

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/12
Core Studies 1

Key messages

- It is critical that candidates read each question part carefully. Many more marks would have been gained if candidates had fully addressed the questions set.
- Candidates need to be able to link their knowledge of concepts to practical situations of specific studies. This is a skill which benefits from practice.
- Methodology underpins psychology. Candidates need a good grounding in methodological concepts to be able to use the core studies effectively in their answers.

General comments

As with all papers, there was a spread of questions on different aspects of the studies, such as background, procedure, results, conclusions and evaluation. In **Section A**, the candidates' knowledge of background/aims (**Questions 3, 6(a)**), procedure (**4, 5, 10, 12**), conclusions (**6(b)**) and ethics (**14**) was fairly good. However, some parts of **Section A** of this paper presented particular challenges to some candidates. Many candidates could improve by having a better general understanding of the studies (for example in response to **Questions 7, 11, 13**). Understanding of some basic methodological terms that underpin studies was fairly good (e.g. **2(a), 8(a)**), although in other places it was not quite so good (e.g. **7**). To improve performance further, candidates would benefit from a more effective grasp of methodology in psychology overall, and specifically being able to explain how a study illustrates these principles.

Overall, better responses were seen to **Question 16** than to **Question 17** in **Section B**. The responses to **Question 17** were less effective because they were not answering the question. Responses typically provided a discussion of the study rather than the research method requested. To improve marks, the responses needed to use the study to provide examples for the discussion. However, responses to **Question 16** tended to be more focused, with candidates using their chosen study to some effect to provide examples to illustrate their discussion.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Many candidates were able to give good explanations for not including traumatic events, scoring full marks for this. Responses typically said that this would be distressing so potentially break the ethical guideline of protection from psychological harm. Others, however, successfully argued that such events would be either very well remembered, or not remembered at all, confounding the results and yet others suggested that very significant traumatic events may be familiar to others so break confidentiality. Some candidates were also able to earn credit for their responses relating to 'family folklore', although this was less common.

Question 2

- (a) This question part was generally well answered.
- (b) Many candidates gained at least some credit here. Where responses were not fully creditworthy this was typically because the answer was generic. In such instances, candidates needed to link their answer to the study by Baron-Cohen et al. as indicated in the question, for example, by referring to being able to understand choices of emotions by participants with autism. Some successful candidates also argued that collecting qualitative data might enable researchers to identify when participants were just guessing the answers and could not really identify the emotion in the eyes.

Question 3

- (a) In this question part, many candidates gained at least some credit. Where responses were not fully creditworthy this was typically because the answer was generic. In such instances, candidates needed to link their answer to the study of visual development. In addition to the common responses as given on the marks scheme, candidates also successfully explained that kittens are born blind so by the time they are old enough to be tested they cannot have had much visual experience, whereas this is not true for humans.
- (b) A wide range of different reasons were given by way of explanation here.

Question 4

- (a) Although many candidates gave good answers to this question, a significant minority did not. This was typically because they gave very general, discursive responses rather than suggesting one feature and explaining why this one feature was important. This shows the critical nature of reading the question and attending to all the requirements (in this case 'why one feature ... was important').
- (b) Candidates often gave good answers to this question part, such as by describing the risk of low ecological validity. However, those discussing demand characteristics often showed a lack of understanding that the demand characteristics are features of the experiment that cause biased responses in participants because they indicate the aim of the study. Many responses incorrectly suggested that demand characteristics were features of the participants themselves.

Question 5

- (a), (b) These question parts were well answered by candidates.

Question 6

- (a) This question part was very well answered by candidates, with a wide range of aims being identified.
- (b) This question part was also well answered by candidates. However, many candidates reported conclusions relating to a different aim from the one they had identified in part **6(a)**, for example having identified aims relating to group size and the influence of the model in part **6(a)**, they then described conclusions relating to the ill/drunken conditions.

A large number of candidates also gave two brief conclusions instead of providing one in detail, which limited the credit they achieved.

Question 7

- (a) Although most candidates were able to state that the model used the Bobo doll, responses for the toy the aggressive model did not use were more confused. Some candidates mistakenly suggested that they did not use the mallet, whilst others gave examples of toys that were not present for the model to use.
- (b) As a consequence of the weaknesses in part (a), answers here were often limited to one mark. Other candidates focused on the need to measure aggression rather than the need to measure imitation.

Question 8

- (a) This question part was often well answered. Where this was not so, candidates had often confused reliability with their generalisability or application to the real world.
- (b) This question part was often well answered.

Question 9

- (a) This question part was often well answered. Where responses did not earn full credit they typically need to go beyond simply naming the possible methods to give an explanation.
- (b) Responses to this question demonstrated that candidates were able to apply their knowledge of the disadvantages of self reports as a method for working with children, but less often to their use in investigating morals.

Question 10

- (a) This question part was generally well answered.
- (b) This question part was also well answered. A small number of responses gave answers to a different question, such as 'Explain an advantage of this sampling technique'. In addition, some candidates gave features of the sampling techniques itself rather than of the sample. This shows the importance of reading the question carefully.

Question 11

- (a) This question part was not well answered. There were many irrelevant responses and even those which indicated an understanding of standardisation typically needed to give more detail.
- (b) This question part was also not well answered. Responses suggested that candidates would benefit from improving their knowledge of the results of this study.

Question 12

- (a) This question part was well answered, suggesting a good understanding of the function of this part of the procedure of the study by Demattè et al.
- (b) This question part was also fairly well answered, with some candidates thinking logically about the procedure of the study by Demattè et al., so producing well-reasoned responses.

Question 13

This question part was not well answered. This was largely because candidates were unable to distinguish between 'behaviours', as required by the question and other variables that were recorded, such as emotions, cognitions, personality or intelligence.

Question 14

- (a) This question part was typically well answered.
- (b) This question part was much less well answered. Many candidates did not address the requirement in the question to give an ethical problem, so their responses did not answer the question set.

Question 15

- (a) This question part was very poorly answered. There was little understanding demonstrated that BDD is an obsession with bodily features, such as the face, that leads to compulsive mirror use.
- (b) Answers to this question part were better than to part (a), with candidates making subtle distinctions such as that in OCD behaviours such as checking are always compulsive whereas for some BDD patients there is an avoidance of mirrors.

Question 16

The responses to this question were typically better than for **Question 17** although even here few were in the top band. The most common study chosen was Langlois, although the studies by Mann et al. and Tajfel were also used by some candidates. In many responses for each of the chosen studies, discussion was limited to a superficial description of the sample that was not meaningfully linked to the consequences for generalisability.

Question 17

Many responses here did not answer the question because they discussed the study rather than the research method of observations. This limited the marks available to the candidate. The most commonly chosen study was Rosenhan, although the studies by Milgram and Schachter and Singer were also used by some candidates.

PSYCHOLOGY

Paper 9698/22
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 the features of a case study and instead gave a number of evaluation points in part **(a)**. 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 case study method 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 candidates are aware of the issues covered in the syllabus. Some candidates were not able to define the situational explanation of behaviour for part **(a)**, and therefore found it difficult to describe a finding from the Haney, Banks and Zimbardo study that supported the situational explanation of behaviour in part **(b)**. The strengths and weaknesses discussed in **part (c)** need to be specific to investigating situational explanations of behaviour rather than general evaluation points relevant to the named 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 three separate points for the part **(c)** of the **Section B** essay in order to achieve full marks. Some discussed one point using the studies as examples and gave a very lengthy answer that only achieved three marks.

General comments

There was a small entry for this last series of the 9698 qualification. The marks achieved by candidates were lower than in previous series. Some 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 very small minority of candidates answered both questions in the **Section B** essay. When a candidate did this they were awarded the mark for the best of the two questions (**Question 3** or **Question 4**). These candidates usually achieved 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) This question was well answered. The most common answers were to state that the case study method is conducted over a long period of time, collects in-depth qualitative data and involves a small number of participants. Some responses used evaluation of case studies which was not creditworthy.
- (b) The majority of candidates achieved in the higher bands for this question. A few candidates described studies that were not a case study or no scanning technique was named. Many candidates outlined the study by Maguire et al. in some detail using the case study method. For full marks, the sampling technique should be outlined (e.g. self-selected sampling).
- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved marks in this question by providing some evaluative points.

Many discussed issues about generalisability of the small sample, issues with qualitative and quantitative data, issues with the longitudinal method if used, ethical issues and scientific nature of the study.

Stronger answers focused on fewer points but really developed them in context. Weaker answers were limited by only giving 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) Most responses achieved some credit for this question by mentioning that the situational explanation of behaviour relates to how the situation affects someone. A few responses provided more detail by giving an example of a situation and its effect on behaviour.
- (b) Many responses achieve some credit by stating a finding from the study. Some received a second mark by providing a brief link to the features of the situation in the study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo that may have caused the finding described. A number of candidates provided a conclusion from the study, such as pathological prisoner syndrome, without giving any clear finding or a feature of the situation that could have led to this conclusion, and which could not be credited.
- (c) The vast majority of candidates achieved in the 5–6 mark band for this question. Many were able to describe at least one strength and/or one weakness of investigating the situational explanation of behaviour with the study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo as an example to back up their points. Common strengths included ecological validity and usefulness. Common weaknesses included issues with validity and ethical issues.

A number of responses used issues that were not relevant to the question such as representativeness of the sample as a weakness.

- (d) There were many reasonable responses to this question with many achieving in the 5–6 mark band. Most referred to the lack of full informed consent and psychological harm in the study and did give detailed examples from the study by Haney, Banks and Zimbardo. Some responses were very brief and achieved in the lower mark bands.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) Many responses to this question were very good and achieved full marks by stating that qualitative data is in-depth and very detailed, often using open questions to obtain data. Limited responses were also common, where the candidate just stated that qualitative data was in-depth.

- (b) Most responses were able to achieve some credit per study given in the question. Some responses were quite brief and lacked depth. A few gave too many features of the study without focussing on how the qualitative data were collected. Most responses described how, in the study by Rosenhan, the pseudopatients wrote in their diaries about the observations they made of the staff and patients in the hospitals. For the study by Thigpen and Cleckley, many responses described the interviews with Eve and for the study by Dement and Kleitman the content of the dreams recorded into a tape recorder. Some responses described how quantitative data were collected in each study (e.g. the IQ testing in the Thigpen and Cleckley study) which was not creditworthy.
- (c) Most responses could describe at least one strength of collecting qualitative data. The most common strength given was that the data is in depth and many could give a study as an example to back up their point. Some responses described the usefulness of qualitative data. Some outlined a number of strengths but made no reference to the study which achieved fewer marks.

Question 4

- (a) Most responses achieve some credit by explaining that ethnocentric bias can lead to studies not being generalisable to the population. Stronger responses gave a more focused response that outlined for instance that ethnocentric bias is about being biased towards one's own culture.
- (b) Responses for this question often achieved higher marks as the responses focused on how the data were collected in each of the three named studies from the question. A small minority did give unnecessary features of the studies such as details of the procedure and sample.
- (c) The majority of responses were able to identify one difficulty of carrying out research in one culture/country and could provide evidence as an example to back up the difficulty described. Common difficulties included generalisability and validity.

PSYCHOLOGY

<p>Paper 9698/32 Specialist Choices</p>

Key messages

- Candidates should write 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 four sides of paper in length.
- Candidates should read all parts of a question before beginning to answer to ensure that all parts of the question can be answered.
- Candidates should ensure that they know the difference between describe and evaluate for Section B questions and between describe and suggest for Section C questions.
- Candidates should look to quote psychological knowledge wherever possible. Anecdotal answers will not achieve top marks.
- Candidates should apply the methodological knowledge learned for Papers 1 and 2 (not 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.

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)

Answers will receive significantly higher marks if the difference between 'describe' and 'evaluate' is known by candidates. **Section B** question part (a) will always be 'describe' and question part (b) will always be 'evaluate'. Evaluation is not simply additional description, but 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, rather than reproduce learning.

Candidates who evaluate can be divided into three types: (i) those who evaluate using a number of evaluation issues in addition to the named issue (and these candidates score the highest marks); (ii) those who focus exclusively on the one named issue and have marks restricted, because one issue is not a range (as required by the mark scheme), and (iii) those candidates who exclude the named issue (and achieve 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 stated that 'obsessive-compulsive disorder is ecologically valid' and that it is 'reliable' and 'valid', which are not meaningful comments. There are many other issues that would be more appropriate and candidates are advised to think carefully 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) or how the balance will be achieved).

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) Most answers correctly stated that a learning disability includes a significantly reduced ability to understand new or complex information; to learn new skills; or to cope independently. Some answers gave an example of a difficulty or disability in support. A few answers referred to giftedness, which could not be credited.
- (b) Two causes were required, and some candidates provided only one. Typically the causes of dyslexia were described and a few candidates opted for autism or for ADHD as their second disability. Some candidates provided long descriptions which were not required, as each cause was only allocated 2 marks.

Question 2

- (a) Many candidates answered the question set, and many considered a wide range of different aspects such as attribution theory and learned helplessness. Other candidates provided descriptions of the various explanations of motivation, which was creditworthy, but the top mark bands were not accessed with this approach because the question asked about motivation and educational performance. For example, candidates would describe the work of Maslow on motivation but needed to relate their points to education.
- (b) The named issue was the cognitive approach and this allowed a comparison and contrast with alternative explanations. A few candidates did only this issue and a small number did not refer to the cognitive approach. Often examples of theories and/or studies to support the advantages and disadvantages of issues were absent.

Question 3

- (a) The question stated 'design and conduct a correlational study', but most candidates did not design a study that resulted in data that could be correlated, and some others did not refer to correlations in their answer, which limited the credit available. Candidates need to ensure they addressed this requirement in their design in order to answer the question set.
- (b) Some candidates suggested that a formal teaching style would reduce disruption because the teacher would maintain control. Other candidates suggested that an informal style would reduce disruption because candidates would be working individually and be more active. Both answers received credit determined by the quality of explanation provided.

Question 4

- (a) Candidates opting for this question commonly described the theory of emotional intelligence proposed by Goleman in sufficient detail, often including his two components and five features. Some candidates described 'a theory of emotional intelligence' and which were commonsense rather than a psychologically informed answer.
- (b) A few candidates were able to show their understanding of reliability and validity, but many were not, and it was common for the concepts to be confused with one another.

PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH

Question 5

- (a) Some answers able to explain the features of psychometric tests and often referred to an example, such as the McGill Pain Questionnaire (MPQ) to support their answer.
- (b) Two psychometric measures were required and whilst most candidates provided two, some could only provide one. The MPQ was mentioned in most answers, but also creditworthy was any visual analogue scale (including the box and category scales) and the paediatric pain questionnaire.

Question 6

- (a) Many excellent answers wrote about a full range of appropriate theory and evidence, often from all three bullet points of the syllabus, such as types, measures and ways to improve adherence. At the top end of the mark range, answers showed good understanding when distinguishing between different ways to measure non-adherence, such as the distinction between subjective and objective measures. A few candidates wrote about the patient-practitioner relationship and this could only receive credit if it was explicitly made relevant to the question.
- (b) Subjective and objective measures was the named issue, and many candidates provided a full and detailed range of advantages and disadvantages, each supported with examples that had been described in part (a). Other common issues covered included the ethics of different measures, the extent to which theory (such as that proposed by Bulpitt) could be generalised, and the usefulness of snapshot studies.

Question 7

- (a) Most answers suggested designs based on questionnaires, and most answers made the distinction between closed and open-ended. Although examples of questions were often given, the way for the participant to answer was not always addressed, such as the inclusion of a five-point rating scale. Another common limitation was that the questions participants were asked were often very general, e.g. 'why do you delay going to see a doctor', rather than being specifically based on appropriate psychological knowledge such as the work of Safer.
- (b) There is only one study listed on the syllabus for delay in seeking treatment, Safer (1979), although this is listed as an example on the syllabus and so any other appropriate study would receive credit. Most candidates could identify the three reasons (appraisal, illness and utilisation), but many could not describe them.

Question 8

- (a) Two psychological techniques were required and the two listed on the syllabus are biofeedback and imagery. Often the studies by Budzynski et al. and Bridge, illustrating these two types, were described in good detail and showing understanding. A few candidates wrote about the giving of drugs or applying techniques to reduce pain, neither of which could be credited.
- (b) Any method could be used to investigate the effectiveness of the two techniques and most candidates chose an experiment. Given this choice of method, the essential features of IV, DV and controls along with an experimental design needed to be included. These features were omitted in some answers, in others the IV and DV were confused, and in other answers the proposed IV was inappropriate for the question (such as looking at male versus female differences).

PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Question 9

- (a) Many answers to this question were vague, often limited to the comment 'urban living has a negative effect on health' rather than having elaboration or a supporting example.
- (b) Most candidates described the study by Amato (1983), listed as an example on the syllabus, about a person with a bleeding leg needing help from passers-by, often in great detail and with accurate percentages. Also creditworthy was the study by Altman (1969), who asked residents to use their telephone to call a friend, also often described with accuracy.

Question 10

- (a) There were many excellent responses to this question with answers often being very detailed and covering a wide range of relevant information. The strongest responses were differentiated by the understanding and organisation shown. For example, rather than listing a number of studies, stronger answers were organised into those relating to the negative effects of noise (with distinction between anti-social and pro-social behaviour and performance) and those relating to the positive uses of sound (music).
- (b) Many answers did not consider evaluation issues in full, often by making statements which were unsupported, for example, 'there will always be individual differences', without elaboration. However, whilst there may be individual differences, these are usually too small to affect the DV, and in the North et al. study, for example, more spending is caused by classical music. Thinking though issues and examples like this is required in order to gain higher marks.

Question 11

- (a) The crucial features of observations would be that it would logically be naturalistic, non-participant, covert and structured. The number of observers could also be considered (with an inter-rater reliability check).
- (b) The laboratory study by Calhoun on rats in a behavioural sink was often accurately described, and occasionally sketched. The study by Christian et al. was also a less common creditable response.

Question 12

- (a) A number of ethical issues would apply if personal space were to be invaded. A small number of candidates were not able to identify any ethical issues.
- (b) Some candidates suggested giving a questionnaire to participants and others suggested an observation. In most answers, there was a lack of appropriate methodological knowledge. When methodological knowledge was present, aspects tended to be identified (such as 'I would use an opportunity sample') but required further elaboration. A small number of candidates described studies that had already been conducted, rather than suggesting their own study, which could not be credited.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY

Question 13

- (a) A number of candidates incorrectly explained an addiction rather than an impulse control disorder (often stating the six features of addiction).
- (b) Many candidates correctly related token economy to the types of ICD listed on the syllabus such as pyromania and kleptomania. Many candidates used alcoholism as their impulse control disorder and described how this could be reduced with token economy (although this is more commonly treated with aversion therapy).

Question 14

- (a) Many candidates wrote detailed and informative answers covering a wide range of different aspects related to obsessive-compulsive disorder. Most started with a distinction between obsessions and compulsions followed by a consideration of different measures. The case study of 'Charles' was often included. Various explanations were then considered as were the different treatments.
- (b) The named issue was case studies, and this method has many advantages and disadvantages that could be used for evaluation, with the case study of 'Charles' used as an example. A number of candidates stated that everything is reductionist and that this is automatically negative. In this instance, the case the study of 'Charles' is reductionist as it is a case study, but this is an advantage, in order to study one person in detail.

Question 15

- (a) A number of candidates correctly described both the assumptions and treatments of the psychodynamic model and often scored full marks. Some candidates incorrectly described behavioural assumptions and some biomedical (drug) treatments which could not be credited.
- (b) Many candidates identified relevant terminology but did not always describe or explain it. For example, stating 'I would use an opportunity sample' without explanation of how such a sample would be gathered. A small number of candidates incorrectly suggested that a random sample is inviting people to participate as they walk past. Candidates were not always able to design their questionnaire to relate their knowledge of the topic area to the questions that could be asked. A common limited response would be to ask the question 'Do you have any knowledge of the psychodynamic model of abnormality' using the wording from the question set rather than asking questions specific to the model itself.

Question 16

- (a) Most candidates chose to conduct a laboratory experiment, which was logical, but then proceeded to have a range of independent variables which did not test side effects, instead comparing drugs with ECT, or looking for sex differences. Some candidates designed a questionnaire but often failed to realise that people with schizophrenia may not be able to answer a questionnaire. A few candidates suggested administering a psychometric test (such as a memory test) before the treatment started which could then be compared with results from the same test completed several weeks later.
- (b) Responses referred to electro-convulsive therapy, token economy, and cognitive-behaviour therapy. Some responses focussed on chemical/drug treatments which were excluded by the question and could not be credited.

PSYCHOLOGY AND ORGANISATIONS

Question 17

- (a) Some candidates were able to provide elaboration to their response by writing about the type of conflict, which could be inter-personal or organisational.
- (b) Responses needed to show evidence of psychological knowledge rather than be anecdotal, and so the identification of a cause with some explanation was required. For example, inter-individual conflict is between two people who might disagree over a process, the way in which something should be done.

Question 18

- (a) Answers to this question scored marks across the entire mark range. Many answers were of very high quality showing excellent understanding and often very detailed knowledge of a wide range of aspects related to the selection of people for work. Some responses were entirely anecdotal showing very limited psychological knowledge.

- (b) The named issue required a discussion about biases and how they could be removed by, for example, having an equal procedure for all candidates such as using a structured interview where all applicants are asked the same questions in the same order. Similarly having a decision-making model, such as the multiple-hurdle model, also helps to reduce bias. A range of other issues could also be applied, such as generalisations, the use of psychometric tests, along with validity and reliability.

Question 19

- (a) Features that are specific to the method in the question are required, in this instance, questionnaires, and there are general features such as the sample, type of data, ethics, etc. Design suggestions also need to relate specifically to the question being asked. In relation to this question many candidates wrote simple responses such as 'I would use an open-ended question and ask 'do you self-actualise'', and needed to provide explanation about why an open-ended question would be asked, how the answers would be analysed, or whether any other questions would be asked in order to gain higher marks.
- (b) Many candidates wrote about Maslow's hierarchy of needs, but tended to include too much detail for this six-mark question. A number of candidates sketched his pyramid to support their descriptions. A number of candidates focussed on the most basic needs only, such as physiological, and would have benefitted from writing more about the higher needs, such as self actualisation.

Question 20

- (a) Many answers were based on questionnaires, some applied as an interview, whilst some candidates decided to observe whether a manager would behave differently when given a different job title. Some responses would have benefitted from a more thorough application of methodological knowledge.
- (b) Candidates addressing psychological conditions, such as feelings of crowding, lack of privacy, or lack of social interaction, often wrote limited responses and needed to apply psychological knowledge in order to gain higher marks. A few responses focussed on physical conditions which could not be credited.