PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/11
Core Studies 1

General comments

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as background, procedure, ethics, results, conclusions and evaluation. In ***Section A***, the candidates' knowledge of procedure (**1(a)**, **2(a)**, **5(a)**, **7(b)**, **11(a)** and **(b)**), results (**9(a)**, **14**), conclusions (**8**, **13(a)** and **(b)**) and evaluation (**5(b)**, **15(b)**) was good. However, some parts of ***Section A*** of this paper presented particular challenges to some candidates. In general, many candidates could improve by having a better general understanding of the background of studies (for example in responses to **Questions 3(b)** and **10**).

To improve performance still further, candidates would benefit from a more effective grasp of methodology in psychology so that they can see how the study illustrates these principles, for example in **Questions 4(a)** and **(b)** (experimental design), although the understanding of ethical implications was generally adequate (for example **Question 6(a)** and **(b)**). Another methodological concept that was frequently misused, or unused, was 'validity'. This was often confused with 'reliability'. One very common omission was to be unable to respond to the demand of a question asking for a link to the study ('… in this study.'), for example in **Questions 2(b)**, **3(a)**, **6(a)** and **9(b)** (although there were other linked questions).

In some cases the ability to reapply knowledge was good (for example in **Question 13**), but in other areas it was not so evident (for example in order to answer **Question 15(b)**).

Some candidates offered good responses in ***Section B***, writing essays that were relevant and focused on the issues in question (observations and nature/nurture) rather than description. **Question 16** produced somewhat better answers than **Question 17**. Many candidates could, however, improve their answers by illustrating their evaluative points with examples from the content of the chosen study. To encourage candidates to read, understand and answer the question asked they could underline the key components of the question before starting to decide what to write. Such advice would also have been helpful elsewhere on the paper, for example, candidates could be told to rewrite the question in their answer so as not to miss something important. If, in **Question 11(a)**, the candidate were to rewrite 'Two controls used by Dement and Kleitman before the study began were…', this would focus attention to include the last part of the sentence and steer the candidate away from talking about controls that were used within the procedures of the study. (The majority of candidates who answered incorrectly failed to notice this aspect of the question).

Handwriting was rarely a major issue this year, it is very important that answers are legible. Most candidates attempted most questions, there were only a few with many questions left blank.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1 Most candidates scored well on this question.

(a) Better candidates provided a range of good answers here, including suggestions that ensuring the suspects spoke English fluently avoided the need for an interpreter, who could have introduced additional uncontrolled variables. Where candidates did not score full marks on this part, they tended not to focus on the relationship between the interviewers/coders and the suspects or did not relate this to the study, i.e. consider the importance to detecting truths/lies.

(b) Some candidates did not attempt this question part. Those who did, often did not recognise that they needed to focus their answer on 'this aspect of the sample', i.e. that 'All the suspects had English as their first language or were fluent in English'/'all the suspects spoke English fluently'. Instead, such candidates gave answers about sample size or irrelevant answers about ethnicity (i.e. ones that did not consider language).

Question 2 Many candidates did well on this question, or scored at least partial marks.

(a) The fact that there needs to be an IV/DV was often addressed, but there was often no link to the study, e.g. the candidate, having identified the role of the IV, DV or controls, did not then give an example from Loftus and Pickrell.

(b) Again, an appropriate disadvantage was frequently given, but this was less often linked to the study.

Question 3

(a) Candidates appeared to have limited knowledge of the meaning of an inverse/negative correlation in the context of this study, and when they did, it was often poorly expressed. Many candidates therefore gave limited answers such as simply stating 'when a high score was given on one test they got a low score on the other' although others made guesses such as that the variables were not linked at all. However, a few candidates suggested *causal* relationships between the variables.

(b) Candidates' answers to this question part tended to lack detail, and those who did score showed a variable understanding of the role theory of mind plays in being able to achieve a high eyes test score, with many candidates being unable to elaborate this idea.

Question 4

(a) Many candidates did not know how to answer this question and responded in terms of 'lab experiment'. Those who addressed the type of design often misidentified it as matched pairs or repeated measures; very few candidates realised this was an independent groups design. This was in spite of knowing that the two levels of the IV were fulfilled by different kittens.

(b) When candidates did not correctly identify the design in **(a)**, this question part was not well answered either. Even those candidates who recognised or described an independent groups design in **(a)** tended to give vague or irrelevant answers here.

Question 5

(a) This question part was often well-answered, with many candidates referring to the newspaper advertisement but some showed a limited understanding of the sampling technique.

(b) This question part was reasonably well answered, although those candidates who did not earn full marks tended to offer limited context or the disadvantage of volunteer sampling was poorly expressed. A small number of candidates cited advantages, having misread the question.

Question 6

(a) There were some good answers to this question part, with 'harm' being most commonly identified as an issue. However, there was often no link to the study.

(b) Some candidates offered good answers here, but many simply continued their answers to 'how' rather than answering *why* the guideline was broken.

Question 7

(a) This question part was typically well answered. However, some candidates confused qualitative and quantitative data or did not give a related example. Where examples were given, many candidates incorrectly included examples of quantitative data.

(b) In **part (b)** there were many partial answers because candidates largely referred to "what" rather than "how", or gave general descriptions of the procedure of the study rather than focussing on the data collection procedure for the qualitative data.

Question 8

This question was often well answered, showing good understanding of the study.

Question 9

(a) This question part was often well answered, with most candidates correctly identifying the use of a scale, but not many making the link to faces or morality. A significant minority of candidates confused this study with Bandura et al.

(b) Although many candidates scored some marks, answers quite often identified lack of detail or simply stated that it 'does not give an explanation as to why something has happened' but such answers were rarely linked to the study.

Question 10

Candidates often lacked the required understanding to earn full marks here, so even when the two factors (physiological/cognitive) were identified, they were rarely backed up with examples. For example, they tended to give results from the study rather than an example of the two factors. These examples could have come from the study, but those who gained credit here tended to use other examples. A small number of candidates were muddled about the study and described Billington et al. (attempting to use empathiser/sympathiser as the two factors).

Question 11

(a) Many candidates answered this question part well. However, there were also many references to controls *during* study, rather than before it.

(b) Again, this question part was well answered by many candidates, although many limited answers lacked the ability to explain clearly why the control was necessary.

Question 12

(a), **(b)** There were many correct answers to these questions although some candidates who scored full marks on **part (a)** could not then provide an answer to **part (b)**. Candidates often included information about parts of the brain involved in the process, making it hard for them to score marks as they had diverted from the question asked.

Question 13

(a) Most candidates scored marks on this question part. They often identified the application and could link it effectively, most commonly directly to attractiveness. There were many inventive suggestions. This skill of applying knowledge should be encouraged.

(b) This question part was also generally well answered in terms of identifying a way of measuring (most often using a scale/questionnaire/observation). A small minority of candidates simply said 'repeat Dematte's experiment' or proposed ways to measure the smell, rather than its effect. Again there were some very innovative suggestions, such as how long the participant looked at the attractive image for, using an app on a phone to measure the duration of gaze at a photo to determine preference, or uploading a picture onto a social media site and seeing how many 'likes' it gets.

Question 14

There were many good answers here, with candidates tackling the question effectively by giving 'paired' statements (what happens normally versus what happened with Eve). However, less successful responses tended to give confused answers such as ones focusing on headaches without reference to memory.

Question 15

(a) This question part was reasonably well answered, with many candidates identifying either that it was a questionnaire or that participants reported themselves. Full mark answers with sufficient detail were less common.

(b) As with **Question 14**, there were some excellent answers to this question part, although many candidates were unable to elaborate their answer sufficiently to gain the second mark.

Section B

Question 16

The most popular choices here were the Bandura et al. and Rosenhan studies, and these also produced the strongest answers. The most successful candidates approach their essay in a structured way, looking first for general strengths or weaknesses of observations and supplying an example of this point from the study. However, such responses were reasonably unusual, with candidates tending to simply report the procedure. A common mistake by candidates was to describe how the children were observed in the Bandura et al. study or the nurses/patients in the Rosenhan study, rather than describing the strengths and weaknesses of observations. When answers were focused, there was evidence of knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of observational techniques. However, answers were often let down by lack of supporting evidence, an imbalance of strengths and weaknesses and/or lack of elaboration as to *why* the issues reported were important.

Question 17

There was a fairly even spread of choices between the studies here and candidates found all of the choices challenging. Many responses were not focused on the question and the weakest candidates missed out debate completely and simply described the study. There were, however, some excellent efforts at a discussion of nature/nurture, but even in the best cases answers often lacked balance.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/12
Core Studies 1

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth two marks should be short and an answer worth 10 marks should be correspondingly longer. **Section B** questions are not short-answer.
- For a Section A 2-mark answer that has the command 'describe', candidates should ensure they provide enough detail to score both marks, rather than a partial, very brief or vague answer.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question, **(a)** and **(b)**, in **Section A** before beginning to write an answer to ensure that the answers to both question parts are not the same.
- Where a question states 'in this study' candidates must relate what they write to the study in question i.e. give an example from the study.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.
- The writing of some candidates is difficult to read and all candidates are encouraged to write legibly. Candidates are reminded that writing in ink that shows through on the opposite side of the paper also makes what is written difficult to read.
- It is helpful to Examiners if candidates answer questions in the order in which they are presented on the question paper, although **Section B** could be done before **Section A**.

General comments

There three errors that are frequently made by candidates and addressing these would increase marks significantly.

Some candidates confuse command terms such as identify, outline, explain and describe. Guidance on the command words can be found in the syllabus.

A common error is not to address 'in this study' in questions. There were many instances of this on this paper and it meant that many candidates failed to score marks because they did not fully answer the question. 'In this study' means relating the answer to the study in the question; without doing this the answer could relate to any study without an explicit link.

In **Questions 16** and **17**, a common error is to describe rather than evaluate. Those who do evaluate often do not evaluate according to the issues identified by the question. On this paper **Question 17** focused on the cognitive approach and instead of answering the question many candidates described one of the studies, identified strengths and weaknesses of the study, but did not consider the cognitive approach.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Most candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding of self-report data, but many candidates did not address the latter part of the question, 'using this study as an example'. Some candidates merely wrote 'when answering a questionnaire' but this is too vague and was not explicitly related to the Loftus and Pickrell study. Candidates who wrote 'when answering a questionnaire in booklets about false memory' showed unambiguously that this is specific to this study.

(b) Answers to this question frequently had the same problem as for part **(a)**. Candidates could easily write about 'tell lies/respond to demand characteristics/display social desirability bias', however, the second half of the question was 'in this study' and only a small number of candidates went on to link the disadvantage to the study.

Question 2

(a) A common error was to state that the experimenter (31-year-old high school biology teacher) observed and took notes, which was incorrect, observations were done through a one-way mirror.

(b) Answers in response to this question part were often better than for part **(a)** with candidates providing appropriate answers. For example, writing that it gave more detailed information/gave qualitative data (as well as quantitative) received credit.

Question 3

(a) Pathological prisoner syndrome describes the *feelings* and experiences of the prisoners and candidates emphasising feelings often scored full marks. The question did not ask about the *causes* of pathological prisoner syndrome, this is an example where some candidates would have benefitted from reading both question parts before starting their response to **(a)**.

(b) There were many causes of pathological prisoner syndrome given by candidates: a loss of identify caused by having numbers rather than names; feelings of emasculation caused by having to wear smocks with no underwear, for example.

Question 4

(a) Candidates were not always able to demonstrate clear understanding of experimental designs. A repeated measures design is where any one participant/group performs in each/every condition/levels of the independent variable, a common error was to describe it as where a participant repeats the same study several times. An independent measures design is where each person/group only performs in one condition/levels of the independent variable.

(b) The main advantage of a repeated measures design is that it overcomes individual differences. A common error was not to address the 'in this study' part of the question. In relation to the Tajfel study, this advantage meant that any difference in the allocation of points could not be due to the characteristics of different boys because this was controlled by the repeated measures design.

Question 5

(a) Many candidates were able to score full marks. Some candidates stated the mean only, which was not sufficient for full marks. Many candidates stated incorrect ages, and some gave ages that would have been impossible, such as 4-6 months.

(b) Most candidates opted to make a suggestion for older children, and suggested that the study would not work mainly because the children would have had more exposure to 'pre-existing' aggression, or that older children would have more highly developed morals (and so would not hit the bobo doll).

Question 6

(a) Many candidates were able to provide a reason why it is possible to generalise from Hans to other children. According to Freud, all children go through his proposed psychosexual stages of development (and not just little Hans); all boys go through the phallic stage and the Oedipus complex. Many candidates wrote that little Hans *suffered* the Oedipus complex, according to Freud there is no suffering, it is simply a component of psychosexual development.

(b) Many candidates were able to provide a reason why it is *not* possible to generalise from Hans to other children. Freud himself stated that Hans was not a normal child. Hans also had a phobia which was specific to little Hans and not all children have this or any other phobia. What also could not be generalised to *all* children was the fact that Hans was male and experienced the Oedipus complex, which does not apply to any female.

Question 7

(a) This question was allocated 4 marks and so answers should therefore be longer than any question that is allocated 2 marks. Some candidates had single sentence, brief answers which scored 1 mark, for example 'the study compared attractive and unattractive faces'; others provided a list of four or more aims but did not score full marks because the question specified two aims. A number of candidates confused the aims of the study when stating incorrectly that it was to test whether babies preferred male *or* female faces, or whether they preferred white *or* black faces.

Question 8

(a) Most candidates answered that it had an IV, a DV and controls, but not every candidate provided an example from the study, i.e. one of the IVs (such as implicit/explicit) or, for the DV, whether the child's judgement was 'good' or 'bad'.

(b) Many candidates correctly stated that by controlling variables, demand characteristics might be introduced and gave a supporting example from the study. There were candidates who wrote only about controls, which scored limited credit.

Question 9

(a) A common error was to describe the sampling technique, rather than the sample.

Question 10

(a) Most candidates stated that an EEG measures 'brain waves', for limited credit. Other candidates elaborated and scored full marks by stating for example, that an EEG measures the amplitude and frequency of brain waves. Answers relating to eye movements were also correct because in this study electrodes connected to the scalp and eyes both fed into the EEG machine.

(b) Most candidates were able to answer that the EEG is used with participants by attaching electrodes to the scalp and close to the eyes. Marks were also awarded for stating that the wires from the electrodes were collected in a 'pony tail', that the wires then went to a different room, and that they were connected to the EEG recorder.

Question 11

(a) Nearly all candidates scored limited credit for explaining what is meant by quantitative data, with most stating that it is 'data that uses numbers'. However, when giving an example from the study, responses were mixed. Some candidates gave no answer at all; some candidates gave an answer that wasn't quantitative (e.g. repeating numbers for the baseline task, which is what people say); and some candidates gave perfect answers such as the time taken (in seconds) to repeat the numbers of the baseline task.

(b) Most candidates scored full marks in response to this question. A few candidates gave examples, even though this was not required for this question.

Question 12

(a) There was some confusion in a few answers when candidates gave a disadvantage of the study rather than specifically focusing on a problem with the smells. Others provided perfect answers, when writing about rubber not being liked, 'gravity' not being liked or not being familiar, or geranium/rubber not being a smell associated with the body. These all reduced the ecological validity or may have pleasant or unpleasant associations for the participants.

(b) This question required candidates to use the results of the study to suggest why some men choose fragranced products. While many candidates had little difficulty in including these two components in their answers, other candidates included nothing more than 'because men want to smell nice', which needed elaboration, or the demonstration of psychological knowledge, in order to receive full marks.

Question 13

(a) This question required a description of a case study. Any two correct features would score marks. Candidates were able to include correct features such as: it is a study of one individual/instance/unit; it collects in-depth/detailed data; it might use many different techniques such as interviews, tests, etc. Many candidates answered that it is longitudinal/conducted over time. Whilst this is a feature of some case studies it is not a feature of all case studies, and so could not be credited.

(b) Most candidates gave a correct disadvantage (e.g. it is not possible to generalise from one person) but then often failed to relate it to the study. A number of candidates wrote that a disadvantage is that a case study goes on for a long time. Some do, but this isn't necessarily a disadvantage; it can be an advantage to study a person for a long period of time.

Question 14

(a) This question was misinterpreted by many candidates who wrote about features of the sample, such as male/female balance, age and other participant details.

(b) This question was answered incorrectly by candidates who could not identify appropriate variables in part **(a)**. Some candidates wrote general comments for limited credit, about controlling variables, such as extraneous variables (if not controlled) causing confounding. Stronger answers continued to relate to the study, for example that if the order of tests was not controlled there could be order effects.

Question 15

(a) There were some excellent answers showing good understanding, but there were a few candidates who appeared incorrectly to think that the study required participants to stand in front of a mirror whilst the experimenters watched, which was not correct. Harm might have been caused by requiring participants to answer questions about their mirror gazing behaviour which may, for example, have made them realise the extent or seriousness of their BDD.

(b) Some candidates appeared to have misread this question. The question required an explanation of an ethical issue which Veale and Riley had resolved. Some candidates incorrectly wrote about deception. As there was no deception in this study, this was not applicable.

Question 16

Answers covered the entire mark range. At the top end, there were candidates who provided two ways in which their named study was useful, supported with examples, and two ways in which their named study was less useful, also supported with examples. A common error was to only consider how the named study was useful, without also considering how it was not useful. There were also candidates who described rather than evaluated which could not be credited as it did not answer the question set.

Question 17

Many candidates scored few marks as they could not demonstrate knowledge of any strengths or weaknesses of the cognitive approach. Questions may cover any of the approaches listed in the syllabus, so candidates need to be familiar with all of them. Many candidates described one of the three named studies, which could not be credited as it did not answer the question set. Many candidates made good attempts and some of the points made were appropriate.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/13
Core Studies 1

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth two marks should be short and an answer worth 10 marks should be correspondingly longer. **Section B** questions are not short-answer.
- For a Section A 2-mark answer that has the command 'describe', candidates should ensure they provide enough detail to score both marks, rather than a partial, very brief or vague answer.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question, **(a)** and **(b)**, in **Section A** before beginning to write an answer to ensure that the answers to both question parts are not the same.
- Where a question states 'in this study' candidates must relate what they write to the study in question i.e. give an example from the study.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will never achieve top marks.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.
- The writing of some candidates is difficult to read and all candidates are encouraged to write legibly. Candidates are reminded that writing in ink that shows through on the opposite side of the paper also makes what is written difficult to read.
- It is helpful to Examiners if candidates answer questions in the order in which they are presented on the question paper, although **Section B** could be done before **Section A**.

General comments

There three errors that are frequently made by candidates and addressing these would increase marks significantly.

Some candidates confuse command terms such as identify, outline, explain and describe. Guidance on the command words can be found in the syllabus.

A common error is not to address 'in this study' in questions. There were many instances of this on this paper and it meant that many candidates failed to score marks because they did not fully answer the question. 'In this study' means relating the answer to the study in the question; without doing this the answer could relate to any study without an explicit link.

In **Questions 16** and **17**, a common error is to describe rather than evaluate. Those who do evaluate often do not evaluate according to the issues identified by the question. On this paper **Question 17** focused on the cognitive approach and instead of answering the question many candidates described one of the studies, identified strengths and weaknesses of the study, but did not consider the cognitive approach.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Most candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding of self-report data, but many candidates did not address the latter part of the question, 'using this study as an example'. Some candidates merely wrote 'when answering a questionnaire' but this is too vague and was not explicitly related to the Loftus and Pickrell study. Candidates who wrote 'when answering a questionnaire in booklets about false memory' showed unambiguously that this is specific to this study.

(b) Answers to this question frequently had the same problem as for part **(a)**. Candidates could easily write about 'tell lies/respond to demand characteristics/display social desirability bias', however, the second half of the question was 'in this study' and only a small number of candidates went on to link the disadvantage to the study.

Question 2

(a) A common error was to state that the experimenter (31-year-old high school biology teacher) observed and took notes, which was incorrect, observations were done through a one-way mirror.

(b) Answers in response to this question part were often better than for part **(a)** with candidates providing appropriate answers. For example, writing that it gave more detailed information/gave qualitative data (as well as quantitative) received credit.

Question 3

(a) Pathological prisoner syndrome describes the *feelings* and experiences of the prisoners and candidates emphasising feelings often scored full marks. The question did not ask about the *causes* of pathological prisoner syndrome, this is an example where some candidates would have benefitted from reading both question parts before starting their response to **(a)**.

(b) There were many causes of pathological prisoner syndrome given by candidates: a loss of identify caused by having numbers rather than names; feelings of emasculation caused by having to wear smocks with no underwear, for example.

Question 4

(a) Candidates were not always able to demonstrate clear understanding of experimental designs. A repeated measures design is where any one participant/group performs in each/every condition/levels of the independent variable, a common error was to describe it as where a participant repeats the same study several times. An independent measures design is where each person/group only performs in one condition/levels of the independent variable.

(b) The main advantage of a repeated measures design is that it overcomes individual differences. A common error was not to address the 'in this study' part of the question. In relation to the Tajfel study, this advantage meant that any difference in the allocation of points could not be due to the characteristics of different boys because this was controlled by the repeated measures design.

Question 5

(a) Many candidates were able to score full marks. Some candidates stated the mean only, which was not sufficient for full marks. Many candidates stated incorrect ages, and some gave ages that would have been impossible, such as 4-6 months.

(b) Most candidates opted to make a suggestion for older children, and suggested that the study would not work mainly because the children would have had more exposure to 'pre-existing' aggression, or that older children would have more highly developed morals (and so would not hit the bobo doll).

Question 6

(a) Many candidates were able to provide a reason why it is possible to generalise from Hans to other children. According to Freud, all children go through his proposed psychosexual stages of development (and not just little Hans); all boys go through the phallic stage and the Oedipus complex. Many candidates wrote that little Hans *suffered* the Oedipus complex, according to Freud there is no suffering, it is simply a component of psychosexual development.

(b) Many candidates were able to provide a reason why it is *not* possible to generalise from Hans to other children. Freud himself stated that Hans was not a normal child. Hans also had a phobia which was specific to little Hans and not all children have this or any other phobia. What also could not be generalised to *all* children was the fact that Hans was male and experienced the Oedipus complex, which does not apply to any female.

Question 7

(a) This question was allocated 4 marks and so answers should therefore be longer than any question that is allocated 2 marks. Some candidates had single sentence, brief answers which scored 1 mark, for example 'the study compared attractive and unattractive faces'; others provided a list of four or more aims but did not score full marks because the question specified two aims. A number of candidates confused the aims of the study when stating incorrectly that it was to test whether babies preferred male *or* female faces, or whether they preferred white *or* black faces.

Question 8

(a) Most candidates answered that it had an IV, a DV and controls, but not every candidate provided an example from the study, i.e. one of the IVs (such as implicit/explicit) or, for the DV, whether the child's judgement was 'good' or 'bad'.

(b) Many candidates correctly stated that by controlling variables, demand characteristics might be introduced and gave a supporting example from the study. There were candidates who wrote only about controls, which scored limited credit.

Question 9

(a) A common error was to describe the sampling technique, rather than the sample.

Question 10

(a) Most candidates stated that an EEG measures 'brain waves', for limited credit. Other candidates elaborated and scored full marks by stating for example, that an EEG measures the amplitude and frequency of brain waves. Answers relating to eye movements were also correct because in this study electrodes connected to the scalp and eyes both fed into the EEG machine.

(b) Most candidates were able to answer that the EEG is used with participants by attaching electrodes to the scalp and close to the eyes. Marks were also awarded for stating that the wires from the electrodes were collected in a 'pony tail', that the wires then went to a different room, and that they were connected to the EEG recorder.

Question 11

(a) Nearly all candidates scored limited credit for explaining what is meant by quantitative data, with most stating that it is 'data that uses numbers'. However, when giving an example from the study, responses were mixed. Some candidates gave no answer at all; some candidates gave an answer that wasn't quantitative (e.g. repeating numbers for the baseline task, which is what people say); and some candidates gave perfect answers such as the time taken (in seconds) to repeat the numbers of the baseline task.

(b) Most candidates scored full marks in response to this question. A few candidates gave examples, even though this was not required for this question.

Question 12

(a) There was some confusion in a few answers when candidates gave a disadvantage of the study rather than specifically focusing on a problem with the smells. Others provided perfect answers, when writing about rubber not being liked, 'gravity' not being liked or not being familiar, or geranium/rubber not being a smell associated with the body. These all reduced the ecological validity or may have pleasant or unpleasant associations for the participants.

(b) This question required candidates to use the results of the study to suggest why some men choose fragranced products. While many candidates had little difficulty in including these two components in their answers, other candidates included nothing more than 'because men want to smell nice', which needed elaboration, or the demonstration of psychological knowledge, in order to receive full marks.

Question 13

(a) This question required a description of a case study. Any two correct features would score marks. Candidates were able to include correct features such as: it is a study of one individual/instance/unit; it collects in-depth/detailed data; it might use many different techniques such as interviews, tests, etc. Many candidates answered that it is longitudinal/conducted over time. Whilst this is a feature of some case studies it is not a feature of all case studies, and so could not be credited.

(b) Most candidates gave a correct disadvantage (e.g. it is not possible to generalise from one person) but then often failed to relate it to the study. A number of candidates wrote that a disadvantage is that a case study goes on for a long time. Some do, but this isn't necessarily a disadvantage; it can be an advantage to study a person for a long period of time.

Question 14

(a) This question was misinterpreted by many candidates who wrote about features of the sample, such as male/female balance, age and other participant details.

(b) This question was answered incorrectly by candidates who could not identify appropriate variables in part **(a)**. Some candidates wrote general comments for limited credit, about controlling variables, such as extraneous variables (if not controlled) causing confounding. Stronger answers continued to relate to the study, for example that if the order of tests was not controlled there could be order effects.

Question 15

(a) There were some excellent answers showing good understanding, but there were a few candidates who appeared incorrectly to think that the study required participants to stand in front of a mirror whilst the experimenters watched, which was not correct. Harm might have been caused by requiring participants to answer questions about their mirror gazing behaviour which may, for example, have made them realise the extent or seriousness of their BDD.

(b) Some candidates appeared to have misread this question. The question required an explanation of an ethical issue which Veale and Riley had resolved. Some candidates incorrectly wrote about deception. As there was no deception in this study, this was not applicable.

Question 16

Answers covered the entire mark range. At the top end, there were candidates who provided two ways in which their named study was useful, supported with examples, and two ways in which their named study was less useful, also supported with examples. A common error was to only consider how the named study was useful, without also considering how it was not useful. There were also candidates who described rather than evaluated which could not be credited as it did not answer the question set.

Question 17

Many candidates scored few marks as they could not demonstrate knowledge of any strengths or weaknesses of the cognitive approach. Questions may cover any of the approaches listed in the syllabus, so candidates need to be familiar with all of them. Many candidates described one of the three named studies, which could not be credited as it did not answer the question set. Many candidates made good attempts and some of the points made were appropriate.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/21
Core Studies 2

Key messages

Section A

Question 1

Candidates should be aware of the requirements of each question in the exam. For example, if asked to describe they should not include evaluative comments. A few found it difficult to just focus on describing what is meant by the laboratory experimental method and instead gave a number of evaluation points in part **(a).** Many candidates described the Bandura et al. study in detail which was not creditworthy. Candidates should suggest a simple alternative to the original study in part **(b)** and give clear details of the procedure followed ensuring that they use the method and the sample described in the question. Extended evaluative points that make direct reference to the alternative idea are necessary in part **(c)** to achieve full marks.

Question 2

It is important that all candidates practice writing these types of questions. Candidates should structure their responses appropriately to achieve full marks. For example, if the question asks for strengths and weaknesses then at least four points must be made (at least two strengths and two weaknesses). In addition, candidates need to address evaluation points to the approach/issue named in the question. Many appeared to have prepared answers to parts **(c)** and **(d)** which sometimes did not receive credit. Candidates must refer to the named study in their responses to achieve higher marks and the vast majority of candidates did refer to the Nelson study.

Section B

Candidates must write more extended responses in both part **(b)** and part **(c)** of the essay as many gave accurate responses that lacked depth. Evidence must be given in part **(c)** to achieve higher marks. In addition, candidates must discuss more than one point for the part **(c)** of the **Section B** essay in order to achieve higher marks. Many discussed just one point using the studies as examples and gave a very lengthy answer that achieved limited credit.

General comments

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

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

A number of candidates answered both questions in the ***Section B*** essay. When a candidate did this they were awarded the mark for the best of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). 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 the part **(c)** of their ***Section B*** essays to achieve higher marks. **Question 3** was the more popular choice of question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) Most candidates achieved some marks on this question. Most candidates received credit for referring to a controlled environment with an IV and DV, with many describing this in more depth by stating that laboratory experiments involved the manipulation of the IV and the measurement of the DV. Very few candidates mentioned anything about the design of the study. A number also included strengths and weaknesses of the laboratory experimental method which did not receive any credit.

(b) The majority of candidates achieved in the 3–4 mark band. Many responses described an observational study rather than a self report.

Candidates have learned a formula of who, what, where, when and how which is helpful, although several then did not then apply it to describing a self-report method. Several candidates designed unethical studies including parents being violent toward each other in front of their children.

Better answers discussed either interviews or questionnaires without reference to other ways of conducting the research.

Those that did create a self report often wrote a simple study but gave a clear indication of the questions asked to the participants in the study (the parents of young children).

Some candidates evaluated their idea in this question, and which could not be credited.

(c) The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points.

Many discussed issues about ecological validity, ethics, strengths and weaknesses of the data collected and generalisability.

Stronger answers focused on just a couple of points but really developed them in context. Weaker answers were limited by only allowing a sentence to address an issue, so that although they may have covered a number of points, none were developed.

Some candidates only briefly identified issues and did not refer back to the context of their own study.

Question 2

(a) Mainly well answered with many achieving full marks by successfully including some reference to how behaviour develops or changes over time. Some responses were limited to just the study of childhood, the developmental approach is more than just the study of childhood, and these responses achieved just one mark.

(b) Many candidates achieved at least one mark for this question for mentioning the moral development of children. Very few achieved more than one mark because they did not clearly show how Nelson's study was developmental through referring to the results of this study. Better responses referred to the difference between the 3 and the 7 year olds in terms of the development of morals.

(c) The majority of candidates achieved some marks in this question. Many were able to describe at least one strength and/or one weakness of the developmental approach. Common strengths included the usefulness of the approach, explanations produced by the approach and the controlled nature of the lab experiments often used in the approach. Common weaknesses included ethical concerns with working with children, communication and language difficulties and the lack of ecological validity of the laboratory experiments often used in the approach.

There were many candidates that discussed just one strength or weakness which limits the marks available; to gain the higher marks, at least two strengths and two weaknesses should be discussed. Many attempted to do this, though often responses included a weaker discussion of the second strength or second weakness. A number of candidates used issues that were not relevant to the approach such as qualitative/quantitative data and generalisability of the sample. Some appeared to have learned strengths and weaknesses and then attempted to make them fit the approach.

Many attempted to link their responses to Nelson and did achieve higher marks as a result of this. Some just made a reference to it so did not receive any credit for context. In addition, many believed that the Nelson study was longitudinal which is not correct.

(d) Some candidates answered appropriately for this question and identified points about the extent to which the Nelson study could be applied to everyday life. Common points included linking the extent the study can be applied to everyday life to ecological validity, sample size, controls used in the study and demand characteristics.

A significant number of candidates described how the findings of the study are useful and did not attempt a discussion of application to everyday life with regards to the Nelson study which limited marks.

Section B

Question 3

(a) Many candidates achieved full marks for this question by explaining that the social approach involves the social interactions between two or more people.

(b) This was generally a well-answered question, with some candidates achieving full marks for excellent descriptions of behaviours. There were many different approaches to answering this question, with some candidates describing the behaviours, e.g. 'Milgram observed how far a person would shock…' whereas some described the results of the behaviours observed, e.g. 'Milgram found that all participants delivered a 300 V shock…'. Most gave very detailed descriptions of the Haney, Banks and Zimbardo study although some did not mention that it investigated social roles (or roles of some description) so could not achieve the maximum marks for this study. The Tajfel study was less well described, many candidates just mentioned that it investigated out-group discrimination and little else, which limited marks. Some candidates only discussed the behaviour from one study at length, rather than mentioning behaviour observed in all three studies, which limited marks available.

(c) Most candidates described two strengths of the social approach. The better answers included a third, distinct strength. Common issues raised included usefulness, explanations offered by the approach, holism and high ecological validity. Candidates did often link at least one of these strengths to a piece of evidence, with the better answers linking all strengths to evidence.

Question 4

(a) The vast majority of candidates explained what is meant by quantitative data and often gave a slightly more detailed definition that achieved full marks.

(b) Candidates gave good responses for this part of the question. The best responses described how the data was collected in each study and/or the quantitative results in the study. For Dement and Kleitman many candidates referred to the EEG and EOG readings, timings of sleep and dreaming including whether the participant believed they had been dreaming for 5 or 15 minutes, number of words used to describe dreams, the numerical results of dreams recalled (e.g. remember 152 dreams in REM and 11 dreams in N-REM). For Thigpen and Cleckley, the vast majority of candidates referred to the IQ testing and most knew that Eve White had a higher IQ than Eve Black (110 vs 104). Some candidates referred to the memory test and that Eve White's memory test revealed her memory was far superior to Eve Black. The results of EEG test with Eve Black had a faster reading was also acceptable and occasionally mentioned by some candidates. For the Loftus and Pickrell study, most candidates could achieve one mark by mentioning that more participants stated they could recall the true memories compared to the false memory. Many also mentioned the clarity rating of memory (1 to 10 scale) and the confidence rating (1 to 5 scale) and achieved marks for these answers. Some referred to the results such as 6 out of 29 participants recalled the false event. Some weaker responses described the procedures of the studies rather than focusing on the quantitative data collection in each study.

(c) The majority of candidates could identify one problem of using quantitative data and often referred to some evidence to back up the problem. Most referred to the problem of quantitative data lacking detail and therefore providing a poor/invalid explanation of behaviour. Some candidates wrote very lengthy responses using three studies as examples to back up this one problem. A few candidates described two or three problems with quantitative data and these included reductionism and that data collection method is inflexible or unrealistic (such as a Likert scale).

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22
Core Studies 2

Key Messages

Section A

Question 1

Candidates need to know what the experimental method involves. They need to suggest simple alternatives to the original study in part **(b)** covering what, how, who, where and when. Extended evaluative points linked to their own study from part **(b)** are necessary in part **(c)** to gain full marks. There were very few examples of unethical studies for part **(b)**.

Question 2

It is important for candidates to know how each study is linked to the methodology and data presentation, so for this examination, how reliability is linked to the study by Schachter and Singer. For part **(b)** candidates need to explain how the study by Schachter and Singer related to aspects of reliability. For part **(c)** candidates need to evaluate reliable research using the study by Schachter and Singer as an example throughout, rather than just an evaluation of the study by Schachter and Singer. To achieve higher marks, candidates need to write about at least two strengths and two weaknesses in context. For part **(d)** candidates needed to be able to correctly appreciate the ethical issues raised by the study by Schachter and Singer.

Section B

Candidates must focus their answers in part **(b)** to what feature(s) the question is asking (in this exam how data were collected or how the study could be applied to everyday life) rather than just writing in general about the study. Candidates must discuss more than one point in part **(c)** *and* have evidence from studies for each to gain full marks.

General Comments

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

Time management appeared to be good for the majority of candidates. There was some evidence that candidates who over-answered question **3(b)** or **4(b)** wrote much shorter answers for **3(c) or 4(c)** as a result. Candidates need to ensure they have enough time to answer all questions to the best of their ability.

Candidates need to be aware that they need to answer **one** of the **two** questions for ***Section B***. When a candidate answered both questions they were awarded the best mark for the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually achieved poorly.

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

Comments on specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) Many candidates could identify at least two types of experiment or experimental design. Candidates tended to describe one of these types to gain more marks. Independent and dependent variables tended to be mentioned as did cause and effect. Some candidates evaluated experiments in their answer which was not required in this question.

(b) There was a wide variety of ideas given by candidates on how to examine sleep and dreaming in a more ecologically valid way. Many candidates could appropriately choose a sample and outline an appropriate sampling technique. Candidates usually did well outlining the what (which aspects of sleep and dreaming were being collected and/or measured) and the where (e.g. participants' own homes). Some candidates did not tackle the how (the actual recording of the sleep and dreaming) sufficiently well to gain marks in the top band; simply writing 'dreaming was recorded' was not sufficient. There were a few answers that replicated Dement and Kleitman in a laboratory but changed the questions asked which gained minimal credit. This type of question examines a candidate's ability to design a study that is practical and their ability to fully understand the potential methodology used by professional psychologists.

(c) Many candidates could highlight one or two evaluative points about the study they had designed in **1(b)**. Common points made were about the sample used, the unethical nature of a study about sleep and dreaming (e.g. lack of privacy) and practicalities surrounding the use of scientific equipment outside of a laboratory. A significant portion of candidates made a series of brief points linked to their own design to gain more marks. Some candidates evaluated aspects generically, which gained minimal credit as they had not linked them specifically to their own study.

Question 2

(a) Many candidates clearly knew what reliability was and gained full marks. Some candidates wrote about validity or about credibility of findings which did not gain credit.

(b) Many candidates did not identify an aspect of the study by Schachter and Singer that made the study reliable. Candidates tended to describe what the study by Schachter and Singer did without linking it to reliability.

(c) Many candidates attempted this question and gained some credit. There was evidence of some candidates evaluating the study by Schachter and Singer in general and these could only gain credit if the answer was linked to clear points about reliable research. Many candidates gave some strengths and weaknesses of reliable research generally, but to gain higher marks these strengths and weaknesses needed to be linked to the Schachter and Singer study.

(d) Many candidates identified at least two ethical guidelines that were relevant to the study by Schachter and Singer. These included potential psychological harm and the problems related to deception to enhance validity of findings. Candidates also attempted to argue about (informed) consent and a lack of privacy due to the intrusive nature of the questionnaire.

Question 3

(a) Many candidates made reference to at least one aspect of an application to everyday life (e.g. usefulness) to score one mark. A significant number of candidates answered the question as if it was about ecological validity which did not gain credit.

(b) Specific details about each study in terms of the actual application to everyday life were crucial to gain full marks per study. Answers relating to the study by Thigpen and Cleckley tended to be focused on therapeutic use but without clear reference to the actual findings from the study. This was the same for the study by Veale and Riley. Many candidates highlighted how the study by Loftus and Pickrell might be useful for the police/courts of law but there was little reference to actual findings. There were some very long answers here that covered all of the study rather than focussing on what the question asked.

(c) Many candidates outlined some problems such as lack of ecological validity or ethics and some then used a study to elaborate on the problem. The better answers then went on to relate studies to all advantages. Some candidates made the same points repeatedly, which limited marks.

Question 4

(a) Many candidates made reference to at least one and usually two aspects of the developmental approach to score maximum marks. A few candidates answered the question as if it was about nature-nurture.

(b) There were many very good answers to this question as candidates picked out the necessary aspects of each study that showed how data were collected. Specific details about each study in terms of the actual data were crucial to gain full marks per study. The study by Langlois tended to be where candidates obtained the least marks. Many candidates could name at least two of the measures taken by Freud, showing good knowledge of the study. The study by Bandura et al. was covered well with many candidates being able to pick out the different ways in which he collected data about the children. There were some very long answers here that covered all of the study rather than having a focus on what the question asked.

(c) Many candidates outlined one or two brief problems and this tended to be about ethics and practical issues (e.g. attention span or language difficulties). The better answers made three separate points and related them all to a study in order to gain the maximum marks per point made. As with **3(c)**, some candidates made the same point several times using different studies (especially about ethics) which limited marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/23
Core Studies 2

Key Messages

Section A

Question 1

Candidates need to know what the experimental method involves. They need to suggest simple alternatives to the original study in part **(b)** covering what, how, who, where and when. Extended evaluative points linked to their own study from part **(b)** are necessary in part **(c)** to gain full marks. There were very few examples of unethical studies for part **(b)**.

Question 2

It is important for candidates to know how each study is linked to the methodology and data presentation, so for this examination, how reliability is linked to the study by Schachter and Singer. For part **(b)** candidates need to explain how the study by Schachter and Singer related to aspects of reliability. For part **(c)** candidates need to evaluate reliable research using the study by Schachter and Singer as an example throughout, rather than just an evaluation of the study by Schachter and Singer. To achieve higher marks, candidates need to write about at least two strengths and two weaknesses in context. For part **(d)** candidates needed to be able to correctly appreciate the ethical issues raised by the study by Schachter and Singer.

Section B

Candidates must focus their answers in part **(b)** to what feature(s) the question is asking (in this exam how data were collected or how the study could be applied to everyday life) rather than just writing in general about the study. Candidates must discuss more than one point in part **(c)** *and* have evidence from studies for each to gain full marks.

General Comments

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

Time management appeared to be good for the majority of candidates. There was some evidence that candidates who over-answered question **3(b)** or **4(b)** wrote much shorter answers for **3(c) or 4(c)** as a result. Candidates need to ensure they have enough time to answer all questions to the best of their ability.

Candidates need to be aware that they need to answer **one** of the **two** questions for ***Section B***. When a candidate answered both questions they were awarded the best mark for the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually achieved poorly.

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

Comments on specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) Many candidates could identify at least two types of experiment or experimental design. Candidates tended to describe one of these types to gain more marks. Independent and dependent variables tended to be mentioned as did cause and effect. Some candidates evaluated experiments in their answer which was not required in this question.

(b) There was a wide variety of ideas given by candidates on how to examine sleep and dreaming in a more ecologically valid way. Many candidates could appropriately choose a sample and outline an appropriate sampling technique. Candidates usually did well outlining the what (which aspects of sleep and dreaming were being collected and/or measured) and the where (e.g. participants' own homes). Some candidates did not tackle the how (the actual recording of the sleep and dreaming) sufficiently well to gain marks in the top band; simply writing 'dreaming was recorded' was not sufficient. There were a few answers that replicated Dement and Kleitman in a laboratory but changed the questions asked which gained minimal credit. This type of question examines a candidate's ability to design a study that is practical and their ability to fully understand the potential methodology used by professional psychologists.

(c) Many candidates could highlight one or two evaluative points about the study they had designed in **1(b)**. Common points made were about the sample used, the unethical nature of a study about sleep and dreaming (e.g. lack of privacy) and practicalities surrounding the use of scientific equipment outside of a laboratory. A significant portion of candidates made a series of brief points linked to their own design to gain more marks. Some candidates evaluated aspects generically, which gained minimal credit as they had not linked them specifically to their own study.

Question 2

(a) Many candidates clearly knew what reliability was and gained full marks. Some candidates wrote about validity or about credibility of findings which did not gain credit.

(b) Many candidates did not identify an aspect of the study by Schachter and Singer that made the study reliable. Candidates tended to describe what the study by Schachter and Singer did without linking it to reliability.

(c) Many candidates attempted this question and gained some credit. There was evidence of some candidates evaluating the study by Schachter and Singer in general and these could only gain credit if the answer was linked to clear points about reliable research. Many candidates gave some strengths and weaknesses of reliable research generally, but to gain higher marks these strengths and weaknesses needed to be linked to the Schachter and Singer study.

(d) Many candidates identified at least two ethical guidelines that were relevant to the study by Schachter and Singer. These included potential psychological harm and the problems related to deception to enhance validity of findings. Candidates also attempted to argue about (informed) consent and a lack of privacy due to the intrusive nature of the questionnaire.

Question 3

(a) Many candidates made reference to at least one aspect of an application to everyday life (e.g. usefulness) to score one mark. A significant number of candidates answered the question as if it was about ecological validity which did not gain credit.

(b) Specific details about each study in terms of the actual application to everyday life were crucial to gain full marks per study. Answers relating to the study by Thigpen and Cleckley tended to be focused on therapeutic use but without clear reference to the actual findings from the study. This was the same for the study by Veale and Riley. Many candidates highlighted how the study by Loftus and Pickrell might be useful for the police/courts of law but there was little reference to actual findings. There were some very long answers here that covered all of the study rather than focussing on what the question asked.

(c) Many candidates outlined some problems such as lack of ecological validity or ethics and some then used a study to elaborate on the problem. The better answers then went on to relate studies to all advantages. Some candidates made the same points repeatedly, which limited marks.

Question 4

(a) Many candidates made reference to at least one and usually two aspects of the developmental approach to score maximum marks. A few candidates answered the question as if it was about nature-nurture.

(b) There were many very good answers to this question as candidates picked out the necessary aspects of each study that showed how data were collected. Specific details about each study in terms of the actual data were crucial to gain full marks per study. The study by Langlois tended to be where candidates obtained the least marks. Many candidates could name at least two of the measures taken by Freud, showing good knowledge of the study. The study by Bandura et al. was covered well with many candidates being able to pick out the different ways in which he collected data about the children. There were some very long answers here that covered all of the study rather than having a focus on what the question asked.

(c) Many candidates outlined one or two brief problems and this tended to be about ethics and practical issues (e.g. attention span or language difficulties). The better answers made three separate points and related them all to a study in order to gain the maximum marks per point made. As with **3(c)**, some candidates made the same point several times using different studies (especially about ethics) which limited marks.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/31
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth two marks should be short and an answer worth eight marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should note that this is a three-hour examination, it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (parts **(a)** and **(b)**) should take approximately 45–50 minutes and be at least 4 sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts of the question can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between *describe* and *suggest* for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will not achieve top marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for Papers 1 and 2 (not just from what has been learned for Paper 3) to their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.
- It is essential that each question is correctly labelled. It is beneficial to Examiners for candidates to arrange additional sheets of answer paper in the correct order and number each sheet, and for candidates to answer questions for each option in the correct order.

General comments

Section A (all options)

Candidates should write an amount appropriate to the marks allocated. If a description of two studies is needed for 4 marks, the allocation of marks is 2 + 2, whereas if a description of one study is required for 4 marks, then the same amount in total should be written as for the 2 + 2 format. Sometimes candidates wrote far too much for 2 marks.

Section B (all options)

Many answers would receive significantly higher marks if the difference between 'describe' and 'evaluate' is understood 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. Evaluation is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about the evidence that has been described in part **(a)**. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and apply and not to just reproduce learning.

Those candidates who can evaluate can be divided into two types:

- those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- those who focus exclusively on the one named issue and gain limited marks, because one issue is not a range (as required by the mark scheme), or those candidates who exclude the named issue altogether (and also gain limited marks).

Some Centres appear to have instructed candidates to use the same four evaluation issues whatever the question. This strategy is not recommended because it meant that candidates were writing about issues that just did not apply to the question. This was most evident for the Abnormality option when candidates were writing that 'phobias are ecologically valid' and that they are 'reliable' and 'valid'. These issues don't make sense in relation to phobias. There are many other issues that would be more appropriate and there are many issues that can be applied to every topic area and candidates are advised to think carefully about and choose issues appropriate to the topic area of the question.

Section C (all options)

In general answers did not always demonstrate sufficient methodological knowledge. This is evident in the ambiguous use of different methods, and in ambiguous comments about sampling and other aspects such as experimental design. Frequently candidates write 'I will use a random sample of participants' but need to include detail about how that sample will be gathered. Sometimes candidates write that their sample will include 50 males and 50 females and be balanced in terms of age range, etc. (describing the sample) but there will be no details about the sampling technique (i.e. how that sample will be gathered).

When a question instructs candidates to use a specific method, then that method must be used. Candidates often start with 'I will conduct an experiment' and write nothing further about the IV or DV or controls or apply a design (repeated measures, for example). These are essential features of an experiment and should be included. Candidates often use the term experiment incorrectly when they are conducting an observation or questionnaire. Candidates are also advised to focus on one method in detail rather than having several superficial sentences about a number of different methods. Candidates should always show their methodological knowledge because application of it scores most marks in this section.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

(a) Some candidates struggled to explain the *cognitive* theory of motivation, often writing about motivation in more general terms. Some candidates knew the term and explained it clearly, often using McClelland as an example. Common errors were to refer to behaviourist theory or to use Maslow as an example.

(b) Some candidates struggled with this question part. Many others explained McClelland's theory in detail, often scoring full marks. A few candidates chose to write about Bandura (1977) and this was equally acceptable.

Question 2

(a) Some candidates were not able to demonstrate their knowledge of a perspective on learning and there were some weak answers as a result. Such answers tended to list studies (e.g. Piaget, Skinner, Rogers, Vygotsky, etc.) without reference to a perspective. Answers in the higher mark bands showed good organisation by writing a paragraph on each perspective, for example, which showed good understanding of the subject matter. What was written about each perspective was often very good and related to education, whereas some answers wrote about Pavlov and his dogs for example, without any reference to how this might be applied in a classroom. This latter type of answer scored limited credit, but needed elaboration for higher marks.

(b) Answers covered the whole range of marks with excellent answers showing thorough appropriate evaluation, although at the other end of the mark range there were answers which did not include any evaluation. Evaluation was required from a range of issues that had to include a discussion about applications to education. For this named issue candidates had the opportunity to discuss whether a particular application is useful or not. For example, is operant conditioning useful in a classroom; is co-operative learning useful in a classroom?

Question 3

(a) This question part asked candidates to design and conduct an observational study of disruptive behaviour. Quite a few candidates answered the question in a complex way, as if they were writing an essay on disruptive behaviour. A few candidates decided to conduct an experiment and a few used a questionnaire. The named method must be used to answer the question set. Candidates using observation sometimes wrote about the type, response categories, number of observers, and other features of observations, but often these were incomplete and not always coherent. Candidates should know the main features of all methods and be able to apply them to a given situation.

(b) Many candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding of the difference between a corrective and a preventative strategy and wrote answers which scored maximum marks, but there were candidates who did not know the difference.

Question 4

(a) Most candidates were able to design and conduct an investigation using a correlation to analyse data, but some were unable to clearly express their understanding of correlation. In the strongest answers, the autism questionnaire (AQ) was chosen to measure autism and some candidates were able to apply their knowledge from the Baron-Cohen study here. To measure giftedness some candidates chose to use an IQ test which was legitimate because high IQ is one form of giftedness. These candidates then were able to predict that there would be a positive correlation between AQ score and IQ score, showing their knowledge and understanding.

(b) Most candidates were able to identify a range of features of autistic spectrum disorders, but often failed to describe any in detail. For example, writing “one feature is echolalia” without describing echolalia. As this question was allocated 6 marks, a description of three features would have been ideal, a list of features was not sufficient for this question, as description was required. Some candidates would benefit from a clearer understanding of the features of an ASD.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

(a) Most candidates were able to provide a statement of what was meant by chronic pain, namely it is pain that continues for a relatively long time. Some candidates provided additional detail to support their answer, such as providing a contrast with acute pain or by giving an example.

(b) Most candidates answered the question very well, although some examples were very brief, e.g. ‘chronic back pain’, which needed more detail for higher marks.

Question 6

(a) A number of candidates wrote excellent answers which covered a wide range of different aspects (such as from all three bullet-points of the syllabus), showed accuracy, and were detailed with excellent understanding being evident. Some answers were too detailed. There were answers where the range was limited, had important omissions or inaccuracies, or where the detail provided was brief.

(b) Answers in response to this question followed the same pattern as for other part **(b)** answers. Some candidates write excellent evaluative answers, following the technique outlined in the general comments, and even extending it. Other candidates had poor technique and either wrote only about the named issue (in this instance, generalisations) or did not write about the named issue at all. Finally, some candidates did not evaluate, but continued to describe their part **(a)** answer, or made general evaluative comments rather than following the evaluative issues that are listed on the syllabus. Marks for this question covered the entire range.

Question 7

(a) The question required candidates to design and conduct an experiment, so the main features of an experiment should be included in answers, such as the IV, DV, controls and experimental design. In addition, candidates could include other methodological aspects such as the sampling technique, types of data gathered, ethics, etc. Many candidates included these features, but many did not. The strongest answers compared students using deep breathing exercises with students in a control group, with a DV of either examination performance or by asking them afterwards how they felt about the success of the technique on a scale of 1–5.

(b) In response to this question, candidates could have described the study by Budzynski et al. (1973), listed on the syllabus for managing stress through biofeedback. Many candidates did this, often with success. A few candidates described alternative studies, which was acceptable because the Budzynski et al. study is listed on the syllabus as an example study, so any appropriate alternative could be used. A few candidates wrote about ways to manage stress other than by using biofeedback and these answers could not be credited.

Question 8

(a) Candidates were given a free choice of method to investigate the relative success of a community health campaign. Most candidates chose to use a questionnaire, others an interview and some suggested taking blood and other physiological measures which would determine whether people had acted on the advice given in the programme. Some answers included good methodological knowledge whilst others were quite basic, with some candidates asking nothing more than 'do you think the programme was successful? Yes or no?' Methodological knowledge is essential for to score high marks on these questions.

(b) Many candidates correctly described a *community* health promotion campaign, as the question requested. However, many candidates did not, instead describing programmes that were conducted in schools (e.g. that by Walter or that by Tapper et al.) or in worksites (e.g. that by Gomel). The syllabus distinguishes between these three types. Candidates are always advised to read the question carefully before beginning their answer, and ensure they answer the question set.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

(a) Candidates needed to include in answers a comment about crowding, which is the 'perception of restrictedness' and they also needed to include a comment about pro-social (i.e. helping) behaviour. Not all candidates were able to do this, with some being unable to define crowding correctly, often defining a crowd rather than crowding. Crowding is what an individual person experiences, where a crowd is a physical situation when there are a number of people in close proximity. Similarly, some candidates struggled to explain pro-social behaviour.

(b) This question required description of one study conducted on crowding and pro-social behaviour. The syllabus provides two examples of studies relating to pro-social behaviour, Dukes and Jorgenson and Bickman et al. Some candidates could describe one study with ease, many others could not describe an appropriate study.

Question 10

(a) Many candidates wrote excellent answers on environmental cognition. Most candidates emphasised studies on cognitive maps in animals and often included three or more studies (e.g. on squirrels, bees and pigeons) in their answers. Other candidates provided a more balanced approach and considered information from all three bullet points in roughly equal detail. All these answers showed good technique and preparation. There were candidates whose answers were weaker in many respects.

(b) The named issue here was 'the usefulness of sketch maps' which candidates should have considered as one of their issues, and many candidates provided full and thoughtful evaluations using the range of studies mentioned in part **(a)** to support their advantages and disadvantages. A few candidates could not demonstrate understanding of the syllabus term 'sketch map'. Such a discussion could include comments about a sketch map being what most people use, however, it isn't a cognitive map and it is difficult to analyse and quantify.

Question 11

(a) This question, asking for a field experiment to investigate music and pro-social behaviour, was generally answered well by candidates and there were a few excellent answers. Candidates often described quite elaborate procedures and whilst these were interesting to read, a procedure is just one component of designing a study; other methodological aspects (IV, DV, controls, etc.) are of equal, if not more, importance. A balanced answer, covering a range of different methodological aspects would show good examination technique and maximise marks.

(b) Some candidates began with a definition of noise, that it is unwanted sound, and then progressed to describe a study. Most candidates chose to describe the Donnerstein and Wilson study (on noise and the giving of electric shocks) and some described the study by Geen and O'Neil. A few candidates chose to describe the study by Matthews and Canon, which could not be credited because that study was investigating pro-social rather than anti-social behaviour as the question requested.

Question 12

(a) This question required the design of a questionnaire to investigate ethics and personal space. All candidates included some form of questionnaire in their answer, but many often became too focused on either ethics or personal space without considering ethics specifically related to space invasion. A common error was not writing enough about methodology, or writing relevant words such as "I would use a random sample" (for example) without any elaboration of how that would be achieved.

(b) There were many superb answers written in response to this question with many candidates scoring full marks as they described two appropriate studies. The study by Felipe and Sommer was commonly included as was the study by Middlemist et al. Candidates appeared to know these studies very well, and often described them in far more detail than was necessary to achieve full marks.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

(a) This question asked about learned helplessness. Many candidates were able to provide a good explanation of the term with many referring to the work of Seligman as elaboration.

(b) Correct answers referred to Seligman, often beginning with his study of dogs before moving on to explain how internal, stable and global attributional features could lead to depression. Some candidates gave examples from the Education option to answer the question, which could not be credited as they did not answer the question set, which was related to depression.

Question 14

(a) Most candidates were able to answer this question well. Often a full range of different aspects from the syllabus was included, (i.e. all three bullet points) such as: definitions, types and examples; explanations and treatments. Candidates often described the case studies of little Albert and little Hans in too much detail. Often the applied tension technique by Ost was misunderstood because it does not involve relaxation, unlike other anxiety-reducing techniques. Some candidates restricted their answer to information from just one bullet point and were not able to provide enough detail for higher marks.

(b) There were three types of answer: those which evaluated appropriately; those which did not include the named issue or included only the named issue; and those which did not evaluate at all. There were superb answers which used the named issue of behavioural explanations to compare and contrast little Albert and little Hans, and systematic desensitisation with other forms of therapy. A few candidates were able to contrast approaches themselves (e.g. behavioural versus psychodynamic).

Question 15

(a) This question asked candidates to investigate what the attitude of the general public towards psychotherapy. This meant that in addition to knowing what psychotherapy is, to allow the construction of a relevant questionnaire, candidates also needed to select an appropriate sample from the general public. A few candidates were unable to address either of these aspects. Some candidates included both, but made errors. For example, many suggested using a random sample by asking people in a street. This is not a random sample, it is an opportunity sample. Answers at the top end of the range designed a relevant questionnaire (usually closed), selected an appropriate sample, analysed the data quantitatively, and included other relevant aspects of methodology.

(b) Many candidates were able to answer this question correctly, providing insightful answers. The main weakness with other answers was that candidates were unable to demonstrate their knowledge of the term psychotherapy. Many described it just as 'therapy' without elaborating that psychotherapy is based on the work of Freud and is very different from any cognitive-behaviour therapy which has its roots in behaviourism. This is also the reason why candidates could not construct appropriate questions to ask participants in part **(a)**.

Question 16

(a) The effectiveness of aversion therapy would logically be tested using an experiment, which many candidates suggested, comparing an aversion therapy group with another group of participants who had received a different treatment or no treatment at all. However, many candidates did not specify that this was an IV and that as participants were in different conditions of the IV it was an independent measures design. Some candidates suggested conducting a longitudinal study considering whether aversion therapy works long-term. This was an acceptable alternative. As with all 'suggest' questions in Section C, marks were awarded for methodological knowledge which was present in some answers but largely absent in many others.

(b) Many candidates appeared to misunderstand what aversion therapy is. Many wrote about relaxation techniques and other therapies. Aversion therapy is based on classical conditioning where a person associates alcohol (or whatever the target is) with an unpleasant stimulus. It follows the 'conditioning formula' where (CS + US = UCR) leads to (CS = CR). For this question associating alcohol with an emetic (e.g. mixing alcohol with the emetic Antabuse makes a person violently sick) leads to the person to stop drinking alcohol because they do not want to be sick.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

(a) This question led to a number of answers that were anecdotal, which received limited credit. Some answers were more psychologically informed. In relation to organisations, equal opportunities means that when making selection decisions there should be no discrimination based on race, colour, age, gender, national origin, religion, or mental or physical disability.

(b) Candidates were required to consider two ways in which equality in selection decisions could be improved. Any appropriate suggestion could be credited.

Question 18

(a) The topic area of leadership appears to be popular and many candidates wrote excellent answers. Strong answers were organised in the information they presented. Rather than just listing names of theories and research, they were organised into types of theories, such as individual and situational, or those proposing leaders are born (nature) with leaders who are made (nurture). This meant that the issues that were to be included in part **(b)** had already been hinted at in part **(a)** and this showed excellent overall planning and coherence of both part **(a)** and **(b)**.

(b) Strong answers applied what they had described in part **(a)**, but some evaluations were rather weak. Attending to what makes a good evaluation will help many candidates to produce better answers.

Question 19

(a) Although this question allowed candidates a free choice of method, most opted to design and conduct a questionnaire, with a few suggesting that they interview teachers at their school. Candidates doing this often failed to mention that this would be an opportunity sample. The addition of methodological knowledge always enhances marks. Answers could have been improved by considering how data would be analysed and conclusions drawn. For example, the question asks which reward system is preferred, so this should be made clear in the answer.

(b) Intrinsic motivation was known by all candidates and the challenge in this question was to apply that knowledge to a specific group of people at work, in this case teachers. This challenged some candidates, whilst it stimulated others to reflect and write some very good answers. The most common suggestion was the job satisfaction experienced when their students achieved good examination results.

Question 20

(a) Many answers were too brief and scored limited credit. For example, a candidate might write ‘temperature is important because it should not be too hot or too cold’. This comment required elaboration or evidence of psychological knowledge.

(b) Answers to this question followed a similar pattern to those for other questions: a basic structure for a questionnaire and brief details of a sample. The application of psychological knowledge was required for higher marks. For questionnaires, this means identifying the type of questionnaire, examples of questions, how respondents will answer and the type of data that will be produced.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/32
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth two marks should be short and an answer worth eight marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should note that this is a three-hour examination, it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (parts **(a)** and **(b)**) should take approximately 45–50 minutes and be at least 4 sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts of the question can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between *describe* and *suggest* for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will not achieve top marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for Papers 1 and 2 (not just from what has been learned for Paper 3) to their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.
- It is essential that each question is correctly labelled. It is beneficial to Examiners for candidates to arrange additional sheets of answer paper in the correct order and number each sheet, and for candidates to answer questions for each option in the correct order.

General comments

Section A (all options)

Candidates should write an amount appropriate to the marks allocated. If a description of two studies is needed for 4 marks, the allocation of marks is 2 + 2, whereas if a description of one study is required for 4 marks, then the same amount in total should be written as for the 2 + 2 format. Sometimes candidates wrote far too much for 2 marks.

Section B (all options)

Many answers would receive significantly higher marks if the difference between 'describe' and 'evaluate' is understood 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. Evaluation is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about the evidence that has been described in part **(a)**. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and apply and not to just reproduce learning.

Those candidates who can evaluate can be divided into two types:

- those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- those who focus exclusively on the one named issue and gain limited marks, because one issue is not a range (as required by the mark scheme), or those candidates who exclude the named issue altogether (and also gain limited marks).

Some Centres appear to have instructed candidates to use the same four evaluation issues whatever the question. This strategy is not recommended because it meant that candidates were writing about issues that just did not apply to the question. This was most evident for the Abnormality option when candidates were writing that 'OCD is ecologically valid' and that it is 'reliable' and 'valid'. These issues don't make sense in relation to OCD. There are many other issues that would be more appropriate and there are many issues that can be applied to every topic area and candidates are advised to think carefully about and choose issues appropriate to the topic area of the question.

Section C (all options)

In general answers did not always demonstrate sufficient methodological knowledge. This is evident in the ambiguous use of different methods, and in ambiguous comments about sampling and other aspects such as experimental design. Frequently candidates write 'I will use a random sample of participants' but need to include detail about how that sample will be gathered. Sometimes candidates write that their sample will include 50 males and 50 females and be balanced in terms of age range, etc. (describing the sample) but there will be no details about the sampling technique (i.e. how that sample will be gathered).

When a question instructs candidates to use a specific method, then that method must be used. Candidates often start with 'I will conduct an experiment' and write nothing further about the IV or DV or controls or apply a design (repeated measures, for example). These are essential features of an experiment and should be included. Candidates often use the term experiment incorrectly when they are conducting an observation or questionnaire. Candidates are also advised to focus on one method in detail rather than having several superficial sentences about a number of different methods. Candidates should always show their methodological knowledge because application of it scores most marks in this section.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

(a) Answers to this question were often vague and many candidates answered this question incorrectly, for example by writing about IQ tests and how intelligence is measured. Candidates who had read part **(b)** of the question first were able to mention the theory of triarchic intelligence by Sternberg in their answers.

(b) Most candidates could describe the three components and so scored good marks. Only a small number of candidates described Sternberg's seven types, which include analyser, creator, etc. Some candidates did not know the triarchic theory.

Question 2

(a) Many candidates related many of the syllabus bullet points to education, particularly evident when candidates considered the work of Weiner, Dweck et al. and Charms when focusing on attributions and learned helplessness. Many candidates did not focus on the educational performance aspect of the question. Many candidates wrote about Maslow's hierarchy of needs for example, but did not relate it to education.

(b) Answers covered the whole range of marks with excellent answers showing thorough appropriate evaluation (see Section B general comments) although there were answers which had no evaluation at all. For example, for this question part, evaluation was required from a range of issues that had to include a discussion about behavioural explanations.

Question 3

(a) This question part asked candidates how they would use a questionnaire to investigate attitudes towards open classrooms. There were many strong answers, in which the questionnaires were appropriately designed, which included examples of questions, and crucially, how those questions were to be answered. A few candidates appeared not to know the term 'open classroom' and a number of candidates did not conduct a questionnaire.

(b) Candidates were invited to describe the main features of the humanistic approach, one aspect of which is the open classroom. It was therefore expected that the basics of the humanistic approach would be included along with examples of how it is applied in classrooms, such as through co-operative learning and learning circles in addition to open classrooms. Many candidates did this and scored high marks.

Question 4

(a) The question required candidates to design a field experiment, so the main features of an experiment should be included in answers, such as the IV, DV, controls and experimental design. Whilst many candidates did include these features, many other candidates did not. For example, candidates would suggest having two groups, one with Mrs Waljee's strategy and one with PQRST (for example) but needed to identify that these were conditions of the IV. Similarly, candidates would suggest having different participants in each of the groups, but needed to mention that this would make it an independent measures design. Section C questions test application skills and if appropriate methodology needs to be applied.

(b) Many candidates successfully described two other techniques in good detail, often scoring maximum marks. Some candidates repeated information given in (a), which could not be credited. Others could describe one strategy but could not always describe a second. All three study skill techniques are listed on the syllabus.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

(a) Most candidates were able to score limited credit for providing a statement of what was meant by a delay in seeking treatment. Some candidates struggled to elaborate on this basic statement, but others gave a good example for further marks. Many candidates referred to the work of Safer, but often rather than write a brief answer of appropriate length, proceeded to describe his three types of delay in detail. Such detail was unnecessary for a two-mark question, and often this information was creditable in part **(b)** and had to be repeated. Candidates are advised to read all parts of the question before beginning their answer.

(b) Most candidates who answered this question correctly wrote all three of Safer's types when only two were required. If a question asks for two reasons, then writing more gains no further marks and is not a good use of time which could be better spent answering other questions in more detail.

Question 6

(a) Many candidates wrote excellent answers, with many scoring the maximum mark available. Answers were well organised and covered a wide range of appropriate aspects listed on the syllabus: definitions, accident proneness and how accidents can be reduced. A number of candidates did not focus on health and safety, instead focussing on health promotion. There is a small amount overlap between promoting health and promoting safety behaviours, and so a few candidates made creditable points, but the majority could not be credited as the responses did not answer the question set.

(b) Answers in response to this question followed the same pattern as for other part **(b)** answers. Some candidates write excellent evaluative answers, following the technique outlined in the general comments, and even extending it. Other candidates wrote only about the named issue (in this instance theory A and theory B explanations) or did not write about the named issue at all. Finally, some candidates did not evaluate, but continued to describe their part **(a)** answer, or they made general evaluative comments rather than following the evaluative issues listed on the syllabus. Marks for this question part covered the entire range.

Question 7

(a) The question required candidates to design and conduct a questionnaire, so the main features of a questionnaire should be included in answers, such as the type (open or closed), examples of questions and how the answers would be scored. Many candidates included these features, but many did not. A common error was to suggest that questionnaires always begin by asking for a name, followed by age and gender, but this information is never requested in psychology studies because of confidentiality, and in asking for this a study would be unethical. Another common error was to misunderstand the term customising treatment. Suggestions for designs were therefore often ambiguous, and if customising treatment wasn't fully addressed then the design was not valid and marks were limited.

(b) Some candidates described both studies in good detail and scored marks at the top end of the range. Candidates who did not know what customising treatment was struggled to provide two studies investigating non-adherence, the two studies listed on the syllabus are 'rational non-adherence' (Bulpitt) and 'customising treatment' (Johnson and Bytheway). These candidates often made anecdotal suggestions without demonstrating psychological knowledge.

Question 8

(a) Candidates were given a free choice of method to investigate simple repetitive jobs compared with difficult, varied jobs. Some candidates chose to use a questionnaire, others an interview, and some suggested participants from either type of job come into a laboratory to have their performance tested on a task. In all answers, there could have been more specific methodological knowledge evident. For example, some candidates described the sample, but did not include detail about the sampling technique. Others stated simply 'I will use a random sample' without elaboration of how that would be achieved.

(b) The one study appearing on the syllabus, which most candidates used to answer this question, is that by Johansson who compared the stress levels of 'finishers', skilled wood-workers, with cleaners. Whilst most candidates described details of the study correctly, there were a number of anecdotal answers which could not be credited. A few candidates considered alternative studies related to work stress, and these answers could be credited.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

(a) Most candidates scored full marks for this question part. Nearly all candidates knew what density was and could make the distinction between social and spatial density.

(b) A number of components were needed to score full marks for this question. Firstly, the difference between density and crowding needed to be made, and then to support that difference, examples were needed (at least two, as 'examples' were specified in the question). Very few candidates scored full marks. Most candidates outlined density (the physical features) but often struggled to outline crowding (the subjective or psychological experience when in high density conditions). Candidates often confused density and crowding with a crowd (and collective behaviour). Whilst examples of density were often good, candidates were not always able to give an appropriate example of crowding.

Question 10

(a) Many candidates wrote excellent answers on architecture and behaviour. Some candidates emphasised building design, contrasting the Pruitt-Igoe design with Newman's designs. Other candidates were more 'experimental' describing the studies by Amato on social behaviour and Michon et al. on shopping mall atmospherics for example. Some candidates' answers were more balanced when they included something from each bullet point of this topic area.

(b) The named issue here was determinism and many candidates provided full and thoughtful evaluations using the range of studies mentioned in part **(a)** to support their advantages and disadvantages. A few candidates did not know the term, which is a named issue on the syllabus. There are different types of determinism and in this case architectural determinism is the view that the architecture (buildings) can cause us to behave in particular ways. The contrast in the way people feel after being in the two types of casino environment is a good illustration.

Question 11

(a) This question was generally answered well by candidates and there were a few excellent answers. Answers by these candidates showed very good methodological knowledge and applied it to the question set. Other candidates, who scored fewer marks, had ambiguities in their designs or failed to include a sufficient range of methodological aspects. Candidates are advised to aim to include five specific (e.g. aspects of the named method) or general methodological aspects (such as the sampling technique) in their answers.

(b) Nearly all candidates correctly defined noise as unwanted sound. Many then went on to identify the factors which make it annoying, its volume, its unpredictability and that it is uncontrollable. A few candidates went on to give details of studies which illustrate them, such as that by Donnerstein and Wilson.

Question 12

(a) This question was answered by very few candidates, perhaps because it involved a case study rather than an experiment or questionnaire. Those candidates opting for this question either wrote very weak or very strong answers. The strongest answers focused on one person, used a range of different methods to acquire data, and in so doing studied the person in detail. Frequently the participant was obtained using a self-selecting sample using an advertisement in a newspaper, so the participant volunteered because he/she was experiencing symptoms of PTSD.

(b) There were many superb answers written in response to this question with many candidates scoring full marks as they described two events. Most common were earthquakes for disasters and common for technological events were aeroplane crashes and the sinking of ships. A few candidates described the 2005 London bombings. Whilst many of these survivors are still suffering from PTSD, this is neither a natural nor a technological event, but a criminal/terrorist action.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

(a) A small number of candidates answered this question incorrectly because they wrote in general terms about abnormal affect without reference to bipolar (or even unipolar) affect. Some candidates mentioned ‘mania and depression’ without elaboration for limited credited, but most candidates identified the terms and then wrote more showing they knew what both depression and mania were for full credit.

(b) Nearly all candidates were able to describe two explanations for depression in detail. Those candidates scoring fewer marks did so because their answers were very brief, with nothing more than a single sentence on each explanation.

Question 14

(a) Most candidates scored high and top marks for their answers to this question. Often a full range of different aspects from the syllabus was included (all three bullet points), such as: definitions and examples (e.g. the study of Charles by Rapoport); explanations (e.g. biomedical, cognitive and behavioural); and treatments (with CBT most evident). Some candidates restricted themselves to including information from just one bullet point and, usually associated with short answers, this restricted marks.

(b) Many candidates had planned their answers and had included in part **(a)** information that could be evaluated in part **(b)**. Those who hadn’t planned found themselves describing rather than evaluating in this question part even though there are no marks for description. For example, if the case study of Charles is described in part **(a)** then case studies can be evaluated in part **(b)**. If the

MOCI is described in part **(a)** then it can be evaluated as a psychometric test in part **(b)**. If neither the MOCI or Charles are described in part **(a)** then this will limit evaluation in part **(b)**. Planning and thinking about answers will make a significant difference to marks.

Question 15

(a) Most candidates knew how Ost used applied tension to treat blood phobia, but the amount of detail and quality of answers varied. A small number of candidates appeared not to know the term applied tension and instead wrote about relaxation techniques, anxiety hierarchies and systematic desensitisation, which were not creditable responses.

(b) The long-term effectiveness of applied tension needed to be tested using a longitudinal study, which many candidates suggested, and the other feature needed was to compare the applied tension group with another group of participants who had a blood phobia but who had received a different treatment or no treatment at all. In effect, an experiment was required, although many candidates did not suggest this. As with all 'suggest' questions in Section C, marks were awarded for methodological knowledge which was present in some answers but largely absent in many others.

Question 16

(a) This question asked candidates to investigate what the general public knows about cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT). This meant that in addition to knowing what CBT is, to allow the construction of a relevant questionnaire, candidates also needed to select an appropriate sample from the general public. A few candidates were not able to address both these respects and scored limited credit. Some candidates included both aspects, but made errors. For example, many suggested using a random sample by asking people in a street. This is not a random sample, it is an opportunity sample. Answers at the top end of the range designed a relevant questionnaire (usually closed), selected an appropriate sample, analysed the data quantitatively, and included other relevant aspects of methodology.

(b) This question part required a description of cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT). Many candidates made errors in their answers by writing about psychotherapy, the use of biochemicals, or writing that it is a cognitive therapy. CBT focuses on both the cognitions/thoughts *and* the behaviour/actions of a person. Both aspects needed to be included in answers in order for candidates to score full marks.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

(a) There were those candidates who wrote nothing more than a sentence stating the obvious, i.e. that a work selection procedure is the process of selecting a person for a job, and these answers scored limited credit. Those candidates who provided some elaboration, such as mentioning any aspect of what that procedure might involve, scored further credit.

(b) There were three types of answer: (i) those who did not know the term psychometric test; (ii) those who knew the term and could write about why they are used in selection, but could not provide any example; and (iii) those who knew the term, could provide two or more examples and explained the value of them in selection procedures.

Question 18

(a) Candidates were invited to describe what psychologists have learned about motivation to work. There is no doubt that candidates know the need theory proposed by Maslow and nearly all answers started with his theory. However, candidates tend to forget to mention how his theory is related to motivation at work. Candidates also included other theories, McClelland's achievement motivation for example. Answers at the top end of the mark range often showed understanding when organising their answers. For example, they organised theories into need theories, cognitive theories and goal setting theories rather than just listing theories without distinction. It was also useful to see a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

(b) Evaluations for this question followed the same pattern as for other Section B part **(b)** answers and answers covered the entire mark range. Weaker answers evaluated only the named issue, that of individual and situational explanations, and often strong answers gained limited credit for only including one issue. Centres are reminded that questions always state 'Evaluate…and include' and give one named issue which must be included in the range of evaluation issues. Many candidates did not consider the named issue and gained limited credit.

Question 19

(a) A few candidates scored full marks, but most answers were lacking in either detail or accuracy. Groupthink was well known, and candidates could often describe a number of its features, but group polarisation was not well known, with a common error was the suggestion that it is where decisions are made 'at the extremes'.

(b) This question left the choice of method to the candidate and a wide range of methods were applied. Whilst there were some appropriate suggestions, many designs were confused with it often being unclear exactly what candidates were proposing. There were also many anecdotal answers with candidates applying very little psychological or methodological knowledge. In order to score marks, details of a psychological investigation need to be suggested.

Question 20

(a) Many candidates scored full marks for this question because they were able to explain clearly what the term compressed work week involves and what is meant by flexitime. Examples of each of these were also included. Weaker answers could not demonstrate knowledge of these terms, some candidates incorrectly wrote about shiftwork patterns, for example.

(b) This question required candidates to consider three types of working weeks. Many candidates worked out that having three conditions of an IV rather than two was perfectly acceptable, however, many candidates, as with other Section C questions, did not mention an IV at all. Those including an IV often mentioned a DV, controls and an experimental design, and in including all these features often scored high marks. Those candidates not knowing the three types of work weeks typically provided confused suggestions.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/33
Specialist Choices

Key messages

- Candidates should provide answers that equate to mark allocation, so an answer worth two marks should be short and an answer worth eight marks should be correspondingly longer.
- Candidates should note that this is a three-hour examination, it is expected that the amount of writing should be lengthy. A **Section B** essay (parts **(a)** and **(b)**) should take approximately 45–50 minutes and be at least 4 sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts of the question can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for **Section B** questions and between *describe* and *suggest* for **Section C** questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will not achieve top marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for Papers 1 and 2 (not just from what has been learned for Paper 3) to their **Section C** suggestions.
- Candidates should always seek to evaluate using psychological methods, approaches, issues and debates as appear in the syllabus rather than with general evaluation points.
- It is essential that each question is correctly labelled. It is beneficial to Examiners for candidates to arrange additional sheets of answer paper in the correct order and number each sheet, and for candidates to answer questions for each option in the correct order.

General comments

Section A (all options)

Candidates should write an amount appropriate to the marks allocated. If a description of two studies is needed for 4 marks, the allocation of marks is 2 + 2, whereas if a description of one study is required for 4 marks, then the same amount in total should be written as for the 2 + 2 format. Sometimes candidates wrote far too much for 2 marks.

Section B (all options)

Many answers would receive significantly higher marks if the difference between 'describe' and 'evaluate' is understood 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. Evaluation is a comment about what is good and what is not so good about the evidence that has been described in part **(a)**. Evaluation requires a candidate to think and apply and not to just reproduce learning.

Those candidates who can evaluate can be divided into two types:

- those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks);
- those who focus exclusively on the one named issue and gain limited marks, because one issue is not a range (as required by the mark scheme), or those candidates who exclude the named issue altogether (and also gain limited marks).

Some Centres appear to have instructed candidates to use the same four evaluation issues whatever the question. This strategy is not recommended because it meant that candidates were writing about issues that just did not apply to the question. This was most evident for the Abnormality option when candidates were writing that 'phobias are ecologically valid' and that they are 'reliable' and 'valid'. These issues don't make sense in relation to phobias. There are many other issues that would be more appropriate and there are many issues that can be applied to every topic area and candidates are advised to think carefully about and choose issues appropriate to the topic area of the question.

Section C (all options)

In general answers did not always demonstrate sufficient methodological knowledge. This is evident in the ambiguous use of different methods, and in ambiguous comments about sampling and other aspects such as experimental design. Frequently candidates write 'I will use a random sample of participants' but need to include detail about how that sample will be gathered. Sometimes candidates write that their sample will include 50 males and 50 females and be balanced in terms of age range, etc. (describing the sample) but there will be no details about the sampling technique (i.e. how that sample will be gathered).

When a question instructs candidates to use a specific method, then that method must be used. Candidates often start with 'I will conduct an experiment' and write nothing further about the IV or DV or controls or apply a design (repeated measures, for example). These are essential features of an experiment and should be included. Candidates often use the term experiment incorrectly when they are conducting an observation or questionnaire. Candidates are also advised to focus on one method in detail rather than having several superficial sentences about a number of different methods. Candidates should always show their methodological knowledge because application of it scores most marks in this section.

Comments on specific questions

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION

Question 1

(a) Some candidates struggled to explain the *cognitive* theory of motivation, often writing about motivation in more general terms. Some candidates knew the term and explained it clearly, often using McClelland as an example. Common errors were to refer to behaviourist theory or to use Maslow as an example.

(b) Some candidates struggled with this question part. Many others explained McClelland's theory in detail, often scoring full marks. A few candidates chose to write about Bandura (1977) and this was equally acceptable.

Question 2

(a) Some candidates were not able to demonstrate their knowledge of a perspective on learning and there were some weak answers as a result. Such answers tended to list studies (e.g. Piaget, Skinner, Rogers, Vygotsky, etc.) without reference to a perspective. Answers in the higher mark bands showed good organisation by writing a paragraph on each perspective, for example, which showed good understanding of the subject matter. What was written about each perspective was often very good and related to education, whereas some answers wrote about Pavlov and his dogs for example, without any reference to how this might be applied in a classroom. This latter type of answer scored limited credit, but needed elaboration for higher marks.

(b) Answers covered the whole range of marks with excellent answers showing thorough appropriate evaluation, although at the other end of the mark range there were answers which did not include any evaluation. Evaluation was required from a range of issues that had to include a discussion about applications to education. For this named issue candidates had the opportunity to discuss whether a particular application is useful or not. For example, is operant conditioning useful in a classroom; is co-operative learning useful in a classroom?

Question 3

(a) This question part asked candidates to design and conduct an observational study of disruptive behaviour. Quite a few candidates answered the question in a complex way, as if they were writing an essay on disruptive behaviour. A few candidates decided to conduct an experiment and a few used a questionnaire. The named method must be used to answer the question set. Candidates using observation sometimes wrote about the type, response categories, number of observers, and other features of observations, but often these were incomplete and not always coherent. Candidates should know the main features of all methods and be able to apply them to a given situation.

(b) Many candidates were able to demonstrate their understanding of the difference between a corrective and a preventative strategy and wrote answers which scored maximum marks, but there were candidates who did not know the difference.

Question 4

(a) Most candidates were able to design and conduct an investigation using a correlation to analyse data, but some were unable to clearly express their understanding of correlation. In the strongest answers, the autism questionnaire (AQ) was chosen to measure autism and some candidates were able to apply their knowledge from the Baron-Cohen study here. To measure giftedness some candidates chose to use an IQ test which was legitimate because high IQ is one form of giftedness. These candidates then were able to predict that there would be a positive correlation between AQ score and IQ score, showing their knowledge and understanding.

(b) Most candidates were able to identify a range of features of autistic spectrum disorders, but often failed to describe any in detail. For example, writing “one feature is echolalia” without describing echolalia. As this question was allocated 6 marks, a description of three features would have been ideal, a list of features was not sufficient for this question, as description was required. Some candidates would benefit from a clearer understanding of the features of an ASD.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

(a) Most candidates were able to provide a statement of what was meant by chronic pain, namely it is pain that continues for a relatively long time. Some candidates provided additional detail to support their answer, such as providing a contrast with acute pain or by giving an example.

(b) Most candidates answered the question very well, although some examples were very brief, e.g. ‘chronic back pain’, which needed more detail for higher marks.

Question 6

(a) A number of candidates wrote excellent answers which covered a wide range of different aspects (such as from all three bullet-points of the syllabus), showed accuracy, and were detailed with excellent understanding being evident. Some answers were too detailed. There were answers where the range was limited, had important omissions or inaccuracies, or where the detail provided was brief.

(b) Answers in response to this question followed the same pattern as for other part **(b)** answers. Some candidates write excellent evaluative answers, following the technique outlined in the general comments, and even extending it. Other candidates had poor technique and either wrote only about the named issue (in this instance, generalisations) or did not write about the named issue at all. Finally, some candidates did not evaluate, but continued to describe their part **(a)** answer, or made general evaluative comments rather than following the evaluative issues that are listed on the syllabus. Marks for this question covered the entire range.

Question 7

(a) The question required candidates to design and conduct an experiment, so the main features of an experiment should be included in answers, such as the IV, DV, controls and experimental design. In addition, candidates could include other methodological aspects such as the sampling technique, types of data gathered, ethics, etc. Many candidates included these features, but many did not. The strongest answers compared students using deep breathing exercises with students in a control group, with a DV of either examination performance or by asking them afterwards how they felt about the success of the technique on a scale of 1–5.

(b) In response to this question, candidates could have described the study by Budzynski et al. (1973), listed on the syllabus for managing stress through biofeedback. Many candidates did this, often with success. A few candidates described alternative studies, which was acceptable because the Budzynski et al. study is listed on the syllabus as an example study, so any appropriate alternative could be used. A few candidates wrote about ways to manage stress other than by using biofeedback and these answers could not be credited.

Question 8

(a) Candidates were given a free choice of method to investigate the relative success of a community health campaign. Most candidates chose to use a questionnaire, others an interview and some suggested taking blood and other physiological measures which would determine whether people had acted on the advice given in the programme. Some answers included good methodological knowledge whilst others were quite basic, with some candidates asking nothing more than 'do you think the programme was successful? Yes or no?' Methodological knowledge is essential for to score high marks on these questions.

(b) Many candidates correctly described a *community* health promotion campaign, as the question requested. However, many candidates did not, instead describing programmes that were conducted in schools (e.g. that by Walter or that by Tapper et al.) or in worksites (e.g. that by Gomel). The syllabus distinguishes between these three types. Candidates are always advised to read the question carefully before beginning their answer, and ensure they answer the question set.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

(a) Candidates needed to include in answers a comment about crowding, which is the 'perception of restrictedness' and they also needed to include a comment about pro-social (i.e. helping) behaviour. Not all candidates were able to do this, with some being unable to define crowding correctly, often defining a crowd rather than crowding. Crowding is what an individual person experiences, where a crowd is a physical situation when there are a number of people in close proximity. Similarly, some candidates struggled to explain pro-social behaviour.

(b) This question required description of one study conducted on crowding and pro-social behaviour. The syllabus provides two examples of studies relating to pro-social behaviour, Dukes and Jorgenson and Bickman et al. Some candidates could describe one study with ease, many others could not describe an appropriate study.

Question 10

(a) Many candidates wrote excellent answers on environmental cognition. Most candidates emphasised studies on cognitive maps in animals and often included three or more studies (e.g. on squirrels, bees and pigeons) in their answers. Other candidates provided a more balanced approach and considered information from all three bullet points in roughly equal detail. All these answers showed good technique and preparation. There were candidates whose answers were weaker in many respects.

(b) The named issue here was 'the usefulness of sketch maps' which candidates should have considered as one of their issues, and many candidates provided full and thoughtful evaluations using the range of studies mentioned in part **(a)** to support their advantages and disadvantages. A few candidates could not demonstrate understanding of the syllabus term 'sketch map'. Such a discussion could include comments about a sketch map being what most people use, however, it isn't a cognitive map and it is difficult to analyse and quantify.

Question 11

(a) This question, asking for a field experiment to investigate music and pro-social behaviour, was generally answered well by candidates and there were a few excellent answers. Candidates often described quite elaborate procedures and whilst these were interesting to read, a procedure is just one component of designing a study; other methodological aspects (IV, DV, controls, etc.) are of equal, if not more, importance. A balanced answer, covering a range of different methodological aspects would show good examination technique and maximise marks.

(b) Some candidates began with a definition of noise, that it is unwanted sound, and then progressed to describe a study. Most candidates chose to describe the Donnerstein and Wilson study (on noise and the giving of electric shocks) and some described the study by Geen and O'Neil. A few candidates chose to describe the study by Matthews and Canon, which could not be credited because that study was investigating pro-social rather than anti-social behaviour as the question requested.

Question 12

(a) This question required the design of a questionnaire to investigate ethics and personal space. All candidates included some form of questionnaire in their answer, but many often became too focused on either ethics or personal space without considering ethics specifically related to space invasion. A common error was not writing enough about methodology, or writing relevant words such as "I would use a random sample" (for example) without any elaboration of how that would be achieved.

(b) There were many superb answers written in response to this question with many candidates scoring full marks as they described two appropriate studies. The study by Felipe and Sommer was commonly included as was the study by Middlemist et al. Candidates appeared to know these studies very well, and often described them in far more detail than was necessary to achieve full marks.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

(a) This question asked about learned helplessness. Many candidates were able to provide a good explanation of the term with many referring to the work of Seligman as elaboration.

(b) Correct answers referred to Seligman, often beginning with his study of dogs before moving on to explain how internal, stable and global attributional features could lead to depression. Some candidates gave examples from the Education option to answer the question, which could not be credited as they did not answer the question set, which was related to depression.

Question 14

(a) Most candidates were able to answer this question well. Often a full range of different aspects from the syllabus was included, (i.e. all three bullet points) such as: definitions, types and examples; explanations and treatments. Candidates often described the case studies of little Albert and little Hans in too much detail. Often the applied tension technique by Ost was misunderstood because it does not involve relaxation, unlike other anxiety-reducing techniques. Some candidates restricted their answer to information from just one bullet point and were not able to provide enough detail for higher marks.

(b) There were three types of answer: those which evaluated appropriately; those which did not include the named issue or included only the named issue; and those which did not evaluate at all. There were superb answers which used the named issue of behavioural explanations to compare and contrast little Albert and little Hans, and systematic desensitisation with other forms of therapy. A few candidates were able to contrast approaches themselves (e.g. behavioural versus psychodynamic).

Question 15

(a) This question asked candidates to investigate what the attitude of the general public towards psychotherapy. This meant that in addition to knowing what psychotherapy is, to allow the construction of a relevant questionnaire, candidates also needed to select an appropriate sample from the general public. A few candidates were unable to address either of these aspects. Some candidates included both, but made errors. For example, many suggested using a random sample by asking people in a street. This is not a random sample, it is an opportunity sample. Answers at the top end of the range designed a relevant questionnaire (usually closed), selected an appropriate sample, analysed the data quantitatively, and included other relevant aspects of methodology.

(b) Many candidates were able to answer this question correctly, providing insightful answers. The main weakness with other answers was that candidates were unable to demonstrate their knowledge of the term psychotherapy. Many described it just as 'therapy' without elaborating that psychotherapy is based on the work of Freud and is very different from any cognitive-behaviour therapy which has its roots in behaviourism. This is also the reason why candidates could not construct appropriate questions to ask participants in part **(a)**.

Question 16

(a) The effectiveness of aversion therapy would logically be tested using an experiment, which many candidates suggested, comparing an aversion therapy group with another group of participants who had received a different treatment or no treatment at all. However, many candidates did not specify that this was an IV and that as participants were in different conditions of the IV it was an independent measures design. Some candidates suggested conducting a longitudinal study considering whether aversion therapy works long-term. This was an acceptable alternative. As with all 'suggest' questions in Section C, marks were awarded for methodological knowledge which was present in some answers but largely absent in many others.

(b) Many candidates appeared to misunderstand what aversion therapy is. Many wrote about relaxation techniques and other therapies. Aversion therapy is based on classical conditioning where a person associates alcohol (or whatever the target is) with an unpleasant stimulus. It follows the 'conditioning formula' where (CS + US = UCR) leads to (CS = CR). For this question associating alcohol with an emetic (e.g. mixing alcohol with the emetic Antabuse makes a person violently sick) leads to the person to stop drinking alcohol because they do not want to be sick.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

(a) This question led to a number of answers that were anecdotal, which received limited credit. Some answers were more psychologically informed. In relation to organisations, equal opportunities means that when making selection decisions there should be no discrimination based on race, colour, age, gender, national origin, religion, or mental or physical disability.

(b) Candidates were required to consider two ways in which equality in selection decisions could be improved. Any appropriate suggestion could be credited.

Question 18

(a) The topic area of leadership appears to be popular and many candidates wrote excellent answers. Strong answers were organised in the information they presented. Rather than just listing names of theories and research, they were organised into types of theories, such as individual and situational, or those proposing leaders are born (nature) with leaders who are made (nurture). This meant that the issues that were to be included in part **(b)** had already been hinted at in part **(a)** and this showed excellent overall planning and coherence of both part **(a)** and **(b)**.

(b) Strong answers applied what they had described in part **(a)**, but some evaluations were rather weak. Attending to what makes a good evaluation will help many candidates to produce better answers.

Question 19

(a) Although this question allowed candidates a free choice of method, most opted to design and conduct a questionnaire, with a few suggesting that they interview teachers at their school. Candidates doing this often failed to mention that this would be an opportunity sample. The addition of methodological knowledge always enhances marks. Answers could have been improved by considering how data would be analysed and conclusions drawn. For example, the question asks which reward system is preferred, so this should be made clear in the answer.

(b) Intrinsic motivation was known by all candidates and the challenge in this question was to apply that knowledge to a specific group of people at work, in this case teachers. This challenged some candidates, whilst it stimulated others to reflect and write some very good answers. The most common suggestion was the job satisfaction experienced when their students achieved good examination results.

Question 20

(a) Many answers were too brief and scored limited credit. For example, a candidate might write ‘temperature is important because it should not be too hot or too cold’. This comment required elaboration or evidence of psychological knowledge.

(b) Answers to this question followed a similar pattern to those for other questions: a basic structure for a questionnaire and brief details of a sample. The application of psychological knowledge was required for higher marks. For questionnaires, this means identifying the type of questionnaire, examples of questions, how respondents will answer and the type of data that will be produced.