edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

Examiners' Report Summer 2008

GCE

GCE Psychology (8555/9555)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales No. 4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London WC1V 7BH

A PEARSON COMPANY

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2008

Publications Code UA020385

Contents

Unit 6761-01

General Comments

The paper was on a par with previous papers and many candidates performed very well. In a similar way to January, this paper contained many standard questions (outline/describe/evaluate), which were generally answered well and some which provided more of a challenge in terms of application and analysis. Once again, most candidates timed their answers appropriately and completed all of the questions, with just a few running out of time/not attempting certain questions.

It's pleasing to note that candidates and centres are showing continual improvements for questions with specific requirements and responding well to issues raised on previous examiner reports. However a significant number of answers to Q1 (eii) gave both a strength and a weakness when the question only required either.

There are fewer instances of candidates using text language in answers, there is less confusion between key assumptions and key applications and even rarer cases of any pre-prepared answers from candidates. Although there are still candidates describing other theories/studies when they should be evaluating, it is an ever decreasing problem.

The main distinction between more and less able candidates was and always has been the ability to elaborate. Higher scoring answers could back up a point with general and specific examples of research. Others find it difficult to provide relevant psychological research and instead rely on anecdotal information which is not creditworthy. There are continuing signs of a gradual improvement in this area but it still remains the main differentiator amongst all candidates.

There is a growing trend for candidates to write additional comments on the exam paper itself. Whilst this is accepted in terms of essay plans etc its worrying to see candidates actually highlighting AO1 / AO2 on the last question where *they* think they have got the marks.

Just as concerning is the increase in acronyms such as AMRC and GRAVE. A growing number of candidates are presenting formulaic answers based on these which in some cases bear little if any relationship to the question. For example 'it is a lab study so it is reliable and valid', - no reference to topic or study. Some candidates do this for every study they mention. This practice needs to be carefully monitored by centres as it might provide weaker candidates with an easy but flawed way around revising. Better candidates tend to use GRAVE (generalisability, reliability, application, validity and ethics) in particular for any *additional* evaluation point which is fine.

There were some real discriminators on the paper. Q3 evaluating brain damaged patients was once again only answered remotely well by a minority of stronger candidates. Q2c involved applying knowledge from elsewhere to the question which proved too difficult for some. Interestingly however these same candidates were able to pick up marks on Q5b which involved the same kind of requirement.

Question 1

Part (a) was not as well answered as in previous exams for this type of opening question and a number of candidates failed to score full marks. Piaget's stages have been asked before but some candidates were not as prepared for a question on his formal operational stage. There were the usual cases of complete guesswork where a minority of candidates put a cross in more than 3 boxes in the hope of getting at least some marks. This type of random answering was not successful.

Generally candidates were able to answer part (b) however some are still getting assimilation and accommodation mixed up. Others just relied on giving a detailed example which was not always suitable. There were lots of tautological answers such as 'we accommodate new information.' Better candidates answered appropriately with good examples usually involving birds and aeroplanes.

In part (c) candidates seemed to know vaguely what equilibrium is but had problems expressing the concept. It was clear a lot of them had not been taught what this term meant, as answers given included 'a balance' 'everything is equal'

In both (b) and (c) candidates fail to gain marks because they do not expand and rearrange the wording of the question in the answer which does not explain the term adequately.

In part (d) a few answers outlined features from the pre operational stage rather than the sensorimotor stage. There were some quite superficial answers often stating the age of the sensorimotor stage rather than a feature. The vast majority of those who did not pick up marks here dwelt on egocentrism as a main feature. Some candidates still cannot distinguish between having and not having object permanence or in which stages egocentrism / conservation are key features.

For better candidates part (e) seemed to be quite an easy and straight forward question they might have done from past papers. Laboratory experiments and longitudinal studies tended to be the two most popular methods given and only very few did not mention a suitable research method. Evaluating the method seemed more challenging to all candidates but even here the majority were able to access at least one of the two marks available. The high drop out rate for longitudinal studies and high ecological validity for natural observations were common evaluative points which were elaborated upon fully by better candidates to gain both marks. A few candidates did not read the question, offering strength and a weakness, which is a common error and unfortunately wastes valuable time.

Question 2

Generally this question was answered very well. Candidates showed good structure in the description of the study although many continue to evaluate with the point that Piaget used his own children and so the findings cannot be generalised. Very few candidates wrote about a study from the wrong approach but one or two examples did come through.

In (a) the majority of candidates described either three mountains or naughty teddy to good effect, many used the NAMRC formula. This worked well for most although there were many different versions of the three mountains study and the unfortunate few who decided the question meant describe a theory from the cognitive developmental approach. The latter showed they knew Piaget very well indeed but had just misread the question. More impressively those who chose naughty teddy in

particular were able to accurately reel off the results in percentages which was very pleasing. These tended to be the better candidates who in turn for three mountains made it explicitly clear which ages could and could not decentre.

Not enough detail in the aim also meant some missed out on one mark. Others gave brief responses such as Piaget's 3 mountains "to prove egocentrism happened in the pre- operational stage". Better answers even cited various hypotheses from studies and were deemed creditworthy.

Evaluation in part (b) however was very poor and contained too many generic points e.g. it supports his stages, has low ecological validity without saying how, the children had never seen mountains before etc. Reliability was more often than not used incorrectly, this may be because some candidates used 'generic' evaluation techniques (GRAVE) which often have no actual relevance to the study itself. Candidates need to understand that this system will only ever pick up limited marks it is used with the correct elaboration.

Weaker candidates would try and use GRAVE but through bullet point answers i.e. controlled or reliable or lacks ecological validity without elaborating and showing knowledge and understanding. Most answers did not have enough detail for four marks. Once again as in all past exams there was an abundant use of incorrect terminology, such as ecological validity and demand characteristics. It seems some candidates pick up these terms through rote learning in the classroom without having any idea what they actually mean and in what context to place them as a weakness. Better candidates were able to apply both these generic terms correctly.

Part (c) was answered really well by a few and proved to be a real discriminator between better and weaker candidates. But in particular it helped determine those who were flexible enough to adapt their knowledge to the requirements of the question. In this respect there was a definite divide in responses here, they were either excellent or poor.

Many able candidates gained two out of the three marks because they failed to use more than two studies or use more than two concepts. Weaker candidates just couldn't do it and they simply re-stated the assumption in their own words. This was a question that really tested candidates as it required them to use the information learned in a different way and will be more akin to some of the assessment on the new specifications.

Question 3

Again this year we saw much confusion over the Computer Analogy and the Information Processing Assumption. Many candidates wrote about input-process-output without reference to the similarities between the computer and the brain. The evaluation of the Case Studies of brain damaged patients was answered reasonably well although a lot of candidates insisted that they are high in ecological validity because they take place in a natural environment, which of course, gained no marks because testing is in a clinical environment.

In part (a) most candidates were able to answer this question well. They explained what the analogy meant and gave the examples of printer/RAM etc for human behaviours. There were a small minority who still got it muddled up with the info processing approach. It is clear that a distinction needs to be made by centres as to what is the computer analogy and what is information processing. There was a lot of

repetition in some answers and in others examples dominated the response without clear reference to an actual answer. The best answers identified the computer analogy and then made two fully comparative statements, such as 'humans obtain data from the sense organs whereas as a computer receives data through a device such as a keyboard' and 'the response for humans is a behaviour whereas for a computer it might be a printed document'.

Part (b) provided plenty of general evaluation rather than specific and it proved tricky for a lot of candidates, some in as far as saying that these are caused by researchers actually damaging the brains of patients! Other weaker candidates are just not aware of how these case studies are actually carried out. Some just described Clive Wearing fully with no thought of any A02. There were the usual number of responses which evaluated case studies in general. This question has been on a few exams over the years and is still not answered well at all, even by the better candidates.

Part (c) proved to be another good discriminating question. Again because it required candidates to manipulate their knowledge, the weaker candidates did poorly; they tended just to quote Loftus' study and Yuille and Cutshall etc with no reference of the problems with EWT. Many candidates did not make the link to EWT and instead just gave plenty of description of research. Some massive amounts in regards to Loftus and Palmer. However it was pleasing to see so many answers demonstrating a breadth of knowledge. These typically used material including limit of STM; shallow processing; interference; repression; decay and reconstruction really well.

Question 4

By far the most popular theories of memory described were the MSM and Levels of Processing. Indeed, those candidates who chose to write about the reconstructive model described it less well and picked up fewer marks. Most marks were easily accessed by most students, particularly when answering using the multi-store model. Providing students could talk about the characteristic of SS, STM and LTM and refer to rehearsal these were achieved in full. Where less than full marks were scored, this was often because no or inadequate reference to SS were made. The weakest answers were vague but usually managed to get a mark by talking about the rehearsal loop.

A few candidates mentioned studies rather than theories but they were in the minority.

Many candidates still do not seem to know the difference between theories of memory and forgetting which explained the answers on repression and interference.

There were a number of answers that actually evaluated models described as if they felt their answer would have been incomplete without this A02. In a way this is not surprising considering the high number of candidates who feel they must describe something in a question that asks to evaluate.

Question 5

Part (a) was not always answered correctly despite being multiple choice and was less well answered than the opening question in the exam. Some candidates identified 'observing spontaneous behaviour' as a characteristic of a field experiment. Others crossed more boxes than required in an attempt to guarantee themselves marks.

In part (b) there were some very good answers, many focussed on the setting and grey technicians coat etc. It was good to see how in depth some centres had taught candidates particularly in reference to the slippery slope idea. This was the first time this type of question had been asked about Milgram and most candidates of varying ability were able to access good marks. This may tell us more about the nature of the topic at hand than candidates' pure abilities. A few candidates made a few points about social acceptance being the reason for obedience and others offered criticisms of Milgram rather than influencing factors.

Part (c) was done exceptionally well by some candidates, writing more than enough for five marks. Not only were they focussing on the ethics, but also methodology and control of variables etc. There were also some good real life applications about how the findings have been used to explain atrocities. Technical language was used but not linked to the study or explained so as to show knowledge and understanding. Weaker answers could not differentiate between reliability and replicability and tended to throw in terms like these without any linkage to methodology.

Question 6

AO1 marks were found very easily in this essay but many candidates did not realise that the evaluation was of the research rather than the theory and relied on studies to support (which mainly picked up AO1 marks). Weaker candidates simply gave lengthy descriptions of Sherif and Elliott's studies. These turned into 'all I know about prejudice' essays partly because they had not read the question carefully. There were some good answers which showed a thorough understanding of the methodology of these studies e.g. field experiments, sample ethnocentric etc. and the limitations of techniques used.

There were a number of common sense answers such as 'getting them to talk to each other' when talking about reduction of prejudice. There were also a number of responses focusing on the authoritarian personality stating 'parents should be told to look after their children properly' which is not a method of reducing prejudice. A number of answers were vague with made up terms linked to incorrect definitions. Better candidates included details of Sheriff's work and clearly explained how the method worked. Most candidates could identify at least two theories of prejudice SIT being the most popular and methods of reducing prejudice (super ordinate goals, education most common) and give accurate details of what would be involved.

In terms of using formulas some students had marked on their papers which sentence/paragraph was AO1 and which was AO2-not necessarily correctly. Overall the content was good which was reflected in the balance clarity and communication marks.

Unit 6762-01

General comments

The candidates seemed to find the paper slightly harder than in previous series, possibly because there were slightly more methods questions though these were in the standard format of describing and evaluating specific methods. There were some standard questions that have been on previous papers, such as describing a study, and describing theories. The essay was also fairly straightforward in that candidates had to describe and evaluate a theory, on a par with previous exams. Again candidates tended to do worse on the AO2 marks, and as in previous years this was down to lack of detail and explanation, e.g. saying something wasn't ecologically valid but not explaining why not. Candidates should be reminded that marks are not available for just putting down evaluation terms that they have memorised; these terms need to be explained in relation to the question to gain a mark.

Question 1

In part ai most candidates understood the term role model and were able to access the marks. However, very few candidates were able to outline the term vicarious reinforcement, either leaving it blank or talking about the observer receiving reinforcement rather than the model.

In part aii the better candidates were able to use attention, reinforcement, reproduction and motivation and relate it to learning to eat with a spoon, so gaining good marks. However, in some cases lack of detail and application to the stem resulted in lower marks. Weaker candidates could talk about observation and imitation but then went on to talk about operant conditioning, which was not relevant to the question.

Part 1b was not very well answered, with few candidates getting above 2 out of the 4 marks. There was a lot of confusion over social learning theory and operant conditioning. Some candidates tended to describe Bandura's study in detail, rather than evaluating the theory. A range of students could give an alternative explanation such as genes as a point. Good candidates were able to say how social learning theory looked at cognitive factors unlike other learning theories. A vast minority said that Bandura ignored operant and classical conditioning, when in fact he didn't he offered an extension to the two theories of conditioning and did acknowledge that they explained how we learnt, just not how we learnt all our behaviour.

Question 2

The stronger candidate did quite well on part a, though there were a wide variety of answers. Good candidates were able to say that case studies incorporate other research methods and make a link to mental health, and were able to use the example of Little Hans to elaborate on this. However weaker candidates just used Little Hans as a named example without relating him to the point being made. Some candidates described an actual case study rather than the method, and other strayed into cognitive case studies rather than focussing on the Psychodynamic Approach as the question asked.

In part bi those candidates who gained full marks tended to give good descriptions of the latent and manifest content and had a good understanding of Freudian principles such as the unconscious mind. However, some candidates confused the two terms. Weaker candidates tended to focus on an example of a symbol and what it

represented rather than the method of symbol analysis. It seemed an easy question for the weaker candidates to waffle on without putting in any psychological knowledge.

In part bii most candidates could give good comments on the problems with interpreting the symbols, with stronger candidates being able to offer an explained biological explanation of dreams. Weaker candidates failed to explain their answers in enough detail to gain many marks, e.g. they would say it was an unscientific method but failed to say what made it unscientific. Those who failed to answer part 2bi also struggled with this question.

Question 3

Most candidates got maximum marks for part a.
Dement and Kleitman was the most popular study described in part b, followed by Rechtstaffen. On the whole this tended to be well answered, with those candidates who picked a physiological study often gaining 4 or 5 out of the 5 marks. A few candidates confused the physiological with the psychodynamic approach and so failed to gain any marks as the study wasn't relevant to the question.

Part c tended to be poorly answered, with very few candidates achieving full marks. Good students could link adoption studies, twin studies and family studies to the question, but some failed to gain marks for stating points such as 'if similar to adoptive parents it shows environmental influences' and vice versa. A lot of candidates went on to describe what positive and negative correlations are rather than describe the method.

In part d a lot of candidates tended to repeat the stem without adding any more detail and so failed to gain marks. Some candidates confused the amount of genes that were identical in MZ twins with DZ twins. Very few were able to offer points about why the behaviour may not have been due to genes, such as MZ twins have a more similar environment than DZ twins.

Question 4

Most candidates got the first two answers correct, however, once again there was confusion about the difference between negative reinforcement and punishment. When a child is behaving well to avoid something unpleasant this is negative reinforcement, as they are being rewarded for their good behaviour by not having the unpleasant consequence.

In part aii there were a lot of good answers. Some candidates evaluated token economy in general, whilst other evaluated the scenario given for part a, both approaches to the answer were equally valid. Stronger candidates were able to give both strengths and weaknesses of token economy including why the behaviour may not be replicated in the outside world. Those who commented on the ethics were often able to successfully relate it to the scenario rather than just give general comments. A handful of candidates described token economy rather than evaluating it, often repeating what had been in the scenario for part ai. Some candidates evaluated operant conditioning in general rather than token economy, so restricting their marks.

Answers to part b varied from excellent with well reasoned and justified arguments to weak answers that often focussed on human ethics such as can't consent rather

than focussing on non human ethics. Generalisability was often discussed appropriately, though weaker students failed to explain why animal studies can't be generalised to humans.

Question 5

Part ai was generally well answered with the majority of candidates gaining full marks. The most common mistake was to talk about the sleep cycle rather than the sleep wake cycle.

Part aii was also well answered with many candidates gaining marks for appropriate symptoms. Some students talked about shift work rather than jet lag and so couldn't gain credit for their answers.

Part aiii was not as well answered as the previous two questions. Few candidates could give accurate answers regarding phase advance/delay often muddling what direction it is best to go in. When discussing melatonin many candidates didn't state when it should be taken in order to be effective.

Answers for part b varied with the majority of the students being able to offer some description of the restoration theory. Most candidates were able to mention repair of the body. Stronger candidates were able to outline what went on in specific stages of sleep. Some answers tended to be common sense answers with little psychological content, or just said that restoration theory says you restore yourself.

Question 6

The most popular theory was Erikson's theory, where candidates were often able to offer detailed description of some of the stages, but then had limited time, if any, to evaluate his theory. Some candidates tended to restate the name of a stage as a description of that stage rather than saying what happens during a particular stage. Hardly any candidates were able to offer studies in evaluation of Erikson's theory, either to support it or to disprove it.

The next most popular answers were Object Relations theory and the Maternal Deprivation theory, with only handful writing about Klein's theory. These answers tended to be more focussed with a more even split between the description and evaluation, and more use of research to evaluate the theories. However, the AO2 marks were weaker than the AO1 marks whatever theory was written about. Evaluation points tended to be simplistic and lacked enough detail to gain marks.

A few candidates lost valuable marks through writing in bullet points rather than in essay format, or due to very poor spelling and grammar.

A few candidates left this answer blank, either due to lack of time or lack of knowledge.

Very few candidates described an evaluated a study rather than a theory, and some described a physiological theory rather than a psychodynamic theory.

Unit 6763-01

General

In this, the penultimate outing for Unit 3 some of the issues of concern that have been raised in previous years seem to have been dealt with by centres while others continue to be a source of problems.

A small number of candidates persist in plagiarising either each other's work, textbooks, or with increasing frequency material from the internet. It is vital that centres continue to get the message across that plagiarism is entirely unacceptable. It is also worth pointing out that crediting a source in the references does not make plagiarism acceptable. Anything copied directly from another source should be in quotation marks, the source should be given with the quotation and referenced in full in the references. Credit cannot be given for quoted material as part of the introduction, penalties for plagiarism are more serious.

While many candidates from most centres do now adhere to the word limit some still ignore the 2000 word maximum, this is often centre specific. Work that is well over 4000 words is unacceptable. Similarly while the majority of centres present scripts appropriately, that is, fastened with treasury tags and not placed inside any form of plastic pouch or wallet, again a few centres persist in ignoring these instructions, creating more work and inconvenience for examiners

Most candidates do now make a point of declaring whether they worked in a group or alone, and detailing the roles of co-workers in their write-up, though the request for teachers to identify this is usually ignored.

Whereas in many of the previous series the candidates who did best tended to be the ones who went for "safe" topics and the more unusual topics tended to do less well, in the current series there are indications that this trend has been reversed and some quite unusual but interesting topics gained very high marks. Nonetheless there is evidence that unusual topics only pay off if the candidate is very able.

There is still evidence of a very strong centre effect that is not replicated in the other Units. This stems, in part, from the varying levels of teacher support between centres. All centres must continue to ensure that the level of support offered to candidates is appropriate and within The Joint Council for Qualification's (JCQ) guidelines; it is the candidate's own work that should be submitted. More information can be found on the JCQ website at http://www.jcq.org.uk/homepage.cfm (search for 'coursework' in the search field and the Instructions for Conducting Coursework / Portfolios document is the first item to be returned).

Introduction

1a Introductions show evidence of better selection of material than in the past, with relatively few candidates presenting material that is not relevant to their study. However many failed to funnel down to the most relevant as the last cited research. Many candidates did include detailed evidence from the most relevant research. There was a tendency for some candidates to give detailed results for all their studies, making the introduction rather long. A small but significant number of candidates failed to include relevant research even when it was available. For example candidates investigating the effect of music as a cue to recall not including the work by Smith, or smell as a cue failing to mention either Aggleton & Waskett or Schabb.

1b Rationales have improved greatly over the years and many now do well on this section. It flows best if candidates remember to start from the most relevant piece of research, explain similarities and differences and the likely impact such changes are likely to have on results.

1c Aims are usually good, though a significant minority produce overlong and poorly focused aims.

1d Many candidates still fail to either operationalise hypotheses or keep their hypotheses succinct, however there has been a steady improvement in response to feedback.

Method

There is a very strong centre effect in this section, with the majority of candidates from a particular centre producing work at a similar standard. This year there was clear evidence that many centres are producing a template for candidates to assist in the write-up. This frequently misfires as many of the candidates use the support in a formulaic manner and fail to make the points necessary to gain marks. A template without understanding does not work well, if understanding is present the template becomes redundant.

2a Method & Design: The majority of candidates opted for experiments and correctly identified these, the majority also correctly identified the design they had used. There were instances where the candidates identified their method incorrectly, for example that the method was a questionnaire when, although a questionnaire was used within the study, the method was in fact an experiment. Similarly some candidates claimed repeated measures designs because they had two measurements from each participant even though they had two groups doing different things, which is what they were comparing. Some candidates failed to gain both marks here as justifications were either absent or a very brief general justification was given.

2b The most frequent mark here was 1, usually for the dependent variable. Independent variables were rarely fully operationalised. Candidates need to do more than merely state that e.g. three levels of processing were used, the levels and examples to show how the levels were achieved, is required.

2c While the majority of candidates did succeed in correctly identifying the sample type, very few were able to give reasons for their decision that were specific to their situation and/or study. A significant minority failed to include information on the size and structure of the sample and there were some cases where the claimed sample structure did not match the evidence from the data collected. Reports must be internally consistent.

2d The majority of candidates do include the relevant apparatus, however very few are able to justify the selection of materials appropriately. This is a section where the use of a template is obvious and more often than not, badly done. Candidates who do not understand why certain materials have been used because they have been given them by staff are not likely to be able to give a coherent explanation of the reasons behind the selection. Justification of a word list for example should indicate both how the words were selected and why that strategy was seen as appropriate by the members of the group, e.g. they were all single syllable nouns because that way words were of similar length and would be likely to be equally memorable.

2e Procedure is usually fairly well done, with many candidates gaining 3 out of 4 marks. There are very few full mark responses however as two very common omissions are, how participants were allocated to conditions in independent groups designs and details on timings of the various stages of the tasks. Fewer candidates fail to declare the role of co-workers now.

2f Controls are usually very well done. Most candidates give both ethical considerations and controls, explaining both why and how these were implemented.

Results

Some candidates show good evidence of understanding both the skills required and the nature of the data collected. Evidence from some centres suggests that guidance is not confident and candidates appear to have little understanding and fundamental errors are frequent.

3a Most candidates gain at least 1 mark here though there are many who fail to gain both. There are two reasons why this may be so. Some tables fail to include a clear indication of the units of measurement, for example "time taken" could easily be seconds or minutes, scale must always be clearly identified. The instructions make it clear this is supposed to be a summary table, as such raw data should not form part of the table and means the second mark is withheld. Raw data should be included in a separate table in the appendix. There is also concern that far too often there is a mismatch between the raw data and the summary statistics, suggesting that the simple expedient of checking calculations is not done.

3b Comments were usually relevant and many gain both marks here. There has been a gradual move away from comments that merely reiterate the information in the table to ones which interpret the table.

3c There is a very strong centre effect in the appropriateness of graphs. Too many graphs either use an inappropriate scale, or are incorrectly labelled or choose inappropriate axes. Common errors include joining up non-adjacent points on frequency polygons, using participants on the x axis, not starting the y axis scale at zero (this can be appropriate if properly explained and justified but is best avoided at this level). Cumulative frequency graphs and pie charts are rarely appropriate and are best avoided, unless both the teacher and the candidate have a higher level of understanding in statistics. Three dimensional graphs continue to be a problem, they may look nice, but they are extremely difficult to read accurately.

3d Some candidates fail to make any comments on graphs and trends at all. Most manage a simple comparison but meaningful comments such as comparing trends including possible outliers or skews are rare.

3e The majority of candidates are able to make a basic statement regarding which hypothesis is the more appropriate in the light of their results. A few assert they have found a difference when a comparison between means demonstrates this is untrue. Credit is not given for incorrect decisions. There are still very few who use the evidence from results to support their decision and so gain full marks.

Discussion

Most candidates follow the headings as set out in the published mark scheme and this helps them to gain better marks. Those who choose not to use the headings invariably miss out on the marks available for various sections.

4a While there is still a tendency for candidates to focus too much on ecological validity, the trend of recent years to address issues such as whether the IV genuinely manipulated the aspect of the study intended and whether demand characteristics could have influenced validity continued. There are now many more gaining 2 or 3 marks than previously, though 4 is still rare as candidates are rarely succinct.

4b Many candidates limited themselves to 2 marks here as they failed to be specific about how suggested improvements may affect results. A general statement that changing the task from x to y would "improve the results" is not clear enough, how would they improve, does that mean participants will recall more words or there will be a bigger difference between the two conditions.

4c Most candidates who use the headings gain 3 marks here. However there are a significant minority who gain less because they are convinced they have a perfect piece of research with no weaknesses. While criticising one's own research is difficult, if they have learned to evaluate studies for Units 1 and 2 the skill ought to be transferable.

4d Those who asserted their study was perfect found it impossible to gain marks here as they had nothing to improve. Those who had found flaws fell to the same limitation as in 4b by not spelling out the likely effect on results of any modifications.

4e Provided there was appropriate material in the introduction, most candidates could gain marks here. However often comments were brief and general, those who compared their results directly with the related research tended to score better.

4f Although this is an area where there has been general improvement in recent times, there is still a tendency to assert that generalisations can or cannot be made which clearly contradict common sense. E.g. A sample from one geographical location is unlikely to be wildly different from another location in the same country unless there is evidence that the sample was biased. There is also a problem with claiming a sample is too small to generalise from. While candidates are not experienced enough to fully comprehend the complexities of sampling a basic understanding that size of effect and sample size can be traded off against one another is within the comprehension of most people. They would not feel the urge to buy and test another 200 CDs from a market stall to prove they are duff if out of 12 bought only 1 played properly!

4g While most who found an effect in their study could usually suggest an appropriate application for one mark it was rarely developed sufficiently for the second mark. Those who failed to get an effect in their study did find this somewhat more difficult and are probably best to use the findings of the research they failed to replicate while alluding to their own results.

References etc

5a There are still too few candidates who produce a set of appropriate and correct references. Credit is not given for a bibliography and candidates need to be sure they understand the difference between references and bibliographies. References need to be for all the research cited in the write up, no additional names should be there and there should be no omissions. It is not appropriate for staff to provide the references ready set out for the candidates to paste into their work and it is usually very obvious when this has happened. It is clear that some centres provide a ready produced set of references where the candidate deletes the ones not used. While stronger candidates do not need such inappropriate spoon-feeding weaker candidates tend to be misled by this strategy and either include inappropriate research in the introduction or fail to match introductory research with the references. The appendix should be more than a single sheet of information that is not central to the study, it should at the very least contain raw data and materials used for the study. When an observation has been undertaken a plan showing the layout of the location and possibly a photograph would be appropriate but is rarely included.

5b There were fewer candidates this year who incurred the maximum penalty for excessive word length, there were also fewer who lied about the length. Centres are reminded again, though, that work exceeding the published word limit is unacceptable. A significant minority of candidates continue to exceed the word limit, some by a substantial margin.

Unit 6764-4A/4B/4C/4E

General

Many candidates still complete both options in one booklet or with part of an option in a second booklet. This causes administrative problems and it can take considerable effort to marry these answers together again. A few candidates answer a different option from the one for which they have been entered. This should be avoided as these candidates rarely obtain good marks.

There were parts of this exam for which candidates were very well prepared whilst other areas of the specification seemed less familiar. A recurring problem is that candidates describe when they are asked to evaluate – this skill should be practised in centres especially throughout the A2 year. Timed essays are also recommended so that candidates become comfortable with the time allocated for the questions.

Option A Clinical Psychology

Clinical psychology continues to be a very popular option and many candidates display a good level of knowledge and understanding. Physiological and psychological explanations are frequently confused.

Q1a Candidates were usually able to identify one cultural issue and many identified two; however many struggled to elaborate on these for the second mark. The most common answer identified mental disorders as being stigmatised and unacceptable in some cultures eg schizophrenia in Japan. Occasionally cultural issues were confused with definitions of abnormality.

Q1b Candidates did not attempt this question confidently. Answers were quite short and were not elaborated to make the points clearly. Some candidates appeared able to 'think on their feet' and made some sensible suggestions: others showed very little understanding of the issues.

Q2a A significant number of candidates offered physiological and social explanations for this question. Many failed to identify a specific mental disorder and produced a generic response. Where psychological explanations were given psychodynamic were the most popular ones followed by cognitive. A variety of explanations from these approaches were used. Some candidates lacked the descriptive skills to elaborate on these.

Q2b A lot of the assessment was restricted to the physiological approach which did not enable candidates to access full marks. Apart from genetic studies there was very little research evidence produced and often evaluative points were vague and poorly explained. Some candidates did not assess at all but merely described the mental disorder. Few candidates achieved full marks here.

Q2c in general candidates were able to identify a therapy from the behavioural approach. The most popular choices were systematic desensitisation and token economy. The token economy programmes were related to prison use which is more appropriate in the criminal option rather than the clinical option. Many candidates were able to achieve full marks here but some misinterpreted the question and described the therapy instead.

Q3 Candidates were well prepared for this question which was answered in many different ways – some candidates chose to answer the question with reference to schizophrenia and described and evaluated the medical approach through this disorder whilst others spoke about the therapies used in medical approach. Candidates were very clear about the aims and therapies of this approach and most candidates achieved good marks. Many achieved full marks.

Option B Criminological Psychology

Criminological Psychology is still the most popular option and candidates are knowledgeable about the topics; however this knowledge must be adapted to answer the question.

Q1a Many candidates produced a clear description of offender profiling and responses obtained full or nearly full marks.

Q1b Although candidates were very knowledgeable about offender profiling and gave considerable descriptive detail of both the UK and US systems of profiling, very few were able to compare the approaches. Most candidates knew that the UK approach is bottom up and the US approach is top down but the comparison ended there. Candidates then reported on the UK approach for a paragraph and the US approach for a paragraph without drawing comparison, thus limiting the number of marks they could obtain.

Q2a Outlining attributional biases caused various difficulties for candidates. Many recognised that there were dispositional and situational factors and described these confidently but did not identify and link them to specific biases. When an individual bias was identified, it was rarely described clearly. A confused account of the Fundamental Attributional Error, in particular, was often given.

Q2b Similarly candidates struggled with the way these biases could affect recall. Examples given to describe the bias in 2a were often repeated here. Candidates who chose the self serving bias or hedonic relevance were best able to make an effort to relate their answer to EWT. A significant number of candidates misinterpreted the question and discussed leading questions or weapon focus.

Q2c Responses to this part of the question were generally good although there was a tendency to describe the methods of research studies in too much detail. For example if leading questions were identified as a factor the Loftus and Palmer's experiment was reported in excessive detail. Candidates could, however, describe many factors so were able to obtain high marks. Leading questions and weapon focus were the most popular choices for answers.

Q3 Description of Self-Fulfilling Prophecy was generally quite weak and the examples used often did not relate to Anti-Social Behaviour. Some candidates appeared to misunderstand ASB and instead referred to unsociable behaviour which did not address the question. Any research evidence used to support a link between SFP and ASB was patchy. Many candidates used the Jahoda Study which is very appropriate. Other studies such as Rosenthal and Jacobsen, Eden and Snyder were described to illustrate SFP but candidates rarely attempted to link these with ASB. In a significant number of answers no research evidence at all was produced. Few responses accessed the full marks available.

Option C Psychology of Education

A limited number of centres completed this option so therefore there can be a strong centre effect on the trends identified.

Q1a Most candidates made a good attempt at this question and identified a teaching style. Many went on to describe the important features of this teaching style. In a few cases learning styles were described instead.

Q1b Most candidates could access good marks in this part of the question; however some responses duplicated the answers to 1a and described a teaching style rather than assessing its effect on student performance.

Q2a Nearly all candidates attempted this question but very few gave a clear description of giftedness. Comments were often vague, for example,' has a high IQ' and seemed to indicate a common sense approach rather then a psychological one.

Q2b The responses given tended to misinterpret the question asked. Candidates often described or assessed the process of identifying giftedness rather than explaining the issues associated with being gifted. This prevented candidates from accessing full marks.

Q2c This question was answered confidently with well thought out suggestions of ways in which parents and teachers could be involved in nurturing giftedness. High marks were often gained.

Q3 Responses predominantly included the use of the behavioural approach in discipline within the classroom or behaviour modification. This was acceptable although the question allowed for a wider response than this. Candidates were able to describe behavioural principles clearly but evaluation was less comprehensive.

Option E Sports Psychology

This was quite a popular option attracting a wide range of responses

Q1a The responses to this question varied widely and so it proved to be a good discriminator. A few candidates did not know what the question was asking; however those who had revised this topic thoroughly often obtained full marks.

Q1b Even the candidates who answered 1a confidently did not respond as well to this part of the question. Attempts to assess how participation in sport related to social development were often vague. A limited number of research studies were used as evidence. Many candidates digressed into discussing physical or skills development rather then social development.

Q2a(i) (ii) This was very well answered with a clear distinction made between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Appropriate examples were given to pick up full marks.

Q2b A range of marks was seen on this part of the question. A few candidates evaluated intrinsic and extrinsic motivation very thoroughly and obtained full marks. A significant number, however, continued to describe motivation or considered other motivators such as nAch which limited their marks

Q2c Overall the responses were a little disappointing and this question was not answered as well as application to sport questions often are. It was especially important to read the question carefully. Many candidates neither related their answer to novice sportspeople nor linked it specifically to the use of intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. Answers included general ways that coaches could motivate athletes which could not gain marks.

Q3 Essay responses were encouraging as this topic has not been addressed well in past papers. Most candidates were able to describe self efficacy. Good answers went on to make clear points to distinguish between self efficacy and self belief with appropriate use of examples. It was harder to make a link to how self efficacy relates to boosting performance and some candidates struggled to keep to the point in the evaluation. Wells' study was used as supporting evidence in many cases.

Unit 6765-51/5A/5B/5C

Section 1: Research methods

Question 1

1(a)(i)

Most candidates understood the nature of a non-directional hypothesis but did not fully operationalise the DV (child's understanding of the Earth) for both marks. A minority of candidates wrote a null hypothesis or one-tailed hypothesis, which received no credit. This may have been due to not reading the question properly as many of these candidates accurately defined what a non-directional hypothesis was in (aii).

1 (a)(ii)

Generally answered well and gained full credit. Some candidates did not express the definition well enough for credit eg. a hypothesis that says two things can happen.

1 (b)

Most candidates were able to refer to the statistics in the data table and draw a conclusion. A degree of interpretation, as opposed to restating the figures, was needed to access more than 2 marks. A conclusion was sufficient as interpretation, and most were able to achieve this. A few stated that open questions were better, possibly schema driven. Some focused on the bottom line of the table and misinterpreted this as the total number of correct answers rather than the total number of children. Some candidates went beyond interpretation and offered a reason for the findings; children were more likely to be correct if given a choice of answers rather than having to produce their own, which also received credit.

1 (c)(i)

There was a clear difference between those who understood and did not understand what 'level of significance' meant. Candidates who did not understand often gave a fumbled answer that restated the question, stated why it is important for results without explaining why this was so, or referred to how relevant the data was.

1 (c)(ii)

Most gained one mark for this question for a partial answer that stated a 5% probability of the result being due to chance factors. A few completed this statement with reference to the probability of the results being due to chance being equal to or less than 5% for both marks. Some candidates simply described the equation as 'probability being 0.05' which showed no level of explanation and therefore gained no credit. Some candidates were obviously confused, stating that there was a 5% probability the results would be due to the IV, or 95% probability the results were due to chance. Quite good odds for a psychology investigation!

1 (d)(i)
Most candidates were able to define what an open ended question was well, and offer examples to show their level of knowledge. Often the expression of the answer let them down e.g. 'there is more one answer', which could be true of any question type.

1 (d)(ii)
Again, as above, most candidates successfully defined a closed ended question. This was unsurprising as a clue to the answer was in the study example. A few confused parts (i) and (ii). Marks were lost for expression; 'answers must be one word', being a common error.

1 (e)
Two marks were available for an advantage and two for a disadvantage. The most common advantage of closed ended questions referred to ease of analysis, although this was often lacking enough detail for both marks. Similarly the most common disadvantage referred to lacking detail/explanation, but this was a little more successful when giving depth.

1 (f)
Candidates typically used common sense to answer this question, such as 'to gain more detailed information'. Some candidates elaborated to gain a second mark but more often candidates gave a second reason for the second mark.

1 (g)
For an ethics question, there were many candidates who did not provide an answer that gained full credit. Most were able to state two guidelines that could relate to children without sufficient elaboration for the second mark for each guideline. Most candidates were able to answer the question in the context of the study, referring to the age of the children involved, their lack of understanding and parental consent required. The second ethical issue was not answered as well, often referring to a generic ethical issue such as right to withdraw or distress without elaboration or reference to children as participants.

Question 2
2 (a)
The vast majority of candidates were able to pick up two or three marks. The common mistakes were that candidates stated they would use a random sample when actually they described an opportunity sample by using available gamblers, and that they would measure gambling behaviour – which simply restated the question stem. Answers that simply restated the question stem did not gain credit. A small number of candidates described how they would conduct a questionnaire or naturalistic observation despite being instructed to conduct an experiment. The question prompts helped structure the candidate answer. In general the psychological imagination and methodological understanding of most candidates impressed.

2 (b)(i)
Most candidates answered this well, although some stated the sampling technique used and on rare occasions did not state the method described in their plan (a).

2 (b)(ii)
If (b) (i) was answered correctly most candidates gained marks for evaluating the participant design. Some candidates did not fully express their evaluation to gain credit eg. 'this design means that there would be demand characteristics', which did not say why demand characteristics would be an issue or what this might involve. Candidates lost marks for simply stating a list of problems rather than explaining what the problems were and/or why.

2 (c)(i)
Most candidates accurately identified two variables that could feasibly affect the results of the planned study. Some answers were a little vague for credit, e.g. individual differences. Answers tended to be lengthy and explained how the variable identified would have an effect rather than merely stating it. This led to repetition in the following question.

2 (c)(ii)
Often repeated what had been explained in (ci). Music preference or addictive personality were the most popular answers, some were underdeveloped for both marks. Under developed answers failed to link the variable to the effect on the study findings.

Section 2: Applications of Psychology

Topic A: Child Psychology (5A)

A1 (a)
This was generally answered well by most candidates, typically gaining at least two marks for describing the child's behaviour when left alone and reunited with the caregiver. A few described the child's behaviour but did not make it clear what stage/episode they were referring to. A few described the behaviour of an avoidant or resistant attachment type, which did not gain credit.

A1 (b)
Typical answers evaluated the cultural bias of the procedure at great length, the ethical problems with the procedure and validity of the procedure. Some candidates referred to different attachment types (D) that was not found by Ainsworth, but was not a requirement of the question. Type D attachment was identified by the strange situation procedure. Credit was not given for describing how good the test is without qualifying the answer.

A1 (c)
Candidates tended to describe at length Bowlby's theory rather than focusing on the requirement of the question. The question allowed scope for evaluating any part of Bowlby's theory (internal working model, evolutionary basis, maternal deprivation hypothesis) but this did not seem to help many candidates who simply described the theory. Evaluation tended to focus on Bowlby's own research, Brazelton, Harlow and Lorenz, but some failed to say how the research supported the theory. Common answers discussed monotropy and multiple attachments, deprivation/privation, application to hospital practice and childcare facilities, blaming mothers and resilience of the child. Some candidates attempted to evaluate Bowlby's impact on the role of the mother in an incorrect manner.

A2 (a)
The Cockett and Tripp study was most commonly described well; the method and results described in detail, however many candidates did not state the aim or conclusion of the study so did not access the fifth mark for breadth of knowledge. A minority of candidates described an inappropriate study; some confused 'reordering' with 'reinstating' children back to original families from institutional care (Tizard and Hodges).

A2 (b)
Strong candidates were able to offer answers quoting the research of Richards and Amato to evaluate the findings of Cockett and Tripp, but many more offered generic evaluation points about reliability, sample size and ecological validity without qualification. Some used the GRAVE evaluation system without any real effect as they did not link points to the actual study being evaluated. Some candidates attempted to explain that there are other factors that could account for the effects of reordering, but did not identify what the factors were. If an inappropriate study was described in A2a, it was the same study evaluated here and could not be awarded marks based on the requirements of the question.

A2 (c)
Most candidates were able to offer some advice to parents, commonly explaining the need for regular contact, increased support, not assigning blame and discussing the situation to help the child understand. A few candidates felt that it was appropriate

for the child to be taken away gradually or placed in care. Most gained full marks for this question if the answer was sensible.

A3

The question required candidates to describe and evaluate research into popularity, and not to focus solely on the research methods used to measure popularity. Many candidates lost AO1 marks for simply describing sociometric measures, observation and interview techniques, although could gain AO2 marks if these techniques were evaluated in context. Many candidates did not explicitly state how factors, such as social skills, could affect popularity; whether it made it made children more popular or less. Strong AO2 focused on research supporting the factor having an affect on popularity and evaluating the research in terms of research methods used and ethics.

Topic B: Environmental Psychology (5B)

B1 (a)
Most candidates were able to define personal space as an invisible boundary. Additional credit was gained by offering a description of how the space changes under different circumstances.

B1 (b)
Gender, age and culture were the most common answers, most candidates gaining 1 mark for outlining how the factor affected personal space. Fewer candidates gained the second mark unless they elaborated, which suggests that candidates expected an ID mark.

B1 (c)
Strong answers referred to research studies into personal space and detailed what was found, some elaborating further to evaluate the described study. Generic evaluation points often failed to gain credit as they were too vague, often the same generic points were used to evaluate all research described.

B2 (a)
Most candidates were able to correctly define 'environmentally friendly behaviour' and describe an example such as recycling. Examples on their own could not gain credit without first defining what environmentally friendly behaviour was or why the example is environmentally friendly.

B2 (b)
The most common answer described consequent strategies such as reward and punishment, but often lacked enough description rather than knowledge. Candidates knew that punishment could be used but not why or how it could be used.

B2 (c)
Candidates that clearly identified reasons why people were not environmentally friendly - time, cost and inconvenience - gained credit quickly. Candidates did use research to show why people may not be environmentally friendly, but often the descriptions related to why people are environmentally friendly rather than the requirements of the question.

B2 (d)
There were some very strong answers by candidates who recommended the use of a variety of strategies such as reinforcement and using the Yale model of persuasion. Most candidates kept sight of the question and stronger answers made reference to the age group of the children and offered strategies that would be suitable for the age range e.g. using stickers as rewards for children, brightly coloured posters that clearly explain the issue and what action is needed, and older children in the school as role models.

B3
There tended to be better description than evaluation of theories of crowding; most popular being deindividuation, followed by contagion, and emergent norm theory. Deindividuation was described better than the other two theories; contagion theory in particular being a bit repetitive and lacking depth. Most candidates gained 3 marks for description. 1 mark was available for just identifying two theories. Evaluation tended to be weak; often supporting/refuting studies were mentioned without reference to the study findings, although candidates who cited research used Festinger

and Zimbardo quite successfully. Other evaluation points seemed limited to the rational behaviour of a crowd or peaceful gatherings. Some candidates misread the question or misapplied their knowledge and described the effects of crowding by describing Calhoun's study or referring to stress. This was a shame as there was a good knowledge of psychology shown despite gaining no AO1/2 marks.

Topic C: Health Psychology (5C)

C1 (a)
Most candidates gained one mark for a definition of psychological dependency being a need to take a drug to function normally. Very few elaborated further, those who did explained a need to feel good. There were very few who confused psychological and physiological dependency.

C1 (b)
There were many vague answers that referred to blocking reuptake, or producing more neurotransmitters, without stating which neurotransmitter was affected. Some answers were clearly wrong in relation to the drug identified, there were no identification marks available for the drug stated. Reference to how the drug affects feelings or the body in general was not linked to neurotransmitter functioning and did not receive credit. Good candidates were able to accurately explain how a drug affects neurotransmitter action with specific reference to the neurotransmitter affected and the agonist or antagonist process in a concise way. Heroin was the most common drug described.

C1 (c)
Candidates were not able to evaluate the influence of social factors on addiction well. Most candidates described, rather than evaluated, social factors, such as peers, availability of drugs and cultural norms. Research and evidence of these was given credit as evidence. Many candidates made the mistake of assuming Social Learning Theory was a social factor when it is a cognitive-behavioural explanation. Many described behavioural theories of classical and operant conditioning in great depth without every stating that they were alternative explanations for addiction. There were also some odd generalisations that working class people were addicted to all drugs, rather than specific ones. Some candidates could not rationalise working class addiction with lower income and hypothesised that higher classes were more addicted as they had a greater income.

C2 (a)
Many candidates described a campaign without explaining how it was used to raise awareness or simply restated the question that it was used to 'raise awareness and change attitudes'. When a health programme was described in terms of how it worked in terms of psychological theory/concepts full credit was given. Some candidates went on to evaluate the programme, although this should have been placed in the following question. Common answers included the use of incentive, role models, information, and fear.

C2 (b)
Health programmes were described in detail here when they should have been evaluated, but would have been more appropriate, and in many cases would have gained more marks, in 2a. Strong answers made good use of research and statistics, perception of vulnerability, and current health weighed against illness in the future. Many candidates cited AIDS campaigns and exploited the effect of the campaign on the behaviour of homosexual and heterosexual men and drug users. Assessment had to be more than anecdotal for credit and answers such as 'smoking bans seem to work', or 'nicotine fear adverts seem to scare people' was not detailed enough for credit. Current publicity into smoking and the effect on children's behaviour showed good awareness of recent programmes, and these were effectively linked to Social Learning Theory concepts.

C3

The most popular strategies were problem and emotion focused. Although, some lumped problem and emotion focused strategies together as one and then explained defence mechanisms. These answers were subject to the rules of rubric and best answers gained credit. Occasionally, there was reference to a hardy personality as a strategy to cope with stress; this only gained any credit if candidates explicitly stated that a person could learn to develop a hardier personality through training. Most were able to describe emotion and problem focused strategies briefly, although some struggled to elaborate on a definition of problem focused. Defence mechanisms were described well, particularly denial, displacement and repression. Evaluation typically referred to solving/not solving the problem long term and not being/being a useful strategy with stressors that cannot be dealt with (bereavement). Many candidates tended to use the same evaluation point for both strategies; this was only credited once as AO2. Stronger answers made good use of research such as 'Three Mile Long Island', Billings and Moos, dental hygiene programmes and cancer patients.

Unit 6766-01

Principal Examiner's report

General

Overall, candidates found this paper quite challenging and at times struggled to come to terms with the demands of the questions. On the whole, the challenges provided by the paper were well balanced, as all three questions focused on what might be regarded as the more challenging areas of this unit. Describing and comparing research methods, reference to the contribution to Psychology rather than society, social control and both social and moral implications and the nature/nurture debate, all kept candidates on their toes and required them to think carefully about the question before launching into a prepared answer. This made it quite difficult for candidates to produce prepared answers to the questions on this paper and where they did appear, sometimes they worked well (1c) and sometimes not (2d).

Candidates appeared to have managed their time reasonably well, although there were some short essays, but it is not clear if this was due to lack of time or simply being unable to answer the question in any more depth. The use of research studies and examples throughout the unit showed some lack of depth with the same ones appearing in a number of different answers, sometimes effectively, but often not. As last year, there were too many rhetorical questions and candidates should be encouraged again to answer the questions set, not to pose their own.

Questions 1 and 3 were the most popular on this paper, with notably fewer responses to question 2.

Question 1

1a(i)/1a(ii)

Most candidates were able to correctly identify a research method from each of the two approaches, with lab. experiments being the most popular for behavioural, and twin studies/brain scans for physiological. Similarly, most candidates were able to make some form of basic description of what is involved in the method, e.g. lab. experiments involve manipulation of the independent variable and measurement of the dependent variable, or twins can be compared to test the effect of genes on characteristics such as mental disorders. Some candidates were able to take this further and provide a reasonably full description of the method, referring to; the circumstances in which they take place, the type of data produced, and a relevant example (examples can only gain credit if they describe some aspect of the procedure).

However, 4 marks were rare on these two questions and candidates still encounter problems when asked to describe a method. Some candidates identified methods not commonly used in the behavioural method particularly, e.g. observations. When describing observations as their chosen method, some candidates would describe the process of experimentation as involving observation, but many were convinced it was appropriate and used versions of the Bandura experiments to back this up. There is clear manipulation involved in the Bandura studies and usually both a control and experimental group(s), so hopefully it is not the case that centres are encouraging candidates to regard these studies as observations. There were significantly less problems with the physiological approach, mainly because there are a lot more methods commonly used within this approach.

Further problems arise on these questions when candidates identify a method, possibly give one line of description and then spend the rest of their answer evaluating the method. This continues to be a problem in spite of continued

attempts to highlight this as an issue and, I rather suspect, continued attempts on the part of teachers to discourage their candidates from doing so. Nonetheless, it is important to keep trying to reinforce the need for candidates to describe when asked and save their evaluation for the likely follow up question.

1b

On this particular paper, of course, the follow up question was not to simply evaluate, but to compare. This proved to be very challenging and clearly showed that it is only the much stronger candidates that can do this well. When done well, candidates were able to provide both descriptive and evaluative points about their chosen methods (very often the ones chosen for the previous questions, but not always) and write in detail about what specifically makes them similar/different.

Common sources of comparison were lab. experiments and brain scans, but some compared lab. experiments and animal studies, which was equally acceptable. The best approaches came from either comparing very similar or very different methods.

Candidates could gain 1 mark for general points, e.g. 'both collect data in an objective way, so can be said to be scientific'. Candidates could gain 2 marks for more specific points, e.g. 'both methods are scientific because functional scans can give very detailed/accurate images of the activity within each part of the brain and lab. experiments are able to isolate one variable'.

Problems arose when candidates provided no direct comparison at all and chose instead to simply evaluate two methods entirely separately or to simply put the word 'whereas' in the middle of these two paragraphs. This approach gained little credit, but as it could be regarded as implicit comparison, 1 mark was given for each set of evaluation points. No further marks were given for unconnected descriptive points however.

1c

The pleasing aspect of this question was the large number of candidates focusing on the question in comparison to the last time a question of this sort was asked. Most candidates focused on the contribution to **Psychology** rather than the contribution to **society** for some or all of their answer. This may have been due to the cue in the question to focus on these aspects, but candidates did seem to be much better prepared than last year.

Most candidates chose psychodynamic and cognitive for their two approaches, although a significant minority used one of those two and social. Very few other approaches were considered and the best answers usually came from the cognitive and psychodynamic choice. A small number described the 'clinical' or 'criminal' approach and gained no marks as these were inappropriate answers. Most were able to say something about key assumptions and give a general idea of the in-depth areas of study for each approach. Weaker answers would provide a vague reference to why the approach is useful to Psychology generally, e.g. 'helped Psychology to be taken seriously' or 'helped to make Psychology scientific', without elaboration. This would be followed up by identification of key assumptions/in-depth areas of study, again without much elaboration. Such candidates tended to provide little relevant evaluation, although some marks could be gained by evaluating the methods used and a large number of candidates took this approach.

Stronger answers tended to; develop on the key assumptions, explain the in-depth areas of study in some detail, and provide some detail on the theoretical aspects of the applications (usually explanations for mental disorders). Such candidates were able to provide evaluation of both the methods and question the usefulness of the contribution with reference studies. However, research was rather thin on the ground for both approaches and when used was sometimes inappropriate, e.g. Loftus

and Palmer was used to support the contribution to eyewitness testimony, which is clearly a contribution to society, not Psychology.
Most candidates fell into the trap of bringing in contributions to society at some point in their essay, either very early on after referring to the key assumptions or much later and usually after having referred to explanations for mental disorders. The most common use of inappropriate material was in reference to therapies/treatments for mental disorders, although eyewitness testimony was often used in the cognitive answer.

Question 2

2a
Most candidates were able to provide some definition of the term, either from a psychological, sociological or dictionary point of view. Given the wording of the question, any of these were acceptable.
Some candidates were able to elaborate on the basic idea of 'using psychological techniques to influence people's behaviour' with reference to an appropriate example, however, some candidates merely mentioned an example, e.g. Aversion Therapy, with no explanation of what is involved.

2b
Considering this was an AO1 question, which only required candidates to describe what is involved in two types of social control, it was answered surprisingly poorly. The most successful attempts to answer the question came from candidates that identified the 'Describe two such areas' injunction as an instruction to describe what is involved in a couple of treatments, e.g. Aversion Therapy and Token Economy. Those candidates that focused on describing two such areas were able to pick up marks relatively easily.
Candidates that focused on the context in which the question was set rather than the injunction, i.e. implications for the individual regarding social control and discussed issues arising from the use of these treatments picked up few marks. Some candidates did refer directly to the cues in the question, e.g. reducing prejudice/managing problem behaviour, but very often still went on to talk about issues arising from the use of these areas, rather than what is involved.
This question shows very clearly the need for candidates to focus on the question set and particularly the injunction, before embarking on their answer. Too many candidates gave answers to this question which would have been much more appropriate as an answer to question 2c.

2c
Having used a lot of the material for this question in their answer to question 2b, it would have been nice to see candidates recognising their mistake and producing the same material as they had used in 2b in response to this question (maybe even going back and changing their answer to 2b). In some cases this did happen and some candidates reproduced a lot of the material from their previous answer to gain reasonable marks on this question. However, some candidates appeared to recognise that there was a need to produce different material in response to each question and now produced the material they should have used in response to 2b, i.e. they described (inappropriately) two types of social control, usually two treatments/therapies.
The focus of this question was clearly on moral implications and therefore candidates were required to assess social control areas related to their effects on individuals. This could include reference to whether the area is designed to help the individual or

society, reference to ethical issues, but could not include reference to the extent to which society alone would benefit, which is clearly a social implication.
Most candidates referred to clinical treatments/therapies in their answers, with weaker answers only mentioning one or two of these and not elaborating on any of the points to provide a proper assessment. Stronger candidates were able to use these **and** refer to other areas, e.g. advertising and sales techniques, to provide a fuller answer.

2d
Certainly, the most poorly answered of the three essays and the one which benefited the least from producing prepared material. Undoubtedly, most candidates had been prepared to describe studies and explain the social implications of these studies. This question diverted from that, whilst remaining within the spirit of the specification and asked candidates to still refer to those social implications, but now to evaluate relevant research. Candidates should still have been able to refer to the studies they had prepared for this question, but just apply them to the demands of this specific question.
Better answers were able to do this and provide relevant points about how studies such as Milgram, Rosenhan, Bowlby, Gottesman, etc have implications for society in terms of the effect (either positive or negative) their research has had on society in bringing about some change in either attitude or policy. Given that the question asked about research, it was equally acceptable for candidates to refer to theories such as Social Learning Theory and describe its effects.
Some candidates were unable to successfully adjust to the demands of the question and merely provided their prepared answer, by describing studies and then going on to either explain the social implications and gain some AO1 marks, or realise their mistake (too late) and now go on to attempt to fulfil the demands of the question by evaluating the studies they had previously described. Consequently, some candidates scored much more highly on AO2 than AO1 on this question. Once again, evaluation was likely to be just methods based, rather than bringing in further research studies. Weaker answers used very general methodological evaluation, whereas stronger answers made it relevant to this particular study.

Question 3

3a
Most candidates were able to make some comment about the nature/nurture debate and gain at least 1 mark, e.g. this debate is concerned with whether our genes or environment affect our behaviour. A reasonable number of candidates could then go further and elaborate on what nature is and what nurture is and gain 1 or 2 more marks depending on the depth of their response. A few were able to include both of these elements and then go on to provide a relevant example to show how some characteristic could be influenced by either nature or nurture, e.g. schizophrenia. The final mark could also be gained by making the interactionist point, i.e. that behaviour could be the result of a mixture of both nature and nurture.
Most candidates were able to provide a couple of the possible points outlined above, with only a few able to provide all of them. Some candidates were able to attempt all of them, but didn't gain full marks due to lack of clarity or elaboration.

3b
Again, most candidates were able to make some comment about how one approach (usually behavioural or physiological) was either based around nurture or nature due to its focus on 'learning from the environment' or 'influence of genetics' etc. The

extent to which candidates were able to go beyond this and elaborate on *different* areas of this approach determined whether they were able to gain further marks. By focusing on the different areas of each approach, e.g. hormones, neurotransmitters, areas of the brain, in their answer, candidates were able to pick up further marks. By simply using different words to make essentially the same point about genetics, for example, candidates were severely limited in terms of the number of further marks they could pick up.
Some candidates were able to use other approaches successfully, e.g. psychodynamic or cognitive developmental, by explaining how they are influenced by both nature and nurture. However, when attempting these approaches, some candidates limited themselves by suggesting that the approach was only influenced by one or the other. Some claimed they were entirely nature, whilst others claimed the opposite, such an approach would rarely gain more than half marks.

3c
This question proved to be problematic for most candidates, with very few candidates gaining high marks and only the very best candidates able to provide enough relevant points to gain full marks.
Most candidates had some idea what the question was about and could give a very vague idea that it is indeed difficult and that most behaviours are influenced by both. The extent to which they elaborated on this point determined what marks, if any, they gained in their answer. Some could not elaborate at all and could only reiterate the fact that it is difficult and gain no marks. Others could go a little further and refer to examples like Gottesman to show how it is difficult to separate twins from their environment and gain 1 or 2 marks. Some candidates didn't really engage with the question at all and simply described the influence of nature on some characteristic and then went on to describe the influence of nurture on that characteristic, gaining just 1 mark for the whole thing.
More sophisticated answers would refer to the influence of the womb environment before birth and would refer to a few different examples to gain higher marks, although examples of this type of answer were rare.
As with many of the other questions on this paper, candidates were limited by the fairly narrow range of research they were using in their responses.

3d
This was by far the most accessible of the three essays on this paper and allowed candidates to describe and evaluate pretty much any two studies that they felt like. As the injunction merely asked them to describe and evaluate two studies in the context of nature/nurture, all they had to do was describe and evaluate the two with some reference to nature/nurture at some point. The only limits placed on candidates in this question were that they could only gain 2 AO1 marks for describing the method/procedure and that at least one of their evaluation points had to make some reference to nature/nurture. The most popular studies were Milgram, Bandura, Gottesman, Curtiss and Watson and Rayner.
Most candidates were able to describe the procedure of two studies reasonably well and provide some form of methodological evaluation. Better answers gave the aim, method/procedure, results and conclusion in some detail and with good clarity and then went on to evaluate in detail, using specific methodological points which questioned the nature/nurture credentials of the study.
Weaker answers would provide a rather vague and sometimes generic description of the method, particularly when describing Bandura. Similarly, the evaluation would be very general and make assertions such as 'lacking ecological validity' without elaboration and little or no reference to nature/nurture.

Concluding points

This paper has reinforced the need for candidates to read the questions, and particularly the injunctions, more carefully. As has been stated in the past, if candidates are going to score highly on this unit, they are going to need to refer to research/studies that enable them to respond creatively to the question, rather than rote learning a particular response.

Grade boundaries

6761

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	51	46	42	38	34
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6762

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	42	37	32	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6763

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	52	47	42	37	33
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6764/01

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	42	37	32	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6764/02

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	42	37	33	29	25
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6764/04

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	43	38	34	30	26
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6764/05

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	42	37	32	27	23
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6764/07

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	43	38	33	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6765/01

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	46	41	36	32	28
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6765/02

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	46	41	36	32	28
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6765/03

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	46	41	37	33	29
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

6766

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	72	41	36	31	27	23
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA020385 Summer 2008

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH