

# CONTENTS

---

<b>PSYCHOLOGY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>GCE Advanced Level and GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Paper 9698/01 Core Studies 1 .....	1
Paper 9698/02 Core Studies 2 .....	4
Paper 9698/03 Specialist Choices .....	6

---

## FOREWORD

This booklet contains reports written by Examiners on the work of candidates in certain papers. **Its contents are primarily for the information of the subject teachers concerned.**



# PSYCHOLOGY

---

## GCE Advanced Level and GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level

Paper 9698/01

Core Studies 1

### General comments

Examining always provides a mixture of emotions! It is always a delight to read impressive answers where candidates have clearly worked very hard and it is a pleasure to reward the efforts of such candidates with a very high mark. However, it is frustrating to read answers which start with **Section A** short-answer questions written in so much detail that it is apparent that such candidates will 'run out of time' when they get to the essay question. Examiners do not understand this strategy. Why write so much for so few marks in **Section A** and then so little for so many marks for the **Section B** essay? There is also the disappointment when candidates have not revised sufficiently or when they do not seem to have studied any psychology at all.

### Comments on specific questions

#### **Section A**

##### **Question 1**

This question required candidates to give any two differences between experiment 1 and experiment 2 in the Loftus and Palmer study. Some answers scored no marks because candidates were apparently unaware that there were two experiments. Others scored maximum marks because two differences were provided. Any difference was accepted such as the number of participants, the number of conditions of the independent variable, the measure of the dependent variable or the delay between presentation of the conditions and the collection of the data.

##### **Question 2**

This question focused on the pictorial perception review by Deregowski. The major conclusion from this was that the perception of pictures is learned. Most candidates correctly stated this, although some candidates confused terms when stating that it was learned (nature) and not inherited (nurture). If the perception of pictures is learned (as was asked in part **(b)**) then pictures cannot be used as a universal language.

**Question 3**

This question on the 'project Washoe' study required candidates to provide two examples of the way in which Washoe was said to have learned language (which is more than the ability to communicate). Gardner and Gardner themselves suggested a list of features Washoe was said to possess including differentiation and sentence combinations. Other writers have suggested Washoe had arbitrariness, semanticity and other features of language. Marks were scored initially for identifying a feature and then a further mark for explaining the feature or giving an example of it.

**Question 4**

This question from the Samuel and Bryant study required candidates to understand the central concept of conservation, in this case applied to number. Whilst most candidates were able to do this successfully, many could not. Conservation is the ability to understand that the number of items remains the same even though the way in which they are arranged may change. Part **(b)** asked for any one finding related to the conservation of number. The two more apparent answers were that children find it easier to conserve number before mass or volume and secondly that younger children make more errors on any conservation task than older children.

**Question 5**

This question required two findings from the study by Bandura, Ross and Ross on the imitation of aggression. Bandura et. al. list a number of main findings which include: the children who saw the aggressive model made more aggressive acts than the children who saw the non-aggressive model; boys made more aggressive acts than girls; boys in the aggressive conditions showed more aggression if the model was male than if the model was female; the girls in the aggressive conditions also showed more physical aggression if the model was male but more verbal aggression if the model was female; and others such as imitative and non-imitative gun play. Most candidates were able to provide two differences with little difficulty.

**Question 6**

This question on the Hodges and Tizard study asked for two problems that were encountered when conducting their longitudinal study. In order to gain maximum marks two components were required in the answer: (i) a problem of a longitudinal study which must (ii) be related to the Hodges and Tizard study. Most candidates successfully wrote that attrition is a problem and commented on the number of participants that were lost during the study, which fulfills both of the above-mentioned requirements. The second problem caused more difficulty with many candidates struggling to provide an answer.

**Question 7**

In their study on sleep and dreaming, Dement and Kleitman used a number of controls: all participants had to sleep in the laboratory; they had to refrain from caffeine or alcohol (which is one control rather than two different ones); they had electrodes attached to their head; they were woken by a bell and they had to recall into a tape recorder next to their bed. Any two controls such as these or any other that is appropriate would gain marks.

**Question 8**

The original aim of the study on obedience by Milgram, as was required in part **(a)**, was to test his 'Germans are different' hypothesis, assuming that they must have some 'personality defect' given their apparent readiness to obey authority without question. Part **(b)** required a consideration of what Milgram concluded from his findings. Milgram's conclusion was that the Germans were not different; that American participants were just as likely to be obedient to an authority figure (even in peace-time). Most candidates were able to answer both parts with little difficulty.

**Question 9**

In their study on emotion, Schachter and Singer used two main methods: standardised observation through a one-way mirror, and a self report questionnaire using number of scales. Description of either of these methods would score maximum marks for part **(a)**. For part **(b)** any advantage of either of these methods scored marks. Many candidates decided to write about the questionnaire which was used as part of the procedure to elicit anger in the participants. This questionnaire was part of the procedure and it was not used to record the responses of the participants as the question asked.

**Question 10**

This question asked candidates to outline two ethical issues. One would expect candidates to have few problems in relating ethics to the Haney et. al. study, but this proved not to be the case. To gain full marks candidates had to identify an ethical issue (such as harm, consent, deception) and then relate the study to the particular issue. Many candidates provided unethical descriptions from the study but failed to relate the description to an issue.

**Question 11**

The study by Tajfel on intergroup categorisation often confuses a number of candidates and this did not prove the exception on this occasion. The boys were given three choices, as stated in the question, and if the study is understood, then the correct answer is evident. Many candidates correctly stated, for part **(a)**, that the boys chose maximum difference and then, for part **(b)**, correctly explained why that was so. However, many candidates still believed the boys chose maximum profit and so failing to understand that profit was not important but that maximising the difference between them and the out-group was.

**Question 12**

In the review by Gould on intelligence testing the recruits were given three tests to determine their levels of intelligence: army alpha, army beta and an individual interview. Most candidates answered this part successfully. In fact most candidates could also answer part **(b)** correctly, which asked for one reason why the recruits performed poorly on the tests.

**Question 13**

Ethnocentrism comprises two components: the belief that one's own group is superior and the belief that another group is inferior. In Tajfel's terms that one has in-group favouritism and out-group discrimination. Reference to both these components was required in order to gain maximum marks. Part **(b)** related this to the Hraba and Grant study, and when the children chose their doll of their own colour they were ethnocentric.

**Question 14**

In the Rosenhan study the pseudo-patients were those (psychologists, housewife, etc.) who volunteered to fake symptoms of mental illness in order to gain admission to various mental institutions. Most candidates answered this part **(a)** correctly. However, many incorrectly believed that the pseudo-patients were the participants. In a very general sense everyone does *participate*, and this would mean that in every study the experimenter also *participates*, but it is usual to assume that the experimenter (or confederates/stooges) manipulate the behaviour of some unsuspecting participant. In this study the experimenter (Rosenhan) and his stooges (the pseudo-patients who knew what to expect) influenced the behaviour of the hospital staff (doctors and nurses). The correct answer to part **(b)** was, therefore, the hospital staff.

**Question 15**

Thigpen and Cleckley used a number of tests; one psychometric test was the intelligence test and one projective test was the Rorschach (Ink blot) test. Some candidates thought the EEG test was psychometric but it is not. In response to part **(b)** most candidates correctly stated that one Eve had an IQ of 110 and the other 104, or referred to the findings of the Rorschach test where one Eve was regressive and the other repressive.

**Section B****Question 16**

This question focused on the physiological approach and the chosen studies could include Schachter and Singer, Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse or Sperry. Most candidates chose the Schachter and Singer study although this was not a popular question overall, particularly for weaker candidates. Part **(a)** asked for a description of the physiological processes involved in the chosen study, and most candidates were able to provide good, relevant detail, most scoring high marks. Part **(b)** asked about the main findings of the chosen study, and again, most candidates were able to provide a reasonably wide-ranging list of appropriate features. Part **(c)** asked about the strengths and weaknesses of the physiological approach and it is here where many candidates began to struggle. Candidates should really know a number of advantages and disadvantages (or strengths and weaknesses). This need not be complicated: physiological data is usually much more objective or scientific than say self report data; but physiological data is often lacking in ecological validity because it is often studied in a laboratory in isolation from behaviour in an everyday environment, for example. Part **(d)** asked for an alternative way of gathering data and on this occasion candidates followed the familiar pattern of 'running out of time' despite this question part carrying ten marks. The alternative need not be an alternative method; it merely needs to be an alternative.

**Question 17**

This question looked at research conducted in everyday environments and the chosen studies included Freud, Baron-Cohen, Leslie and Frith and Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin. Part **(a)** asked for a description of the features of the everyday environment in which the chosen study was conducted. Most candidates were able to provide good answers with appropriate detail. Similarly some very good answers were observed in response to part **(b)** which asked for an outline of the main findings of the chosen study. Part **(c)** asked about the advantages and disadvantages of studying behaviour in everyday environments. Whereas some candidates had prepared well and were able to offer a range of appropriate points, many had not and struggled to provide anything more than common-sense guesses. For part **(d)** many candidates made reasonable suggestions for alternative ways in which data could be gathered. On the one hand the more able candidate often provided more detailed explanations of how their suggestions would work, and on the other, there were those who could not develop their suggestion beyond a few sentences or so, appearing not to have thought about this type of question.

<p><b>Paper 9698/02</b></p>
-----------------------------

<p><b>Core Studies 2</b></p>
------------------------------

**General comments**

The paper was answered well by many candidates and a full range of answers was seen. Very few rubric errors were made and candidates seemed to finish the paper in the time given. Some candidates lost marks on **Section A** through failing to distinguish between 'identify' and 'outline' requests. Where candidates are asked to 'identify' one word answers are sufficient but a more detailed answer is required when 'outline', 'describe' or 'explain' is used. Some candidates had obviously had a good amount of practice at the essay questions where other candidates seemed less well versed in structuring the essays in the required format. Studying the mark scheme is beneficial in this respect.

**Comments on specific questions****Section A****Question 1**

- (a)** This question was answered well and showed a good understanding of ethical issues. Marks were only lost where candidates did not know the details of the study and gave incorrect answers.
- (b)** Most candidates were able to give a good answer, for example relating to the need to deceive participants in order to avoid demand characteristics.

**Question 2**

There was a range of answers given to this question which showed insight into the study. Candidates commonly wrote about the increase in conservation skills with age being due to the maturational process which was either explained in terms of nature or nurture.

**Question 3**

- (a) Many candidates described details of the observation procedure including the use of a one way mirror and observation checklist. Where candidates did not know the study in sufficient detail a general description of the study was given rather than specifics of how the observations were carried out.
- (b) Some candidates merely gave a definition of reliability, whilst others showed little understanding of the term. Better answers included details of the checklist and standardised procedure.

**Question 4**

- (a) Most candidates were able to describe the questions which measured both racial preference and racial identification; weaker answers merely stated 'doll choice'.
- (b) An impressive number of candidates were able to talk about reductionism and how the use of dolls to measure racial identification and preference was a very simplistic way of measuring such complex processes. Where there was no understanding of reductionism, candidates did not attempt this question.

**Question 5**

- (a) This proved to be a straightforward question for most candidates who could easily describe one finding from the study by Milgram.
- (b) Many candidates gave good answers referring to concepts such as ecological validity and demand characteristics together with details from the study to support.

**Section B****Question 6**

Good answers to part (a) provided details of how the situations in each of the studies influenced behaviour and experience, for example materials or methods used in Deregowski, or the actual environment such as the hospitals in Rosenhan's study. In part (b), candidates gained marks for talking about demand characteristics, ethnocentrism, ethics etc. Any relevant point supported with details from one of the studies was awarded marks. In part (c) candidates gave an impressive range of answers and were able to discuss many influences on behaviour other than the situation including cognitive factors and physiological factors.

**Question 7**

Part (a) presented little difficulty for candidates who were able to describe the psychometric tests used in each of the studies apart from the Baron-Cohen study where the Sally-Anne test was sometimes offered as the psychometric test used rather than the IQ tests used to control for intelligence between the three groups of students. Part (b) was answered well by candidates who were able to provide two strengths and weaknesses of psychometric tests. Weaker answers gave only one strength/weakness and were unable to provide a second. Part (c) provided a good stimulus for some thoughtful answers which discussed the extent to which psychometric tests are a valid measure of cognitive processes. Even less able candidates were able to give opinions on the statement given.

**Question 8**

Better answers to part (a) gave an overview of what the studies tell us about human behaviour and experience for example what the study by Loftus and Palmer tells us about eyewitness testimony or the nature of memory in general. Weaker answers merely gave the results of the studies with no interpretation or conclusions made. Part (b) asked for problems of describing human behaviour and experience using numbers which most candidates could do although some had difficulty coming up with four problems whilst others merely gave problems of the studies with no reference to using numbers. Part (c) was generally answered well with candidates giving a good range of ideas about the benefits of using a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative approaches, better answers gave examples from the studies or beyond.

<p><b>Paper 9698/03</b> <b>Specialist Choices</b></p>
---

**General comments**

As always the answers provided by candidates ranged from the spectacularly impressive to those who seemed to have studied no psychology at all. Many candidates could improve performance if they followed the advice in this report. As has been said in previous reports in order to be successful candidates need to demonstrate that they have followed the syllabus, have studied some psychology and understood how relevant terms and concepts can be applied.

In order to be successful candidates must have some understanding of two essential components:

- They must have knowledge that is relevant to their two chosen options and the best sources of information are the recommended texts as outlined in the syllabus.
- They must apply that knowledge to the requirements of the mark scheme, which specifies exactly what marks are awarded for. Consultation of mark schemes is even more important because they include extensive indicative content. Indicative content is the information that Examiners are expecting candidates to include in their examination answers and is generally taken directly from the recommended texts. Reference to mark schemes from a number of examination sessions can be extremely useful to both teachers and candidates, as can the report to Centres.

**Comments on specific questions***Psychology and Education***Section A****Question 1**

The term 'gifted' typically refers to the educational ability of those who are statistically not normal but who are at the top end of the normal distribution curve. For part **(b)** candidates had to describe one way in which giftedness could be measured. This is often done by exceptional performance on an intelligence test, which most candidates described. Other psychologists believe that giftedness is a more specific ability such as in sport or music. Bridges (1969) and Tempest (1974) outline signs of giftedness, Bridges with seven (for example children who read at 3 years of age and have enormous energy) and Tempest with nine (children are likely to be highly competitive and able to deal with abstract problems). Very few candidates referred to factors such as these. Part **(c)** asked how gifted children could be educated. Most candidates were able to mention two of:

- acceleration: bright children are promoted to a higher class than normal
- segregation: bright children are selected for particular schools or classes
- enrichment: done within a normal classroom and can involve extra-curricular activity and individualised learning programmes with independent learning possible.

**Question 2**

Part **(a)** required an explanation of design and layout of classroom environments, and these are features of the architecture and contents of any area where education takes place. Part **(b)** required any two features of learning environments which may affect learning. Whilst candidates could often identify features they could not provide detail or refer to any psychological evidence. Relevant evidence could include: open plan schools versus 'traditional' designs; the effect of number of windows or amount of light (e.g. Ahrentzen, 1982); the effects of temperature (e.g. Pepler, 1972); classroom layout: (a discovery learning room) with availability of resources; use of wall space: too much vs too little (e.g. Porteus, 1972); seating arrangements: sociofugal vs sociopetal (rows vs horseshoe vs grouped); classroom capacity: how many children the room is designed for. For part **(c)** one study was required and a good example would be the study by Bronzaft (1975) where reading ages of children were much lower on the side of the school next to an elevated railway in New York. Rubber tracks and soundproofing were installed and 3 years later reading ages had improved. Candidates quoting psychological evidence always score higher marks than those who do not.

**Section B****Question 3**

A question on individual differences in educational performance is always one that is answered in general terms and this year answers were no different. Candidates often give examples of differences rather than referring to the reasons that may underlie the difference. Answers to part **(b)** often lacked issues with more general points being the norm. Answers to part **(c)** could be taken from other parts of the syllabus as the boys could be segregated, have their learning style modified, be motivated or apply some behavioural strategy that would modify their behaviour.

**Question 4**

This question concerned teaching and learning styles. Whilst many candidates successfully made the distinction between the two, many candidates still do not understand the crucial difference between the way children are taught and the way in which they learn. For part **(a)** more able candidates described a range of styles and often referred to how styles are measured. Part **(b)** often had disappointing evaluation but those mentioning measures had more to evaluate. Part **(c)** provided answers that were generally disappointing. Candidates were seemingly unable to write about the strategies they had used in order to prepare for this examination.

*Psychology and Environment***Section A****Question 5**

Part **(a)** asked for an explanation of the term 'density' (rather than crowding). Density is the physical conditions of a given space and is not psychological. Part **(b)** required two studies which have been done on the effect of crowding on social behaviour. Social behaviour includes aggression and helping amongst others so candidates had a significant amount of research to base their answers upon. However, many candidates chose not to refer to psychological evidence but to give anecdotal examples based on their common-sense experience. The studies by Dukes and Jorgensen on 'dirty dishes' and the Bickman 'post a letter' studies on helping behaviour appear frequently in text books and would be apposite here. Part **(c)** was often poorly answered, with candidates yet again giving anecdotal opinion rather than showing their psychological knowledge.

**Question 6**

Part **(a)** as always required an explanation of terms and for this question community environmental design is the design of buildings for public use and most typically involves the design of shopping centres/malls and design of housing communities. Part **(b)** asked for one effect of urban living on social behaviour and here candidates could have included one of the studies by Krupat (1982), Milgram (1977), Altman (1969) or Amato (1969). For the one study looking at the effects of urban living on health candidates could have included the study by Franck (1974) where students who were urban newcomers experienced significantly more tension than others. Rather than write answers based on these studies candidates yet again failed to impress with anecdotes. Part **(c)** continued the trend of poor answers, where very few could quote a relevant study of successful housing design.

**Section B****Question 7**

The area of noise is very popular and is one of the most detailed in recommended text books. Despite this, noise questions are often chosen by weaker candidates who know very little psychology and think they know something about noise. This is not the case! As is said throughout this report, the quoting of psychological evidence is essential. Here, as with all **Section B** questions, candidates had a free choice to include any relevant information about noise of their choosing. If part **(a)** has carefully chosen evidence then evaluation issues for part **(b)** follow logically and unambiguously. Without evidence in part **(a)**, part **(b)** becomes a struggle. Part **(c)** asked about the positive uses of sound, such as music. Studies have found that music can reduce stress (health option), can improve learning performance (education option) and can help factory or industrial workers reduce boredom (organisations option). There is little evidence relating noise to abnormality!



**Question 8**

Yet again despite the fact that collective behaviour and crowding are different syllabus areas, many candidates still write incorrectly about crowding rather than collective behaviour. Those writing about crowding often score very few and frequently no marks at all. Collective behaviour concerns a number of people gathered together for a variety of purposes and in most cases it is a relatively pleasant experience. The area of collective behaviour is fascinating and relevant material includes the work of Le Bon on mob psychology, Zimbardo on deindividuation, where each person is nameless, faceless, and anonymous and has diminished fear of retribution. It includes the Schank and Abelson work on script schemata or the work by Reicher on social identity theory. Candidates including any of the above mentioned evidence in their answers would score marks. Part **(c)** asked specifically about deindividuation and how this could be reduced. Whereas more able candidates made appropriate suggestions there were candidates who could not provide any answer at all.

*Psychology and Health***Section A****Question 9**

Part **(a)** required an explanation of the term 'adherence to medical advice' and most answers scored maximum marks for this unambiguous term. Part **(b)** required two reasons why people do not adhere. Many candidates impressively quoted relevant studies which more typically included: Becker & Rosenstock's (1984) health belief model where patients weigh up the pros or benefits of taking action against the cons or barriers of taking action and make a decision based on their assessment of these factors. Bulpitt's work on the side effects of treatment is also relevant as are other studies such as that by Ley where patients confuse instructions about treatment. Part **(c)** required one study looking at how adherence could be improved and again relevant evidence was often quoted.

**Question 10**

Most candidates struggle with definitions of stress because they are often long and complex. Despite this, most candidates impressed sufficiently and gained maximum marks. Part **(b)** asked for two ways in which stress could be measured. This could include one physiological measure (such as blood pressure) and one psychological measure or even two different psychological measures. Psychological measures include the use of questionnaires and the three most commonly quoted are the Holmes & Rahe (1967) Social Readjustment Rating Scale; the Kanner et al (1981) Hassles and Uplifts checklist and the Friedman & Rosenman (1974) Type A personality. Part **(c)** looked for one way in which stress could be managed and here most candidates could make a relevant suggestion with little difficulty.

**Section B****Question 11**

This question on health promotion again allowed candidates the freedom to write about whatever aspects of health promotion they had studied. However, many candidates think that writing about what they have done in school, seen on television or what is happening in their community is sufficient. Although what is written is often interesting to read it is frequently not sufficient. If it were related to psychological studies or methods then it would be better but as always the best strategy is to quote published psychological studies. Relevant methods include fear arousal and providing information and the syllabus states that candidates should have studied promotion programmes in schools, worksites and communities. As already stated elsewhere, it is much more difficult to evaluate anecdotal evidence and this proved to be the case yet again with those candidates using evidence providing much better evaluative answers. Part **(c)** asked about a worksite programme and again those quoting a relevant study such as the Johnson and Johnson 'live for life' or the Gomel anti-smoking study scored higher marks than those who quoted no study at all.

**Question 12**

Answers in the area of health and safety more than any other for this option need a psychological basis because so many answers are written by candidates who provide very poor answers. It is often assumed that health and safety is no more than mere common sense and the relating of stories of parents telling them to be careful at home or how to cross a road safely is sufficient to gain an A Level in psychology. Candidates could usefully look at Theory A, the person approach: accidents caused by the unsafe behaviour of people and Theory B, the systems approach: where accidents are caused by unsafe systems at work. More specifically candidates could look at: accident prone personality; human error and the illusion of invulnerability or risk homeostasis or some transient state (such as lack of sleep). Evaluation in part **(b)** was mixed and poorer answers merely re-wrote what was in part **(a)**. Part **(c)** required candidates to write about the reduction of accidents in the home and here again were the anecdotal compared to the 'empirical' candidate.

*Psychology and Abnormality***Section A****Question 13**

This question required an explanation of terms as do all **Section A** part **(a)** questions. For this question abnormal learning includes any type of learning abnormality that a child would typically exhibit in a classroom. Most typically this would include autism, dyslexia (and related difficulties such as dyscalculia) and ADHD (attention deficit with/without hyperactivity). Part **(b)** asked not only for one type of abnormal learning, as above, but also one possible cause. Whilst candidates were able to answer the former competently, they often had difficulty in answering the latter. Part **(c)** asked for a suggestion on how abnormal learning may be overcome. Whilst the usual giving of the drug Ritalin was prominent, the occasional candidate focused on different types of schooling. For example Powell (2000) lists a number of strategies for children with autism and Selikowitz (1998) lists strategies for overcoming dyslexia, with specific strategies depending on whether the problem is a reading, spelling or writing error.

**Question 14**

For part **(a)** abnormal adult development is a general neurological degeneration that occurs as the human body deteriorates with age. Nearly all candidates provided appropriate answers here. Part **(b)** required two types of degenerative abnormality and most candidates chose Alzheimers disease and Picks disease, both of which involve atrophy of brain cells resulting in pre-senile dementia. Often Korsakoff's psychosis was mentioned which is also relevant. Part **(c)** required a suggestion of how one of these may be reduced. This is a difficult question as there is no known cure, simply suggestions of how its effects can be reduced.

**Section B****Question 15**

Candidates produced some disappointing answers in response to this question and very few candidates chose this question to answer. For part **(a)** very few candidates looked at historical explanations of abnormality, most being content to focus on the classifications of the DSM. Some chose to look at the behavioural, psychoanalytic and humanistic explanations but this tended to be rare. For part **(b)** evaluation was adequate but disappointing. The mark scheme is the same for all questions and the emphasis is always on evaluation issues. Part **(c)** caused very few problems and was well answered as all candidates know at least one abnormality and how it can be treated.

**Question 16**

The 'depression' question was by far the most popular and by now candidates have well-prepared answers. Disappointingly some candidates misinterpreted the question, choosing to write about the different syllabus area of abnormal affect due to trauma. Candidates who were prepared for this question wrote some impressive part **(b)** answers but there were others who failed to evaluate and so did not score many marks. Part **(c)** asked how abnormal affect may be overcome and here candidates could relate many of the treatments clearly and accurately.

*Psychology and Organisations***Section A****Question 17**

Part **(a)** asked for an explanation of what is meant by the term 'management style'. It is typically the way in which a leader directs a group toward the attainment of goals. Part **(b)** asked for two theories of leadership. This question part was very well answered by most candidates, many of whom wrote far more than was necessary to achieve a maximum six marks. The two most commonly mentioned were McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Theory Y and Fiedler's contingency model (Fiedler, 1967). Behavioural theories of leadership were rarely mentioned and neither was the Charismatic (or transformational) leaders approach. Part **(c)** asked about leader-worker interaction and generally this was poorly answered. Dansereau et. al.'s (1975) leader-member exchange model would be most relevant here.

**Question 18**

For part **(a)** organisational work conditions refers to the conditions of the working environment and this involves both physical and psychological aspects. Part **(b)** required a description of one physical and one psychological condition. As always this question attracted those weaker candidates who think they understand what an 'organisational work condition' is, but who then struggle to include appropriate information in their answers. Physical conditions include factors such as illumination, temperature, noise, motion, pollution and aesthetic factors such as music and colour. Psychological conditions include privacy or crowding, status/anonymity and importance/unimportance. Vibration, body movement and posture (e.g. seating or lifting) can also be added. Part **(c)** asked about reducing the negative effects of work environments but yet again, candidates often assumed that some common-sense answer would suffice.

**Section B****Question 19**

Communication within organisations is a popular area but many candidates tend not to vary from the traditional communication network format. Other relevant information would include varieties of communication: phone, face-to-face, meeting, memo, newsletter, employee handbooks, reports, e-mail, voice-mail, teleconference, etc. It could also include a consideration of organisational structures: downward, upward and horizontal/lateral; barriers to effective communication such as filtering, censoring or exaggeration. It could include breakdown: impression management, self confidence, competence; mistrust; defensiveness; and under-communication. If a number of these were included in part **(a)** then effective evaluation would be more likely in response to part **(b)**. Part **(c)** asked for a suggestion of how upward communication could be improved. Yet again the extremes of anecdotal and hard psychological evidence were observed. Relevant evidence would be the studies by Machin (1980) and Marchington (1987) who suggests 'team-briefing'. Also relevant would be employee suggestion systems; grievance systems; open-door policies; employee surveys; participative decision making; corporate hotlines; brown bag meetings and skip-level meetings.

**Question 20**

Questions on group behaviour tend not to be popular probably because they are not the favourite of the well prepared candidate or because the area is not one the weaker candidate has any personal experience of. For part **(a)** candidates could write about any aspect of group behaviour such as decision-making and other positive aspects such as team roles and team building, or the cohesiveness, co-operation and competition of groups. The more problematic areas of group polarisation and group-think could also be included. The recommended text by Riggio (1990) is worth looking at. Answers to part **(b)** were lacking in issues and were rather superficial. Part **(c)** focused on group conflict but here common-sense solutions were often offered.