy to tell whether this was due to time constraints or not. For example, one candidate scored high credit in **Section A** and then full credit for **Question 17** but had not done **Question 16** suggesting that they believed they should only answer one question from **Section B**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Mann et al: This question, asking for two behaviours recorded by observers, was generally answered well, typically with reference to blinking and pauses, although some candidates gained only minimal credit per answer (as they only identified rather than going on to describe the factor). A few answers did not identify specific behaviours, referring only to the general idea of 'fidgeting', and others did not appear to be based on the study as they described behaviours not on the list.

Question 2

Loftus and Pickrell: Both parts of this question asked for the results for recall and clarity but part **(a)** asked in relation to *true* events and part **(b)** in relation to *false* events. Where candidates did not gain full credit, they tended to refer only to recall rather than to recall and clarity. Others responded with recall and confidence rather than recall and clarity. Most candidates achieved at least minimal credit per section. Such

candidates could have improved their answers by including quantitative data. Some candidates also confused the findings for true and for false events, so it is important to learn both aspects of the results separately. A very small minority of candidates appeared to be writing about Loftus and Palmer's study about the estimation of speed in crashing cars, so it is essential that candidates learn about the exact study given in the specification.

Question 3

Baron-Cohen et al: Candidates who found this question difficult were typically unable to distinguish between the stages of theory of mind (understanding the emotions of others and responding) and the stages of attribution (identifying the mental state and making inferences from it). It is important that candidates are aware of the key aspects of the context of each study from the introduction of the paper. Some candidates wrote about the Eyes Test, and could have improved their answers by focusing directly on the stages of attribution theory. A very small minority of candidates appeared to be writing about Baron-Cohen's study about the Sally-Anne task. As with **Question 2**, it is essential that candidates learn about the exact study given in the syllabus.

Question 4

Held and Hein: The question asked candidates to describe two of the additional tests used. Where candidates chose additional tests they tended to describe them well. Where candidates used main tests they did not gain any credit so it is important that candidates can distinguish between the main tests used in the study and those which were additional – as stated in the question to check the status of peripheral receptors. Some candidates also confused the horizontal and vertical paw placement tests, so it could be useful for candidates to illustrate the difference between these tests visually.

Question 5

Milgram: This was often well answered with candidates illustrating their knowledge of the study and ability to apply it. The stem of the question told candidates that "In Milgram's study of obedience he says that we learn in childhood that it is a 'breach of moral conduct to hurt another person'". In part **(a)**, candidates were asked 'To what extent did Milgram's participants follow the moral conduct they had learned?' Some candidates did not appear to understand the word 'breach' in the quote from Milgram's study so gave ambiguous answers suggesting that moral conduct was to hurt another person. This question, like others in **Section A**, was asking about the context of the study but in this case, candidates needed to use this context to explain the results. In order to perform well in such questions, candidates must appreciate how the findings relate to the aim and context of the study. Part **(b)** of this question, which asked what Milgram concluded, tended to be answered well with a range of different expressions of the conclusion such as 'People will follow orders even when this hurts someone else'. A few candidates appeared to confuse the study with Tajfel's or Bandura's and wrote about children, so it is important that candidates can reliably identify the terms or short phrases used to identify each study.

Question 6

Haney, Banks and Zimbardo: This question asked for two factors contributing to pathological prisoner syndrome. There was a range of answers here, with many excellent ones which included good use of the terminology and specific examples or evidence. Where candidates did not score full credit, they often needed to offer more specific 'factors contributing', to describe them in more detail, or to focus on the factors rather than on describing pathological prisoner syndrome in general.

Question 7

Piliavin et al: Part **(a)** of this question was generally very well answered, with candidates giving both levels of one of the independent variables, such as the victim's race (black or white), the time of the model's entry (early or late) or the type of victim (drunk or ill) and only a few candidates misreported the cane-carrying confederate as 'blind', 'sick' or 'injured'. In part **(b)**, asking about the DV, there were also many good answers. Some candidates answered in terms of results – so their responses had the DVs within them and could have been improved by presenting their knowledge as what was *recorded* in the study.

Question 8

Freud: Part **(a)** of this question, asking about two features that made this investigation a case study, was typically well answered, with the majority of candidates offering the key elements of case studies (that they

are in-depth investigations conducted on a single individual). In part **(b)**, candidates were able to suggest appropriate problems (typically lack of generalisability). Where candidates did not score full credit they could often have improved their answer by relating the problem they had identified to the study of little Hans.

Question 9

Langlois et al: This question asked candidates to describe two features of the sample. Candidates who did not score full credit sometimes appeared to have misunderstood the study and described the stimulus material (the faces) rather than the sample, or misunderstood the question and described the procedure. It is important that candidates learn the roles of different people in this study, in the way that they learn the roles of the teacher and learner in Milgram's study, or the participants and confederates in Piliavin et al.

Question 10

Nelson: Most answers identified motive and consequence and some identified mode of presentation. Many candidates were therefore able to gain minimal credit although fewer were able to describe the factors. A small number mentioned the age groups, and here they typically did gain further credit. Some incorrect answers suggested factors that the candidate appeared to believe might affect moral development but which were not tested in the study, such as upbringing.

Question 11

Dement and Kleitman: Answers here were generally good, typically answering with the 'tomatoes', 'baseball' or 'hoist' dreams in part **(a)**, which asked for an example of a dream. Candidates could sometimes have improved their answers by giving more than just the 'topic' of the dream, as stated above, but going on to describe what the participants dreamed *about*. There were also many good answers to part **(b)**, although some candidates only stated the relationship without giving details, so could only access minimal credit. A small minority appeared to have misunderstood the study as in part **(b)**, they suggested that the existence of rapid eye movements causes a dream, or means that you will remember a dream, or that fast REM means a horrible dream and slow REM means a nice dream. Others simply explained that REMs meant you were dreaming, without describing what the relationship was. With each of these issues, candidates could have improved their performance by re-reading the question to ensure that they had answered the exact question being asked.

Question 12

Rosenhan: Candidates generally scored well on both parts of this question. In part **(a)**, they were able to give accurate details of the way that the pseudopatients obtained an appointment, and of the symptoms they reported. Where candidates gave the inaccurate response that the pseudopatients "said they had symptoms of schizophrenia", they needed to be more precise in their answer to the question, which asked "What did the pseudopatients *do*...". This required accurate reporting of the way the pseudopatients claimed to hear a same-sex voice saying "empty, thud, hollow". In part **(b)**, candidates typically gave accurate accounts of what the pseudopatients did after admission. Where candidates did not earn full credit, they needed to recognise that this question required 2 separate things to obtain full credit, rather than expansion so, for example, they needed to identify 'ceasing to show any signs of abnormality' and 'writing notes'.

Question 13

Thigpen and Cleckley: Candidates typically gave good answers to this question. In part **(a)**, they named the IQ test, Rorschach ink blots or the memory test, with a small number referring to the 'draw a human figure' test. Where candidates incorrectly responded with EEG or hypnosis they could have gained credit by attending to the word 'tests' in the question. Part **(b)** was correspondingly well answered, generally with either the IQ test results or a description of the findings of the Rorschach test. Where candidates did not earn full credit here, they typically needed to add either the numerical results for the IQ tests, or descriptive results from the ink blots.

Question 14

Billington et al: In part **(a)**, some candidates had the definition for 'empathising' almost word for word. Those who gave confused definitions or simply describing 'sympathy' could have earned full credit by learning key terms from the study. Although candidates were able to give precise evidence from tests in many studies, in part **(b)** of this question many candidates could have gained more credit by focusing on the evidence from the Eyes Test, FC-EFT or SQ/SQR rather than reporting differences between Humanities/

Science or occupations. This was particularly so for candidates who gave anecdotal answers, such as responding in terms of mothering instinct.

Question 15

Veale and Riley: Part (a), was very well answered with many candidates being able to give the two ways in which the samples were matched as age and sex. In part (b), most candidates achieved at least minimal credit. To improve their answers, these candidates needed to be able to accurately recall specific behaviours rather than writing at length and including material that was irrelevant and therefore not creditworthy.

Section B

Although in **Section A**, the candidates' knowledge of the procedure and results of studies was good, with many being able to give some details of procedure and results, some candidates could have improved their performance by learning specific details of the procedure, such as how variables are manipulated, measured or controlled and quantitative/qualitative results, as appropriate, that are central to the aims of each study. An awareness of such details would enable candidates to improve their score in **Section A** questions and, here in **Section B**, would give them more detailed information about the study. Although some candidates were aware of the aims and contexts of the studies, this is also an area in which many could improve. The reasons for each study being done are described in the introduction to each paper and are important for understanding why each piece of research was conducted.

Question 16

Loftus and Pickrell/Bandura et al/Maguire et al: Candidates were generally able to identify two weaknesses but often struggled to elaborate or evaluate above the middle band. Better answers were able to describe appropriate elements of the chosen study but few were able to provide the depth or detail required for top band answers and use of terminology was often weak. Some lengthy answers included irrelevant description of the study so the material was not well shaped to the question.

Candidates chose from the full spread of studies. A very small number of candidates had written about the wrong study – confusion arose with Loftus and Pickrell and with Maguire et al. Overall there was a good range of awarded credit; some candidates wrote very little and others wrote two sides of detailed, accurate, relevant discussion, so there were some excellent answers.

Question 17

Tajfel/Schachter and Singer/Demattè et al: Responses included a good spread of studies. In a small minority of cases, candidates wrote about Milgram rather than Tajfel. There was again a full range of awarded credit. Candidates could typically identify relevant strengths and weaknesses but either appropriate contextualisation or depth and detail was lacking. The use of terminology was somewhat better than in **Question 16**. Some candidates did not answer the question, referring only to the strengths and weaknesses of the study rather than to the strengths and weaknesses of laboratory experiments.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/21
Core Studies 2

KEY MESSAGES

Section A

Question 1

Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in part **(b)**. Extended evaluative points are necessary in part **(c)** to achieve full credit.

Question 2

It is important that candidates are made aware of all of the issues and debates in psychology as sometimes all candidates from a Centre did not know what was meant by either psychometric testing or the individual/situational debate.

Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher credit.

Section B

Candidates must focus their answer on the question asked in part **(b)** of the essay rather than writing lots of detail of the studies. Evidence must be given in part **(c)** for higher credit.

General comments

The credit 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 most candidates. In addition, it was pleasing to see that many candidates answered the questions in a different order to the paper and were able to answer their best question first which gave them more overall credit.

Candidates should be made aware that they need to answer only one of the two questions for the **Section B** essay. When a candidate did answer both questions they were awarded credit for the better of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates tended to achieve very poorly.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to the questions in **Section A** where there is no choice of question. In **Section B**, **Question 3** and **Question 4** were chosen fairly equally by candidates with neither question proving to be more popular.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a)** The vast majority of candidates were able to access some credit for this question. Most could both identify and define ecological validity. Many also gave a clear definition of validity. A few went onto to identify and define construct, external and internal validity. Often these could be identified but incorrectly defined. Candidates could define population validity but would omit the identification.

Many candidates discussed ecological validity in far too much detail which did not gain any additional credit. In addition, some also discussed reliability and ethics which did not gain credit.

- (b) A wide variety of ideas were given by candidates on how to measure theory of mind using actors rather than photographs which was pleasing to see. Full credit was achieved by those who suggested straightforward ideas and were able to give clear details to ensure replicability. Many failed to achieve full credit due to the dependent variable being very unclear or too complicated to achieve replicability.

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question and received no credit for this as this is the correct response to **Question 1(c)**.

A handful of candidates described an alternative design for a different core study other than Baron-Cohen et al and gained no credit.

- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved credit in this question by providing some evaluative points. Many candidates used extra time and expense here as points. The practical issues that would arise were addressed much more confidently than the methodological issues. It was surprising that more did not refer to ecological validity. Quite a few candidates only briefly identified issues and mentioned 3 or 4 points, but did not develop any of them. Some candidates omitted to refer their comments back to the context of their own studies.

Question 2

- (a) Many candidates were able to gain partial credit by identifying IQ tests as a psychometric test. Candidates found it difficult to explain that these tests produce numerical results. There was misunderstanding surrounding what a psychometric test is, with many candidates listing EEG and the ink blot test incorrectly.

- (b) Many candidates knew the numerical results of the IQ tests taken by Eve. Fewer were able to identify that Eve White achieved better in the memory test than Eve Black.

However, many candidates described other results from the study including the ink blot results and the psychological profiles that were performed on Eve's personalities.

- (c) There were a few well constructed responses to this question. Some candidates did give a number of comparison and contrast points and were able to back these points up with evidence from Thigpen and Cleckley as well as other core studies. However, most answers were quite descriptive of the methods rather than being evaluative and terms like similarly/in contrast were missing. Evidence was quite often missing for this question.

Some candidates ignored the requirements of the question and described an alternative way of testing Eve.

- (d) Candidates found this question very difficult but often made a creditworthy attempt at situational explanations but found individual explanations more challenging. Weaker answers stated Thigpen and Cleckley's findings in some detail but went off the point and without relating them to situational/individual explanations.

Some good answers looked at both sides of the question in turn and there was quite a lot of variety in explanations. Better answers included pieces of evidence from Eve's life rather than just saying it was "because of her bad childhood". However, many candidates started their answer by saying that in their view one of the types of explanation was invalid and so only concentrated on the other without expanding on their view. They did not realise that they had to write about both sides in detail. Some also referred to "individual situational explanations" and did not make it clear that they knew it was a debate with 2 sides and then go on to address each side in turn. A large number wrote their answer without sufficient structure.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates were able to achieve partial credit as they were aware that the social approach involves being with another person. Many did achieve full credit by discussing the interaction between groups. Some candidates followed up their answers with detailed examples from the core studies which was unnecessary.
- (b) Many candidates were able to do well on this question and knew the studies in depth. The biggest issue was where responses focused on describing the study and these achieved less well due to the lack of focus on social processes. Too many were listing findings without a clear link to the question so it was more difficult to achieve higher credit.
- (c) To achieve well on this section of the question candidates should have identified and discussed three points with clear reference to the core studies.

Some candidates were able to do this and achieved very well. However, some had little structure to their answers. Some of the answers were too brief to access higher credit.

Question 4

- (a) Most candidates referred to usefulness in their answers but needed to expand on this to achieve full credit. Fewer candidates referred to ecological validity.
- (b) Most candidates understood that they needed to take each of the studies in turn and discuss the usefulness of each one. Candidates were able to come up with suggestions for Rosenhan's study and often achieved full credit. Many candidates found it difficult to write more than just the findings for both Billington and Maguire so achieved low credit for these studies. Several Centres taught the incorrect Maguire study and it was therefore more difficult for candidates to suggest uses for it.
- (c) For this question, candidates needed to identify and discuss three points with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many chose to discuss problems with ecological validity and generalisability and were sometimes able to give clear examples from the listed core studies. Several candidates made a list of problem points with no attempt to expand or give examples.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22
Core Studies 2

KEY MESSAGES

Section A

Question 1

Candidates need to be able to give detailed definitions of issues, methods and debates in order to ensure high credit for part (a) of this question. Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in part (b). Candidates who re-describe the original study will achieve no credit. Extended evaluative points as well as reference to the self report method are necessary in part (c) to achieve full credit. In addition, candidates need to be sure to address both the practical and ethical issues of their alternative to achieve higher credit.

Question 2

It is important that candidates are made aware of all of the issues and debates in psychology as sometimes all candidates from a Centre did not know what was meant by physiological tests or the strengths and weaknesses of this approach.

Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher credit. In addition, Centres need to ensure they teach the correct Maguire study as there are many studies done on taxi drivers and this one involves the use of a PET scanner and not an MRI.

Section B

Candidates must focus their answer on the question asked in part (b) of the essay rather than writing lots of detail of the studies. Evidence must be given in part (c) to gain higher credit.

General comments

The credit achieved by candidates sitting this examination covered the entire range of the awarded credit. 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 most candidates. In addition, it was pleasing to see that many candidates answered the questions in a different order to the paper and were able to answer their best question first which gave them more overall credit.

Candidates need to be made aware that they need to answer one of the two questions for the **Section B** essay. When a candidate did answer both questions they were awarded the credit for the better of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually achieved very poorly.

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

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to access some credit for this question. Many candidates could describe what is meant by a self report as well as give examples of different types such as open, closed, Likert scale, interviews, etc. Many also included evaluation points which were also credited.

Some candidates did not adequately communicate the essentials of a self report, which meant that gaining credit was more difficult compared to those who gave a well organised answer. Many tried to put it into the context of Rosenhan with very limited effect. A few candidates did recognise the term and it was interpreted as participant observation.

- (b) A wide variety of ideas were given by candidates using a self report method rather than participant observation was pleasing to see. Full credit was achieved by those who suggested straightforward ideas and were able to give clear details to ensure replicability. Many would omit a major criterion (what and how) to limit themselves to partial credit only. Some simply wrote out the original Rosenhan and inserted a self-report with limited success.

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question and received no credit for this as this would have been the correct response to part (c).

A handful of candidates described an alternative design for a different core study other than Baron-Cohen et al and gained no credit.

- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved credit in this question by providing some evaluative points. Some good evaluations were seen even if the part (b) answer was weak, with many good examples of practical and ethical issues. This was made easier for some, as many chose similar ideas to Rosenhan so could, essentially, evaluate his study and set-up to gain credit. Some could not gain high credit as they did not address the self-report demands of the question.

Quite a few candidates only briefly identified issues and mentioned 3 or 4 points, but did not develop any of them. Some candidates forgot to refer their comments back to the context of their own studies.

In order to achieve higher credit, candidates needed to refer to both practical and ethical issues, which were not addressed by some candidates leading to lower credit.

Question 2

- (a) Many candidates were able to achieve partial credit by identifying an appropriate test such as PET scan, MRI and EEG. A few candidates could give a good definition but many found it difficult to explain this term.
- (b) It was pleasing to find that many candidates knew a control used in the study.

Many candidates could easily identify some control and that it applies to *all* participants. However, it was very rare for them to explain why the control was needed to gain full credit. Most popular responses focused around the PET scanner or the sample. A sizeable minority had studied the incorrect Maguire study.

- (c) There were a few well constructed responses to this question. Some candidates did give a number of strengths and weaknesses and were able to back these points up with evidence from the Maguire study.

There were some very good answers here with candidates able to pick out strengths and weaknesses in general then elaborate using the Maguire study. A common error made by candidates was about the sample and not stating anything about physiology so therefore could not gain credit. As many had this as their first or second weakness of two, it limited them to partial credit. Also, a sizeable amount of candidates only addressed one strength and one weakness, so had not read the question carefully.

- (d) Some candidates did write well structured answers that used the Maguire study to back up their points. Many used the lack of representativeness of the sample and could often discuss this in some detail. A few also mentioned the lack of ecological validity of the study. Some brought in points about the scientific nature of the study and how this made it more useful.

Many only made one point and gained less credit.

Many candidates could write at length about the usefulness of the study but rarely did they tackle the *extent* part to gain more than partial credit.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) Some candidates gave a clear definition and were able to achieve full credit. Many just linked their response to children or gave a less precise response and only achieved half credit.
- (b) Many candidates were able to do well on this question and knew the studies in depth. The biggest issue was where responses focused on describing the study and achieved less well due to the lack of focus on data collection. Too many were listing findings without a clear link to the question so it was more difficult to achieve higher credit.
- (c) To achieve well on this section of the question, candidates should identify and discuss three points with clear reference to the core studies. Some candidates were able to do this and achieved very well. Common advantages were tracking change and usefulness. However, some had little structure to their answers. Some of the answers were too brief to access higher credit.

Question 4

- (a) Most candidates referred to a specific ethical guideline in their response and achieved partial credit. A brief explanation of the purpose of these guidelines would have helped to achieve full credit.
- (b) Most candidates understood that they needed to take each of the studies in turn and discuss the ethical guidelines raised in each one. Candidates could easily describe ethical guidelines broken in the Milgram and Zimbardo studies, although often found difficulty with the Veale study. The responses could have included ethical guidelines met and when this was done for the Veale study, candidates achieved more credit as this study is fairly ethical.

Many candidates described lots of ethical problems with the studies, but did not describe any in depth and achieved less well. This was particularly evident for the Veale study where many just named an ethical issue.

- (c) For this question, candidates needed to identify and discuss three points with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many chose to discuss problems with ecological validity and attrition and were sometimes able to give clear examples from the listed core studies. Several candidates made a list of problem points with no attempt to expand or give examples. Many found it difficult to discuss more than one or two problems and so achieved less well.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/23

Core Studies 2

KEY MESSAGES

Section A

Question 1

Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in part **(b)**. Extended evaluative points are necessary in part **(c)** to achieve full credit.

Question 2

It is important that candidates are made aware of all of the issues and debates in psychology as sometimes all candidates from a Centre did not know what was meant by either psychometric testing or the individual/situational debate.

Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher credit.

Section B

Candidates must focus their answer on the question asked in part **(b)** of the essay rather than writing lots of detail of the studies. Evidence must be given in part **(c)** for higher credit.

General comments

The credit 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 most candidates. In addition, it was pleasing to see that many candidates answered the questions in a different order to the paper and were able to answer their best question first which gave them more overall credit.

Candidates should be made aware that they need to answer only one of the two questions for the **Section B** essay. When a candidate did answer both questions they were awarded credit for the better of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates tended to achieve very poorly.

Candidates need to cover the entire syllabus so that they can respond to the questions in **Section A** where there is no choice of question. In **Section B**, **Question 3** and **Question 4** were chosen fairly equally by candidates with neither question proving to be more popular.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to access some credit for this question. Most could both identify and define ecological validity. Many also gave a clear definition of validity. A few went onto to identify and define construct, external and internal validity. Often these could be identified but incorrectly defined. Candidates could define population validity but would omit the identification.

Many candidates discussed ecological validity in far too much detail which did not gain any additional credit. In addition, some also discussed reliability and ethics which did not gain credit.

- (b) A wide variety of ideas were given by candidates on how to measure theory of mind using actors rather than photographs which was pleasing to see. Full credit was achieved by those who suggested straightforward ideas and were able to give clear details to ensure replicability. Many failed to achieve full credit due to the dependent variable being very unclear or too complicated to achieve replicability.

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question and received no credit for this as this is the correct response to **Question 1(c)**.

A handful of candidates described an alternative design for a different core study other than Baron-Cohen et al and gained no credit.

- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved credit in this question by providing some evaluative points. Many candidates used extra time and expense here as points. The practical issues that would arise were addressed much more confidently than the methodological issues. It was surprising that more did not refer to ecological validity. Quite a few candidates only briefly identified issues and mentioned 3 or 4 points, but did not develop any of them. Some candidates omitted to refer their comments back to the context of their own studies.

Question 2

- (a) Many candidates were able to gain partial credit by identifying IQ tests as a psychometric test. Candidates found it difficult to explain that these tests produce numerical results. There was misunderstanding surrounding what a psychometric test is, with many candidates listing EEG and the ink blot test incorrectly.

- (b) Many candidates knew the numerical results of the IQ tests taken by Eve. Fewer were able to identify that Eve White achieved better in the memory test than Eve Black.

However, many candidates described other results from the study including the ink blot results and the psychological profiles that were performed on Eve's personalities.

- (c) There were a few well constructed responses to this question. Some candidates did give a number of comparison and contrast points and were able to back these points up with evidence from Thigpen and Cleckley as well as other core studies. However, most answers were quite descriptive of the methods rather than being evaluative and terms like similarly/in contrast were missing. Evidence was quite often missing for this question.

Some candidates ignored the requirements of the question and described an alternative way of testing Eve.

- (d) Candidates found this question very difficult but often made a creditworthy attempt at situational explanations but found individual explanations more challenging. Weaker answers stated Thigpen and Cleckley's findings in some detail but went off the point and without relating them to situational/individual explanations.

Some good answers looked at both sides of the question in turn and there was quite a lot of variety in explanations. Better answers included pieces of evidence from Eve's life rather than just saying it was "because of her bad childhood". However, many candidates started their answer by saying that in their view one of the types of explanation was invalid and so only concentrated on the other without expanding on their view. They did not realise that they had to write about both sides in detail. Some also referred to "individual situational explanations" and did not make it clear that they knew it was a debate with 2 sides and then go on to address each side in turn. A large number wrote their answer without sufficient structure.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates were able to achieve partial credit as they were aware that the social approach involves being with another person. Many did achieve full credit by discussing the interaction between groups. Some candidates followed up their answers with detailed examples from the core studies which was unnecessary.
- (b) Many candidates were able to do well on this question and knew the studies in depth. The biggest issue was where responses focused on describing the study and these achieved less well due to the lack of focus on social processes. Too many were listing findings without a clear link to the question so it was more difficult to achieve higher credit.
- (c) To achieve well on this section of the question candidates should have identified and discussed three points with clear reference to the core studies.

Some candidates were able to do this and achieved very well. However, some had little structure to their answers. Some of the answers were too brief to access higher credit.

Question 4

- (a) Most candidates referred to usefulness in their answers but needed to expand on this to achieve full credit. Fewer candidates referred to ecological validity.
- (b) Most candidates understood that they needed to take each of the studies in turn and discuss the usefulness of each one. Candidates were able to come up with suggestions for Rosenhan's study and often achieved full credit. Many candidates found it difficult to write more than just the findings for both Billington and Maguire so achieved low credit for these studies. Several Centres taught the incorrect Maguire study and it was therefore more difficult for candidates to suggest uses for it.
- (c) For this question, candidates needed to identify and discuss three points with clear reference to a core study for each point. Many chose to discuss problems with ecological validity and generalisability and were sometimes able to give clear examples from the listed core studies. Several candidates made a list of problem points with no attempt to expand or give examples.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/31
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to credit allocation, so an answer worth lower credit should be short and an answer worth higher credit 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 ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions, and between describe and suggest for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will not gain full credit.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as they appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

This is the first sitting of the new syllabus and modified examination format and in general it is pleasing to report that most Centres had prepared their candidates for the examination very well and it was pleasing to be able to award some very high credit to some superbly written answers.

Many candidates correctly used string to tie together their answer pages. Candidates should always tie their pages loosely together for ease of reading by Examiners.

Significant numbers of candidates answered different question parts randomly. Whilst there is no requirement to do **Question 1** first, all the parts of the same question should be answered together.

Section A (all options):

- (a) Most candidates scored full credit in response to questions on all options.
- (b) Most answers for this question part were appropriate, although marks could be improved by writing an amount appropriate to the credit allocated in the question.

Section B (all options)

Question part (a) did not differ in format from questions appearing on previous examinations in that it required candidates to describe information from a given topic area of the syllabus. As with previous questions, a candidate could choose what to write about from the three bullet points of the syllabus and credit was allocated based on the range, detail and quality of the answer.

Question part (b) differed from previous questions because rather than just being asked to 'evaluate' there is now the requirement to include one specifically named evaluation issue. In the past, a candidate could evaluate using any three (or more) issues. The requirement now is to include the named issue as one of those three (or more) issues.

Many candidates mistakenly interpreted the question as 'write about this one issue only' despite the question stating 'evaluate...and include a discussion about'. Such answers could not achieve the highest credit band and neither could answers which did not consider the named issue at all.

Many answers would receive significantly higher credit if the difference between description and evaluation was known by candidates. **Section B** questions part (a) will always be 'describe' and questions part (b) will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description and doing this will gain no credit.

Evaluation is a different skill which can be defined as ‘the ability to analyse and evaluate knowledge and processes and apply knowledge and processes to unfamiliar situations including those related to issues’. In other words, it is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about evidence that has been described in part **(a)**. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and not to just reproduce learning.

For this question part, all candidates could be divided into three types of answer: those who evaluated using a number of issues in addition to the named issue; those who focused exclusively on the named issue or excluded it altogether; and those who did not evaluate at all. It is desirable to see all candidates achieve the first type of answer.

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. There is a fundamental difference between these two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. To suggest is to go beyond description and to think about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. If these two requirements are adhered to, then many more candidates will be awarded more credit.

The amount of detail written should reflect the credit allocation in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Psychology and Education

Question 1

- (a)** Quite a number of candidates misinterpreted this question and wrote about classical and operant conditioning rather than how behaviourism has applied itself to learning in education.
- (b)** Following on from the misinterpretation in part **(a)**, many candidates wrote that one application was classical conditioning and another was operant conditioning. Descriptions of Pavlov’s dogs were common. The question was asking how operant conditioning, for example, could be used in a classroom. A correct answer would be that it can be used in the control of disruptive behaviour by providing positive or negative punishment to a child who misbehaves.

Question 2

- (a)** There were many superb answers which included a range of different aspects such as causes and effects of various special needs and many candidates also considered strategies for educating children with special needs.
- (b)** Following from part **(a)**, there were some superb answers, but also there were candidates who failed to gain credit by not answering the question.

Question 3

- (a)** Many candidates avoided this question, possibly because they did not know a theory of emotional intelligence. The few candidates that did answer this question outlined the theory proposed by Goleman, often describing it in excellent detail.
- (b)** Some candidates confused reliability and validity in this question; some knew the terms but did not know how to test them in relation to an intelligence test. As reliability and validity are fundamental components of both intelligence testing and psychology itself, coverage of these concepts is highly recommended.

Question 4

- (a)** Some candidates did not know what a study skill was, often suggesting that a person merely revise hard. Those who knew about study skills wrote some very detailed and thorough answers showing clear understanding. The PQRS was most popular, with SPELT and 4-MAT also featuring.

- (b) Answers to this part resulted in credit at the opposite ends of the scale. Better answers suggested that an experiment be done comparing two independent groups where one would use a PQRST method and another would use SPELT. Groups would be matched for ability levels. At the end of the year, results on examinations could be compared to see which study skill was more effective.

Psychology and Health

Question 5

- (a) A small number of candidates described adherence without addressing the 'improving' component, but most scored full credit for addressing both components.
- (b) A small number of answers had little more than 'change the practitioner style' without elaboration whilst others wrote superb answers. Such answers suggested for example that a practitioner could be more patient-centred and went on to quote the study by Byrne and Long. Others suggested that a practitioner could improve his or her communication style and quoted the work of Ley (1988). Quoting psychological knowledge is always the best strategy to gain high credit.

Question 6

- (a) Some candidates wrote their anecdotal answers about their own health and their own safety, whilst at the other extreme of the credit range, many candidates wrote extremely competent answers which were clearly based on the content included on the syllabus. Most candidates in this latter category distinguished between individual and systems causes and many went on to consider ways in which accidents can be reduced.
- (b) As mentioned in the general comments, some candidates only considered the issue of usefulness which limited the credit awarded. Some candidates considered usefulness alongside a number of other issues, such as individual versus situational explanations, and the range and quality of such answers often gained high credit.

Question 7

- (a) A few candidates described a providing information technique rather than fear arousal, and a few described the Yale model of communication, but most candidates correctly focused on fear arousal. The studies by Janis and Feshbach (1953) and Leventhal et al (1967) were commonly chosen and many candidates gained full credit with detailed descriptions.
- (b) Those choosing a providing information technique found it difficult to gain credit in this part, but as in part (a), many candidates described fear arousal in relation to many different problems ranging from breast and testicular self-examination to wearing cycling helmets.

Question 8

- (a) Most candidates chose to describe the UAB technique which is specifically for use for longer-stay patients in hospital, but some chose to use more general behavioural categories such as those outlined by Turk.
- (b) This question tested an ability to think about the reliability of observations. Many candidates suggested the use of another nurse in addition to Jamal and impressively wrote about inter-rater reliability. Other candidates suggested using alternative methods, such as giving a patient a MPQ or using a visual rating scale.

Psychology and Environment

Question 9

- (a) It was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates were awarded full credit when answering this part. Those that did not, provided answers that were ambiguous, indicating that they may not have fully understood the term.

- (b) The crucial words in this question were '*where it is known*' and this would include the studies on the syllabus such as those by Hodgkinson and Stewart and Rubin et al. who specifically investigated PTSD following an event. If a candidate *assumed* (but did not know) that there was PTSD, then minimal credit was awarded.

Question 10

- (a) Answers to this question followed the same pattern as for **Questions 2** and **6** in that there was a wide range of credit awarded to candidates based on how well they understood the content of the syllabus.
- (b) This part asked for evaluation of the evidence described in part (a) and the specific issue to include in the answer was that of methods, allowing candidates to focus on one or a number of different methods used in this topic area. A number of candidates simply described the methods used, such as that by Lynch, but description in this part was not awarded any credit. Candidates must evaluate and they must include a number of different issues including the named issue to access the full range of credit available.

Question 11

- (a) Some candidates chose to describe both studies appearing on the syllabus despite the question asking for one, but most others chose to describe either the Whyte or the Brower study. A few candidates interpreted the question incorrectly and wrote about housing design. It is recommended that candidates are aware of the different sub-sections of the syllabus.
- (b) Those candidates describing housing design in part (a) also found it difficult to gain credit in this part. Those candidates describing Whyte or Brower in part (a) simply adapted their designs and applied them to what they could do for their local area. There were some very interesting answers and good to see how such psychology could be applied in the real world.

Question 12

- (a) Although there were a few anecdotal answers such as 'it is how much it gets on a person's nerves', there were many who wrote about the features outlined by Kryter, namely the volume, unpredictability and the lack of control. A few candidates wrote superb answers by adding brief details of a study to support each feature.
- (b) Some candidates merely suggested measuring the decibel levels, but this is a measure of volume rather than annoyance. Some candidates suggested using a questionnaire and others an interview. As noise is psychological and shows individual differences then some form of self report is the most appropriate technique to use.

Psychology and abnormality

Question 13

- (a) Most candidates scored full credit here because in their answers they described both the obsession component and the compulsion component. A few candidates only mentioned one component and so only scored half credit.
- (b) A few candidates incorrectly described an obsession and a few merely re-wrote what they had in part (a). Many candidates gave the common example of hand washing, and those at the top end quoted some psychological evidence, namely the case study of Charles by Rappoport.

Question 14

- (a) Although there were a number of answers scoring full credit, a number of problems were evident. Some candidates simply ran through a list of different phobias without adding anything about the causes or treatments. Secondly, many candidates wrote about obsessive compulsive disorder. Whilst this is a disorder based on anxiety, it is in a different topic group on the syllabus from that of phobias. This means that no credit could be awarded to those writing about OCD and Centres should ensure each candidate knows the difference between these topic areas. **Question 13** was from the OCD section and the same syllabus topic area will never appear twice on the same examination paper.
- (b) Those candidates who listed different types of phobia in part (a) either did not address the specifically named issue at all, or they chose this opportunity to describe the behaviourist explanation. Neither of these strategies was awarded credit. Much more positively, many candidates scored very high credit for impressive evaluations based on a range of issues and many even provided a contrast between behaviourist and psychodynamic explanations.

Question 15

- (a) There were some inspired answers written in response to this question with candidates not only describing the A B C of the theory in detail but going on to describe some of the irrational or illogical beliefs underlying a person's cognitive perception of a situation. At the bottom end of the credit range there was a lack of understanding and ambiguous answers.
- (b) Those candidates knowing rational emotive therapy had little difficulty in applying it to the situation of exam stress (and probably any other situation too). Those who were unclear about the features of RET in part (a) also struggled in part (b), some candidates drifting from the question and suggesting that stress could be reduced using other non-cognitive techniques or simply by doing more revision.

Question 16

- (a) Most candidates knew about and described the six features of salience, euphoria, tolerance, withdrawal, conflict and relapse outlined by Griffiths in ample detail and showed good understanding in doing so.
- (b) Question part (b) asked candidates to suggest how the features of addiction outlined applied to the gambling behaviour of a 17 year-old son. As the features outlined by Griffiths apply to *any* addictive behaviour, it caused little problem for candidates to adapt them to gambling behaviour.

Psychology and Organisations

Question 17

- (a) Most candidates scored full credit here except for those whose answers were insufficiently focused on the question, or were incorrect (even suggesting that the selection interview is done to select members of the interview panel).
- (b) Most candidates knew the difference between these two types and credit was allocated according to the amount of detail written. Minimal credit was achieved by those offering little more than a correct sentence whereas those who offered a number of correct sentences achieved full credit.

Question 18

- (a) As with essay questions in other options, credit was achieved at both ends of the marks range. Some candidates knew little about group behaviour whilst others appeared to have read, digested and understood a whole textbook worth. Better answers covered a range of different aspects such as group dynamics, decision-making and group conflict.
- (b) The pattern observed in other **Section B** questions was repeated here with candidates either not addressing the named issue of generalisations, considering only generalisations and nothing more and finally better answers from candidates who considered a range of issues including that of generalisations.

Question 19

- (a) Some candidates opted to suggest non-monetary extrinsic rewards such as fringe benefits, whilst others opted to suggest intrinsic rewards such as the recognition of success and hard work.
- (b) This question part caused little difficulty for most candidates who related rewards to one or more theories. Many candidates opted to describe intrinsic rewards and chose to associate them with Maslow and some also related rewards to the work of McGregor who also emphasise intrinsic motivators.

Question 20

- (a) This is one of a number of different shift systems (others are more slowly rotating). The rapidly rotating system has different ways in which the rotations are managed and the two most common are the 'metropolitan' rota and the 'continental' rota (as outlined by Riggio). Some ambiguous answers showed a lack of understanding as to what shift work actually is whereas other candidates described a system in detail, even providing a diagram of how it works across a period of time.
- (b) Although it varies with the type of work being done, generally the rapid rotating system is where more errors and accidents occur because workers do not have time to adapt to a change in shift. A slow rotating system gives more time for a worker to adapt to the time/shift change and it is less likely that accidents will happen.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/32
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to credit allocation, so an answer worth lower credit should be short and an answer worth higher credit 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 ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between describe and suggest for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never gain full credit.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as they appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

This is the first sitting of the new syllabus and modified examination format and in general it is pleasing to report that most Centres had prepared their candidates for the examination very well and it was pleasing to be able to award some very high credit to some superbly written answers.

Many candidates correctly used string to tie together their answer pages. Candidates should always tie their pages loosely together for ease of reading by Examiners.

Significant numbers of candidates answered different question parts randomly. Whilst there is no requirement to do **Question 1** first, all the parts of the same question should be answered together.

Section A (all options):

- (a) Most candidates scored full credit in response to questions on all options.
- (b) Most answers for this question part were appropriate, although marks could be improved by writing an amount appropriate to the credit allocated in the question.

Section B (all options)

Question part (a) did not differ in format from questions appearing on previous examinations in that it required candidates to describe information from a given topic area of the syllabus. As with previous questions a candidate could choose what to write about from the three bullet-points of the syllabus and credit was allocated based on the range, detail and quality of the answer.

Question part (b) differed from previous questions because rather than just being asked to 'evaluate' there is now the requirement to include one specifically named evaluation issue. In the past a candidate could evaluate using any three (or more) issues. The requirement now is to include the named issue as one of those three (or more) issues.

Many candidates mistakenly interpreted the question as 'write about this one issue only' despite the question stating 'evaluate ... and include a discussion about'. Such answers could not achieve the highest credit band and neither could answers which did not consider the named issue at all.

Many answers would receive significantly higher credit if the difference between description and evaluation was known by candidates. **Section B** question part (a) will always be 'describe' and question part (b) will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description and doing this will gain no credit.

Evaluation is a different skill which can be defined as ‘the ability to analyse and evaluate knowledge and processes and apply knowledge and processes to unfamiliar situations including those related to issues’. In other words, it is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about evidence that has been described in part (a). Evaluation requires a candidate to think and not to just reproduce learning.

For this question part all candidates could be divided into three types of answer: those who evaluated using a number of issues in addition to the named issue; those who focused exclusively on the named issue or excluded it altogether; and those who did not evaluate at all. It is desirable to see all candidates achieve the first type of answer.

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. There is a fundamental difference between these two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. To suggest is to go beyond description and to think about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. If these two requirements are adhered to, then many more candidates will be awarded more credit.

Comments on specific questions

Psychology and Education

Question 1

- (a) This was a straightforward question to answer for the majority of candidates and it was good to see that answers often focused on the needs of the gifted in addition to those at the difficulty and disability end of the spectrum.
- (b) Of the credit allocated in this question, half was allocated to ‘causes’ and the other half to the ‘effects’ of ADHD. Some candidates failed to include both these aspects in their answer and therefore gained a maximum of half credit. Reading the question and addressing all its requirements is advised.

Question 2

- (a) There were a few anecdotal answers where candidates wrote that a learning style is what they do in class and a teaching style is what their teacher does, but there were also some excellent answers. A few candidates focused only on learning styles and included the models by Curry and Grasha for example, but others considered a wide range of both learning and learning styles covering a range of different models for each.
- (b) As mentioned in the general comments, the different types of candidate were shown in this question. Some candidates *only* evaluated the named issue of methods which limited the credit allocated; some candidates only considered methods and described rather than evaluated which scored no credit at all; some candidates considered a number of issues but not methods; and some candidates considered methods alongside a number of other issues, and the range and quality of such answers often put them into the highest credit band category.

Question 3

- (a) There were some excellent answers written in response to this question with candidates showing very good understanding of the humanistic approach to education. However, other candidates did not know what the humanistic approach was.
- (b) Those candidates who understood the humanistic approach answered this question very well and many scored full credit. Those candidates who did not understand the humanistic approach simply reverted to ‘standard’ exam preparation, and in failing to address the humanistic approach gained no credit.

Question 4

- (a) The most logical technique was one based on behaviour modification as this was mentioned in the question and most candidates opted for this, describing the use of both positive and negative punishment.
- (b) Those using an appropriate behaviour modification technique in part (a) followed it through into this question part by describing the work of Skinner and the use of reinforcement to modify behaviour. Some candidates outlined classical conditioning, showing a lack of understanding between what they had written in part (a) and part (b).

Psychology and Health

Question 5

- (a) Answers were of three types: those who simply re-wrote the question such as 'people who are accident prone'; those who gave a correct sentence without any elaboration to show understanding; and thirdly those who knew the term and gave that little extra to show full understanding.
- (b) Some candidates gave their own anecdotal example, but most candidates used the syllabus example of the sinking of the Titanic. Some candidates told a very long and detailed story, on occasion failing to mention the illusion of invulnerability at all. Many candidates focused correctly on the Captain who had ultimate responsibility but decided that the ship was unsinkable and that any problem could never happen to them.

Question 6

- (a) Most candidates wrote answers which covered a range of appropriate aspects taken directly from the content of the syllabus which included types and theories of pain, ways in which pain is measured and ways in which pain can be managed. Within each of these sub-topics there was often excellent detail and clear understanding of the subject matter.
- (b) A few candidates did not evaluate at all, simply choosing to describe the usefulness of self reports and indeed these candidates excluded this aspect from their part (a) answer to address self reports in this evaluative section. Answers like this scored no credit. Part (a) is for description and part (b) evaluation and candidates should know this fundamental distinction. At the top end of the credit range there were answers which evaluated using a number of different issues including that of the usefulness of self reports.

Question 7

- (a) There were some excellent answers which included not only a description of the syndrome itself but also made reference to the Aleem and Ajarim case study. Some answers went even further and mentioned Munchausen syndrome by proxy.
- (b) This question suited those candidates who were able to think for themselves and some impressive answers showed good understanding of the problems of identifying Munchausen behaviour and so covered a range of methodological suggestions.

Question 8

- (a) A few candidates described the fear arousal technique rather than the providing information, and a few described the Yale model of communication, but most candidates correctly focused on providing information. The study by Lewin (1992) was most commonly chosen and many candidates scored full credit with detailed descriptions.
- (b) Those choosing to describe a fear arousal technique incorrectly in part (a) could gain credit in this question part because the question simply asked for a campaign without specifying which technique to use. Many answers used a combination of fear arousal, providing information and the Yale model. A number of candidates suggested that the campaign be done in schools whereas others suggested community-wide campaigns. All these approaches were legitimate and scored high credit.

Psychology and Environment

Question 9

- (a) This question caused few problems for most candidates with nearly all including a mention of personal space and the invasion of it.
- (b) One fundamental problem was that some candidates described incorrect studies such as that by Middlemist et al or the Fisher and Byrne 'library' study. These studies are incorrect because they involved 'real' people and were not simulations. The study by Little (as appears on the syllabus) is a simulation because dolls were used in various social situations. Some candidates describing the Little study received maximum credit for their detailed and accurate answers.

Question 10

- (a) Most candidates answering this part scored high credit. Better answers were organised around the three sub-sections of the syllabus and some candidates mentioned every single aspect of the indicative content whether it be a model, theory or study.
- (b) Top answers from part (a) transferred to part (b) with some excellent evaluative answers being seen. Some candidates did not evaluate appropriately and followed the pattern consistent with other **Section B** answers.

Question 11

- (a) The syllabus includes the laboratory experiment by Mintz and this is the study that all candidates chose to describe. Some candidates provided a basic outline scoring mid-band credit whilst other candidates described the study in lots of detail and scored full credit.
- (b) Some excellent answers appeared in response to this question by those candidates who chose to design their own study. Many suggested a simulation, had a number of controls, often had independent and dependent variables and even wrote about how data could be collected. The approach of suggesting the design of a study shows thinking and was the optimal way to score full credit.

Question 12

- (a) Although a few candidates only managed to describe one study, usually that of Calhoun, most others described both the Calhoun (laboratory) and either Christian or Dubos studies for the non-laboratory. There were some excellent answers described with good detail and understanding with many candidates scoring full credit.
- (b) This question produced three types of answer. There were those candidates who wrote 'I would do the same as Calhoun' and went on to describe the Calhoun study again. This was flawed for two reasons. Firstly the command of the question was to suggest and not to describe (description was question part (a)) and secondly the Calhoun study examined *social* density and not *spatial* density. Some candidates *suggested* but did not go far enough in their answers whereas others suggested a whole experimental study, manipulating spatial density and measuring various variables. This final type of answer often was awarded full credit.

Psychology and Abnormality

Question 13

- (a) The majority of candidates scored full credit and had little problem in including both the term phobia and treatment in their answer.
- (b) Here too, most candidates scored full credit. Many candidates chose two appropriate treatments, such as systematic desensitisation and applied tension, and those not scoring full credit only did so not because their answers were incorrect, but because they were just too brief and lacking in detail compared to others.

Question 14

- (a) Although there were a number of answers scoring full credit, a number of issues were evident. Some candidates simply ran through the six features of addiction outlined by Griffiths and wrote nothing more. Some candidates also did this but went on to provide a list of different addictions. This type of answer scored more credit, but was still restricted to just one sub-section of the syllabus. The best answers were those who mentioned the features and types, the causes, and the ways in which these disorders can be managed.
- (b) Those candidates who excluded a description of explanations in part (a) found it difficult to compare or contrast them for the named issue in part (b). As is the case for other questions, such candidates incorrectly *described* explanations in this question part and gained no credit. As has been mentioned, knowing the difference between description and evaluation will increase significantly the credit a candidate can achieve.

Question 15

- (a) A number of candidates did not know what psychotherapy is because some described the use of drugs and others described the use of cognitive-behaviour therapy and yet others a cognitive strategy such as rational emotive therapy. This question comes from the *models of abnormality* section where one sub-section lists *Medical/biological, behavioural, psychodynamic* and *cognitive* models and the following sub-section has *Treatments derived from models: biological/medical; psychotherapies; cognitive-behavioural models*. This question was therefore asking about psychotherapy based on the psychodynamic approach.
- (b) Some interesting answers appeared here, again based on many inappropriate treatments. The use of anti-depressants would be inappropriate for example. Some candidates wrote excellent answers, suggesting that the therapist take the person back to childhood and the phallic stage and Oedipus complex where some problem was likely to have happened causing the problem to 'come out' later in life.

Question 16

- (a) Some candidates wrote nothing more than a few words such as 'an excess of dopamine causes schizophrenia', whilst others provided very thorough and detailed explanations quoting research evidence to support the hypothesis.
- (b) Many candidates read the question incorrectly and simply wrote all they knew about schizophrenia. Others *described* evidence supporting a biochemical explanation followed by evidence supporting a genetic explanation. Some of these answers were superb in their depth of knowledge and amount of detail described. However, the question asked for a *suggestion* and not a *description*. The best answers began with 'I would investigate by doing' and went on from there to explain how and why they would investigate the respective causes of schizophrenia.

Psychology and Organisations

Question 17

- (a) This question caused little difficulty for most candidates and maximum credit was frequently awarded. A few candidates rewrote the words of the question and this is not advisable because it does not score any credit.
- (b) Some candidates opted to describe theories of leadership that were not behavioural, such as a 'great man/woman explanation', but most opted for the Ohio and Michigan theories as listed in the syllabus. As with all **Section A** part (b) questions, candidates should write sufficient to guarantee full credit rather than just a sentence or two.

Question 18

- (a) Many candidates described Maslow's theory in detail despite it being just one of many different theories. Answers with nothing more than Maslow remained in the bottom credit band. At the top end, candidates showed their understanding of the topic area by organising their answers around a range of different theories and types of motivation.
- (b) Like the essay (**Section B**) question for other options, candidates' answers were of three types. Two types were restricted to a maximum of half credit: those that did not address the named issue at all; and those that addressed nothing more than the named issue. The third type addressed a number of issues *including* the named issue and these candidates had all of the credit available to them.

Question 19

- (a) Two types of answers were evident in this part. There were those who suggested designing their own measure, usually some form of questionnaire and there were those who simply wrote 'I would use' and went on to *describe* a measure that already exists. The best strategy is always to suggest something new rather than describe because this not only scores most credit but it also leads into part (b).
- (b) Those candidates describing an existing measure struggled to provide an adequate answer here, whereas those suggesting in part (a) could either write about the design of a questionnaire (or other method that they had used) or write about the other measures on which their suggestion was based, or they could describe both.

Question 20

- (a) The better answers decided to run through all the steps involved in personnel selection starting with an application form, and consider all the ways in which biases might apply and as the question asked, how they might be avoided. Often there was consideration of an interview panel which was representative of both genders and that the interview panel used structured interviews rather than an individual person conducting an informal or unstructured interview.
- (b) Many candidates scored full credit here by describing in detail two models. Featuring prominently were the multiple hurdle, multiple regression and multiple cut-off models. Other candidates included two models but wrote little more than a sentence or two. To score more credit, there does need to be more detail than that of a short answer.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/33
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to credit allocation, so an answer worth lower credit should be short and an answer worth higher credit 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 ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between describe and suggest for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never gain full credit.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as they appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.

General comments

This is the first sitting of the new syllabus and modified examination format and in general it is pleasing to report that most Centres had prepared their candidates for the examination very well and it was pleasing to be able to award some very high credit to some superbly written answers.

Many candidates correctly used string to tie together their answer pages. Candidates should always tie their pages loosely together for ease of reading by Examiners.

Significant numbers of candidates answered different question parts randomly. Whilst there is no requirement to do **Question 1** first, all the parts of the same question should be answered together.

Section A (all options):

- (a) Most candidates scored full credit in response to questions on all options.
- (b) Most answers for this question part were appropriate, although marks could be improved by writing an amount appropriate to the credit allocated in the question.

Section B (all options)

Question part (a) did not differ in format from questions appearing on previous examinations in that it required candidates to describe information from a given topic area of the syllabus. As with previous questions a candidate could choose what to write about from the three bullet-points of the syllabus and credit was allocated based on the range, detail and quality of the answer.

Question part (b) differed from previous questions because rather than just being asked to 'evaluate' there is now the requirement to include one specifically named evaluation issue. In the past a candidate could evaluate using any three (or more) issues. The requirement now is to include the named issue as one of those three (or more) issues.

Many candidates mistakenly interpreted the question as 'write about this one issue only' despite the question stating 'evaluate ... and include a discussion about'. Such answers could not achieve the highest credit band and neither could answers which did not consider the named issue at all.

Many answers would receive significantly higher credit if the difference between description and evaluation was known by candidates. **Section B** question part (a) will always be 'describe' and question part (b) will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description and doing this will gain no credit.

Evaluation is a different skill which can be defined as ‘the ability to analyse and evaluate knowledge and processes and apply knowledge and processes to unfamiliar situations including those related to issues’. In other words, it is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about evidence that has been described in part (a). Evaluation requires a candidate to think and not to just reproduce learning.

For this question part all candidates could be divided into three types of answer: those who evaluated using a number of issues in addition to the named issue; those who focused exclusively on the named issue or excluded it altogether; and those who did not evaluate at all. It is desirable to see all candidates achieve the first type of answer.

Section C (all options)

One question part asks a candidate to describe and the second question part asks a candidate to suggest. There is a fundamental difference between these two. Description is to show knowledge and understanding that has been learned. To suggest is to go beyond description and to think about how something could be investigated (studied) or applied to a given situation. If these two requirements are adhered to, then many more candidates will be awarded more credit.

Comments on specific questions

Psychology and Education

Question 1

- (a) This was a straightforward question to answer for the majority of candidates and it was good to see that answers often focused on the needs of the gifted in addition to those at the difficulty and disability end of the spectrum.
- (b) Of the credit allocated in this question, half was allocated to ‘causes’ and the other half to the ‘effects’ of ADHD. Some candidates failed to include both these aspects in their answer and therefore gained a maximum of half credit. Reading the question and addressing all its requirements is advised.

Question 2

- (a) There were a few anecdotal answers where candidates wrote that a learning style is what they do in class and a teaching style is what their teacher does, but there were also some excellent answers. A few candidates focused only on learning styles and included the models by Curry and Grasha for example, but others considered a wide range of both learning and learning styles covering a range of different models for each.
- (b) As mentioned in the general comments, the different types of candidate were shown in this question. Some candidates *only* evaluated the named issue of methods which limited the credit allocated; some candidates only considered methods and described rather than evaluated which scored no credit at all; some candidates considered a number of issues but not methods; and some candidates considered methods alongside a number of other issues, and the range and quality of such answers often put them into the highest credit band category.

Question 3

- (a) There were some excellent answers written in response to this question with candidates showing very good understanding of the humanistic approach to education. However, other candidates did not know what the humanistic approach was.
- (b) Those candidates who understood the humanistic approach answered this question very well and many scored full credit. Those candidates who did not understand the humanistic approach simply reverted to ‘standard’ exam preparation, and in failing to address the humanistic approach gained no credit.

Question 4

- (a) The most logical technique was one based on behaviour modification as this was mentioned in the question and most candidates opted for this, describing the use of both positive and negative punishment.
- (b) Those using an appropriate behaviour modification technique in part (a) followed it through into this question part by describing the work of Skinner and the use of reinforcement to modify behaviour. Some candidates outlined classical conditioning, showing a lack of understanding between what they had written in part (a) and part (b).

Psychology and Health

Question 5

- (a) Answers were of three types: those who simply re-wrote the question such as 'people who are accident prone'; those who gave a correct sentence without any elaboration to show understanding; and thirdly those who knew the term and gave that little extra to show full understanding.
- (b) Some candidates gave their own anecdotal example, but most candidates used the syllabus example of the sinking of the Titanic. Some candidates told a very long and detailed story, on occasion failing to mention the illusion of invulnerability at all. Many candidates focused correctly on the Captain who had ultimate responsibility but decided that the ship was unsinkable and that any problem could never happen to them.

Question 6

- (a) Most candidates wrote answers which covered a range of appropriate aspects taken directly from the content of the syllabus which included types and theories of pain, ways in which pain is measured and ways in which pain can be managed. Within each of these sub-topics there was often excellent detail and clear understanding of the subject matter.
- (b) A few candidates did not evaluate at all, simply choosing to describe the usefulness of self reports and indeed these candidates excluded this aspect from their part (a) answer to address self reports in this evaluative section. Answers like this scored no credit. Part (a) is for description and part (b) evaluation and candidates should know this fundamental distinction. At the top end of the credit range there were answers which evaluated using a number of different issues including that of the usefulness of self reports.

Question 7

- (a) There were some excellent answers which included not only a description of the syndrome itself but also made reference to the Aleem and Ajarim case study. Some answers went even further and mentioned Munchausen syndrome by proxy.
- (b) This question suited those candidates who were able to think for themselves and some impressive answers showed good understanding of the problems of identifying Munchausen behaviour and so covered a range of methodological suggestions.

Question 8

- (a) A few candidates described the fear arousal technique rather than the providing information, and a few described the Yale model of communication, but most candidates correctly focused on providing information. The study by Lewin (1992) was most commonly chosen and many candidates scored full credit with detailed descriptions.
- (b) Those choosing to describe a fear arousal technique incorrectly in part (a) could gain credit in this question part because the question simply asked for a campaign without specifying which technique to use. Many answers used a combination of fear arousal, providing information and the Yale model. A number of candidates suggested that the campaign be done in schools whereas others suggested community-wide campaigns. All these approaches were legitimate and scored

high credit.

Psychology and Environment

Question 9

- (a) This question caused few problems for most candidates with nearly all including a mention of personal space and the invasion of it.
- (b) One fundamental problem was that some candidates described incorrect studies such as that by Middlemist et al or the Fisher and Byrne 'library' study. These studies are incorrect because they involved 'real' people and were not simulations. The study by Little (as appears on the syllabus) is a simulation because dolls were used in various social situations. Some candidates describing the Little study received maximum credit for their detailed and accurate answers.

Question 10

- (a) Most candidates answering this part scored high credit. Better answers were organised around the three sub-sections of the syllabus and some candidates mentioned every single aspect of the indicative content whether it be a model, theory or study.
- (b) Top answers from part (a) transferred to part (b) with some excellent evaluative answers being seen. Some candidates did not evaluate appropriately and followed the pattern consistent with other **Section B** answers.

Question 11

- (a) The syllabus includes the laboratory experiment by Mintz and this is the study that all candidates chose to describe. Some candidates provided a basic outline scoring mid-band credit whilst other candidates described the study in lots of detail and scored full credit.
- (b) Some excellent answers appeared in response to this question by those candidates who chose to design their own study. Many suggested a simulation, had a number of controls, often had independent and dependent variables and even wrote about how data could be collected. The approach of suggesting the design of a study shows thinking and was the optimal way to score full credit.

Question 12

- (a) Although a few candidates only managed to describe one study, usually that of Calhoun, most others described both the Calhoun (laboratory) and either Christian or Dubos studies for the non-laboratory. There were some excellent answers described with good detail and understanding with many candidates scoring full credit.
- (b) This question produced three types of answer. There were those candidates who wrote 'I would do the same as Calhoun' and went on to describe the Calhoun study again. This was flawed for two reasons. Firstly the command of the question was to suggest and not to describe (description was question part (a)) and secondly the Calhoun study examined *social* density and not *spatial* density. Some candidates *suggested* but did not go far enough in their answers whereas others suggested a whole experimental study, manipulating spatial density and measuring various variables. This final type of answer often was awarded full credit.

Psychology and Abnormality

Question 13

- (a) The majority of candidates scored full credit and had little problem in including both the term phobia and treatment in their answer.
- (b) Here too, most candidates scored full credit. Many candidates chose two appropriate treatments, such as systematic desensitisation and applied tension, and those not scoring full credit only did so not because their answers were incorrect, but because they were just too brief and lacking in detail compared to others.

Question 14

- (a) Although there were a number of answers scoring full credit, a number of issues were evident. Some candidates simply ran through the six features of addiction outlined by Griffiths and wrote nothing more. Some candidates also did this but went on to provide a list of different addictions. This type of answer scored more credit, but was still restricted to just one sub-section of the syllabus. The best answers were those who mentioned the features and types, the causes, and the ways in which these disorders can be managed.
- (b) Those candidates who excluded a description of explanations in part (a) found it difficult to compare or contrast them for the named issue in part (b). As is the case for other questions, such candidates incorrectly *described* explanations in this question part and gained no credit. As has been mentioned, knowing the difference between description and evaluation will increase significantly the credit a candidate can achieve.

Question 15

- (a) A number of candidates did not know what psychotherapy is because some described the use of drugs and others described the use of cognitive-behaviour therapy and yet others a cognitive strategy such as rational emotive therapy. This question comes from the *models of abnormality* section where one sub-section lists *Medical/biological, behavioural, psychodynamic* and *cognitive* models and the following sub-section has *Treatments derived from models: biological/medical; psychotherapies; cognitive-behavioural models*. This question was therefore asking about psychotherapy based on the psychodynamic approach.
- (b) Some interesting answers appeared here, again based on many inappropriate treatments. The use of anti-depressants would be inappropriate for example. Some candidates wrote excellent answers, suggesting that the therapist take the person back to childhood and the phallic stage and Oedipus complex where some problem was likely to have happened causing the problem to 'come out' later in life.

Question 16

- (a) Some candidates wrote nothing more than a few words such as 'an excess of dopamine causes schizophrenia', whilst others provided very thorough and detailed explanations quoting research evidence to support the hypothesis.
- (b) Many candidates read the question incorrectly and simply wrote all they knew about schizophrenia. Others *described* evidence supporting a biochemical explanation followed by evidence supporting a genetic explanation. Some of these answers were superb in their depth of knowledge and amount of detail described. However, the question asked for a *suggestion* and not a *description*. The best answers began with 'I would investigate by doing' and went on from there to explain how and why they would investigate the respective causes of schizophrenia.

Psychology and Organisations

Question 17

- (a) This question caused little difficulty for most candidates and maximum credit was frequently awarded. A few candidates rewrote the words of the question and this is not advisable because it does not score any credit.
- (b) Some candidates opted to describe theories of leadership that were not behavioural, such as a 'great man/woman explanation', but most opted for the Ohio and Michigan theories as listed in the syllabus. As with all **Section A** part (b) questions, candidates should write sufficient to guarantee full credit rather than just a sentence or two.

Question 18

- (a) Many candidates described Maslow's theory in detail despite it being just one of many different theories. Answers with nothing more than Maslow remained in the bottom credit band. At the top end, candidates showed their understanding of the topic area by organising their answers around a range of different theories and types of motivation.
- (b) Like the essay (**Section B**) question for other options, candidates' answers were of three types. Two types were restricted to a maximum of half credit: those that did not address the named issue at all; and those that addressed nothing more than the named issue. The third type addressed a number of issues *including* the named issue and these candidates had all of the credit available to them.

Question 19

- (a) Two types of answers were evident in this part. There were those who suggested designing their own measure, usually some form of questionnaire and there were those who simply wrote 'I would use' and went on to *describe* a measure that already exists. The best strategy is always to suggest something new rather than describe because this not only scores most credit but it also leads into part (b).
- (b) Those candidates describing an existing measure struggled to provide an adequate answer here, whereas those suggesting in part (a) could either write about the design of a questionnaire (or other method that they had used) or write about the other measures on which their suggestion was based, or they could describe both.

Question 20

- (a) The better answers decided to run through all the steps involved in personnel selection starting with an application form, and consider all the ways in which biases might apply and as the question asked, how they might be avoided. Often there was consideration of an interview panel which was representative of both genders and that the interview panel used structured interviews rather than an individual person conducting an informal or unstructured interview.
- (b) Many candidates scored full credit here by describing in detail two models. Featuring prominently were the multiple hurdle, multiple regression and multiple cut-off models. Other candidates included two models but wrote little more than a sentence or two. To score more credit, there does need to be more detail than that of a short answer.