

GCE A Level Examiners' Report

Psychology

GCE

Summer 2025

© WJEC CBAC Ltd. 2025



Introduction

Our Principal examiners' report provides valuable feedback on the recent assessment series. It has been written by our Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators after the completion of marking and moderation, and details how candidates have performed in each component.

This report opens with a summary of candidates' performance, including the assessment objectives/skills/topics/themes being tested, and highlights the characteristics of successful performance and where performance could be improved. It then looks in detail at each unit, pinpointing aspects that proved challenging to some candidates and suggesting some reasons as to why that might be.¹

The information found in this report provides valuable insight for practitioners to support their teaching and learning activity. We would also encourage practitioners to share this document – in its entirety or in part – with their learners to help with exam preparation, to understand how to avoid pitfalls and to add to their revision toolbox.

Further support

Document	Description	Link
Professional Learning / CPD	Eduqas offers an extensive programme of online and face-to-face Professional Learning events. Access interactive feedback, review example candidate responses, gain practical ideas for the classroom and put questions to our dedicated team by registering for one of our events here.	https://www.eduqas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/
Past papers	Access the bank of past papers for this qualification, including the most recent assessments. Please note that we do not make past papers available on the public website until 12 months after the examination.	Portal by WJEC or on the Eduqas subject page
Grade boundary information	Grade boundaries are the minimum number of marks needed to achieve each grade. For linear specifications, a single grade is awarded for the subject, rather than for each component that contributes towards the overall grade. Grade boundaries are published on results day.	For unitised specifications click here: Results and Grade Boundaries and PRS (eduqas.co.uk)

¹ Please note that where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

Exam Results Analysis	Eduqas provides information to examination centres via the WJEC Portal. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.	Portal by WJEC
Classroom Resources	Access our extensive range of FREE classroom resources, including blended learning materials, exam walk-throughs and knowledge organisers to support teaching and learning.	https://resources.eduqas.co.uk/
Bank of Professional Learning materials	Access our bank of Professional Learning materials from previous events from our secure website and additional pre-recorded materials available in the public domain.	Portal by WJEC or on the Eduqas subject page.
Become an examiner with WJEC.	We are always looking to recruit new examiners or moderators. These opportunities can provide you with valuable insight into the assessment process, enhance your skill set, increase your understanding of your subject and inform your teaching.	Become an Examiner Eduqas

Contents

	Page
Executive summary	5
Component 1	6
Component 2	9
Component 3	14
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	18

Executive Summary

In Component 1, candidates generally engaged well across all assessment objectives (AO1, AO2, AO3), with a noticeable improvement in independent thinking, particularly in AO3 evaluation responses. AO2 application skills showed marked progress, with many candidates effectively linking their answers to stimulus material. Where responses fell short of top band marks, it was typically due to a lack of depth rather than poor application.

Understanding of classic studies, therapies, and psychological terminology was strong. However, time management remains a concern, with some candidates spending disproportionate time on lower-mark questions. The contemporary debate section was notably weak, with many candidates either omitting it or relying on superficial, common-sense responses rather than psychological research. This continues a trend from previous series, where textbook reliance overshadowed independent research. AO3 conclusions were often repetitive or absent, limiting marks even in otherwise strong evaluations. Candidates must be encouraged to develop conclusions that introduce new insights rather than summarising prior content. Additionally, handwriting quality has declined, making some responses illegible. Centres should consider access arrangements for candidates with poor handwriting to ensure their work can be assessed.

Performance in Component 2 was generally positive, though recurring issues hindered top-level achievement. Many candidates demonstrated sound mathematical skills, such as identifying measures of central tendency, but struggled to explain their appropriateness, indicating a gap in depth of understanding. Contextualisation of responses showed slight improvement, but few candidates consistently applied context throughout their answers. Given AO2's high weighting in this component, this skill is essential and should be a focus for future preparation. Confusion between reliability and validity persists. Candidates often lack clarity on the three stages outlined in the specification: identifying issues, addressing them, and assessing them. This conceptual misunderstanding continues to impact performance.

Most candidates fully engaged with Component 3, demonstrating broad understanding across the three applications and associated controversies. A wide range of responses reflected varying levels of ability across AO1, AO2, and AO3. Some candidates failed to follow rubric instructions, particularly by answering more questions in Section A than required. Centres should reinforce the importance of adhering to exam instructions. A strategic shift was observed, with many candidates starting with Section B controversies, which appeared to improve time management and response quality. Fewer unfinished Section A responses were noted, suggesting better exam pacing. However, poor handwriting again affected some scripts, making them difficult or impossible to assess. Centres are urged to explore access arrangements such as word processors or scribes for affected candidates.

PSYCHOLOGY

GCE A level

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 1: PAST TO PRESENT

Overview of the Component

The vast majority of candidates engaged with all questions across the three assessment objectives: AO1 (knowledge and understanding), AO2 (application), and AO3 (analysis and evaluation). Examiners observed a broad range of answers that often displayed a higher level of independence than has been seen in previous series, especially with regards to AO3 evaluation questions.

On the whole AO2 application skills have notably improved, with many AO2 answers evidencing clear links to the stimulus material. When these answers did not reach the top band, it was due to a lack of depth rather than a lack of application.

Candidates generally have a clear understanding of classic evidence, therapies and evaluating the approaches whilst displaying an understanding of psychology and specific terminology used within the discipline. However, time management is still an issue for some, often due to spending longer on the 4 and 8 mark questions than would be required.

Although there has been much improvement, the contemporary debate was very disappointing. The main issue in previous series has been candidate use of textbook information rather than utilising independent research, but this series saw many debates either not attempted or relying on generic, common sense details on eyewitness testimony with very superficial reference to psychology. Conclusions also remain an issue in AO3 answers therefore, even when evaluation answers were strong, marks awarded were often limited due to absent or repetitive conclusions. Conclusions must explore new ideas and not be a summary of what has already been written.

Finally, handwriting ability has deteriorated during this series which has made it near impossible in some cases for examiners to be able to extract the information from candidate answers. If centres identify candidates with illegible handwriting, then practice is needed, or access arrangements should be explored.

Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1** This question was the one that candidates scored the highest on, possibly because there was an element of choice with specific behaviourist assumptions not being stated. The assumption of 'behaviour learnt through conditioning' was answered well. Confusion between the two types of conditioning was not evident in this series but on occasions the classical conditioning formula was muddled, especially the role of the neutral stimulus. The assumption 'humans and animals learn in similar ways' generally lacked detail. Examples given were mainly from animal research rather than comparing results of animal research to human e.g. Pavlov's classical conditioning research was outlined but the links to human learning, such as in Watson and Rayner's research, was not evident. The 'blank slate' assumption examples were appropriate but occasionally terminology was lacking e.g. 'environmental determinism', 'vicarious reinforcement' etc.

- Q.2** Candidates displayed a solid understanding of how the results of Myers and Diener's research could be evaluated e.g. socially sensitive findings, positive impact on the workplace etc, there was some confusion on who carried out the research. Many candidates stated that Myers and Diener carried out the original research rather than it being a literature review. Although evaluation points were acceptable, conclusions were very weak and therefore limited marks to the middle bands.
- Q.3** This was the question that overall candidates gained the least number of marks for. Issues arose when candidates did not fully explain the link between the assumption and their chosen behaviour e.g. when linking tripartite personality to criminal behaviour candidates often focused on the ID but ignored the role of the ego and superego so the answer was incomplete.
- Q.4** (a) Mindfulness answers attracted basic marks if the main focus was simply on meditation practices. Better answers referred to Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction and named the 3 stages. Quality of Life Therapy was the lesser written about therapy but was well answered with aspects of the Quality of Life Inventory, examples and the Three pillars clearly outlined in the majority of candidate responses.
- (b) This was the least attempted question, which was disappointing with it being an AO3 question that did not require a conclusion. The main misconception was that Mindfulness is effective because it can be performed anywhere. This does not make the therapy effective, it makes it accessible. For both therapies ethics references did not gain credit because the question was focused on effectiveness. Answers that attracted top band marks included research evidence to back up the effectiveness points made.
- Q.5** This question was attempted by the majority of candidates, and it is pleasing to note that there was better use of AO2 links than in previous examinations. However, the full range of links were not often used and that was the only way to attract top band marks. Marks are not awarded for analysing that the approaches have different therapies or assumptions unless these differences are well explained e.g. instead of outlining that the biological approach uses drug therapy whereas the psychodynamic approach uses dream analysis, a creditworthy answer would explore the fact that biological therapies only tackle the symptoms whereas psychodynamic therapies tackle the underlying cause. Of course, a link to the scenario would need to be included with this being an AO2 question.
- Q.6** This question gained the second highest mean mark, and many candidates found it to be accessible. Answers that separated the stages into ages and named processes were well structured and tended to be more focused and informative. Some answers were brief, often omitting important processes, especially in the first 3 stages of the research. The original emotional testing was not evident in many answers. The rule of thumb is that if the process could not be replicated by using the candidates' answer, then it is not thorough.
- Q.7** This was the second most accessible question for candidates, and it was answered well overall. Both strengths and weaknesses were provided with very few instances where a one-sided answer was seen. Unfortunately, as with question 2, weak conclusions kept some answers in the 'reasonable' band even though the evaluation on the whole was written well.

- Q.8** Generally, because answers were brief, close to superficial, even though AO2 links were included. Thorough answers tended to give both sides of an argument with very clear links throughout, exploring the fact that findings both were and were not dangerous to society with valid explanations and a range of clear links throughout.
- Q.9** Unfortunately, there were many basic and brief answers. Some answers simply described and evaluated Loftus and Palmer's research, which attracted minimal credit. Candidates who gained thorough marks were able to describe a wide range of theories and research to back those theories up as well as evaluating research and bringing in extra discussion e.g. social implications and methodological issues with eyewitness testimony. Answers that were kept in the basic bands tended to mention a theory e.g. flashbulb memories, repression, schemas, but did not describe what they are.

PSYCHOLOGY

GCE A level

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 2: INVESTIGATING BEHAVIOUR

Overview of the Component

Candidates generally performed well on Component 2, however, a failure to address persistent issues are preventing candidates from achieving the top marks.

A range of reasonable maths skills were clearly displayed by many candidates; however, the depth of their knowledge is not always as effective as it should be, for example, candidates could identify an appropriate measure of central tendency but could not explain why it was appropriate.

Contextualisation of answers continues to improve slightly, however few candidates clearly linked or contextualised their answers throughout the paper. AO2 has the highest weighting in Component 2, so it is a skill that is vital for learners to practise and display.

Candidates continue to be confused between the concepts of reliability and validity. It is also clear that some candidates are not fully conversant with the three stages of these concepts noted in the specification: issues of reliability (or validity); ways of dealing with issues of reliability (or validity) and assessing reliability (or validity).

Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1** This question required clear definitions of key terms and candidates who had learned the definitions from the Eduqas resources scored highly. Many could not define the term co-variable without using the word 'variable' which received minimal credit.
- Q.2** Parts a and b of this question required knowledge of maths symbols and was correctly answered by a high number of candidates, although some offered incorrect variations. Part c required a clear expression of probability, and many candidates could not transfer the percentage to a decimal correctly.
- Q.3** In this question, candidates were required to explain two advantages of longitudinal research, which often resulted in a description of what longitudinal meant (over time, explores patterns over time) rather than the advantage of using the research. Many offered advantages of qualitative data which is not always the case with longitudinal research.
- Q.4** Part a required a description of how stratified sampling is used and many candidates achieved full marks. Marks were lost for not explaining the random selection from the subgroups. Part b required an evaluation of this sampling technique, and many candidates lost marks for generic responses which could be true of several sampling techniques, e.g. time consuming, representative, without specifying how this relates to stratified sampling.

- Q.5** Candidates achieved full marks for explaining that the values should be added and then divided by the number of values. When marks were lost, it was often for poor expression of this calculation, which then made the response inaccurate, e.g. add up all of the number and divide by the numbers.
- Q.6** This question asked for comparisons; in part a, the difference between two probability values and in part B, the difference between two types of data. Similar to question 2, many candidates incorrectly transferred a decimal to a percentage. For part b, marks were lost for descriptions of the type of data with no comparison between them.
- Q.7** This question was answered well when the candidate understood the concept of online research. However, many candidates understood this to mean findings research online and receive minimal or no credit for their evaluation. Better responses were not generic, and the evaluation point was made specific to online research, for example, evaluation of a larger sample was minimal, but more developed responses explaining how online research can reach a global audience through the internet gained higher marks.
- Q.8** This question was divided into three shorter tariff questions than on papers in previous series and this allowed some candidates to access higher marks for each section. Part a required a description of the sample, and many candidates achieved full marks for detailed and accurate descriptions. However, many responses were brief or included information that was not derived from Milgram's original published article so did not receive credit. Other responses explained the procedure which wasted valuable time, e.g. how Milgram recruited the sample.

For part b, evaluation of the sample was required and, as in previous series, very few candidates achieved the full 5 marks as they simply listed strengths and weaknesses, rather than evaluating.

For part c, a similar style of answer received minimal credit. Listing ethical issues is not awarded AO3 credit at the higher end of the mark scheme. As in previous years, candidates are still presenting ways of dealing with ethical issues as the issue itself (e.g. right to withdraw).

- Q.9** This question contained a series of sub questions relating to the quasi-experiment regarding age and sleep. As in all personal investigation questions, unless there is a link to the investigation, no credit can be given. This means that candidates who had rehearsed accurate responses to many research question did not achieve any credit for generic responses.
- (a)** Many hypotheses were not fully operationalised, particularly with the variable of sleep, for example, presenting 'amount of sleep' rather than the time spent asleep. Many hypotheses were presented as correlational or as an aim, which received no credit. Poorly worded responses also changed the meaning of the sentence, for example 'there will be a difference between age and sleep'.
- (b)** Many candidates answered this question well, with a full understanding of a quasi-experiment.

- (c) This question caused issues where candidates could not distinguish between reliability and validity. While there is some cross over of these concepts, centres should prepare candidates for clearly defined issues of reliability which do not cross over with validity to help avoid confusion in exam answers. Many candidates did know how to deal with issues, or provided vague or inaccurate responses, such as 'test them again'. If the issue of reliability was inaccurate, credit could not be given for the way of dealing with it.
- (d) If the ethical issue was inaccurate, credit could not be given for the way of managing it. Many candidates (as in the Milgram question) presented ways of dealing with the issue as the issue itself (e.g. consent rather than a lack of consent). Some candidates presented ways of managing with the issue that were not plausible and therefore were not credited, for example, issue of embarrassment being managed by giving an ID number or issues of deception being dealt with by giving participants an information sheet before the research took place.
- (e) Many candidates could identify the descriptive statistic, although a high number presented an inferential statistic or level of measurement. Very few candidates could justify why the descriptive statistic was appropriate, with many responses merely describing what the statistic did, for example, "the mean, because it finds the average" or "the mode, because it shows the most common answer".

Q.10 These questions asked about the correlation using a Stroop test. As in all personal investigation questions, unless there is a link to the investigation, no credit can be given.

- (a)
 - (i) Many candidates could provide a reasonable aim and gained full marks. Incorrect responses included an experimental aim (effect of...) or were not appropriate for a correlation (e.g. gender as a covariable).
 - (ii) When asked for operationalised covariables, many candidates presented the method/measure of a variable, for example "Beck's anxiety inventory" or how the Stroop test was carried out.
- (b) Most candidates could identify a sampling technique but did not gain full marks for the justification. Many responses were generic and true of other sampling techniques (e.g. representative) or were vague (e.g. quicker). Candidates should be advised that justification requires an explanation of how this method is better.
- (c)
 - (i) Most candidates could identify the scattergram as the correct graphical representation. Variations were credited but not 'correlational graph' as this word is in the question.
 - (ii) + (iii) This question asked for an appropriate inferential statistic and justification. Many responses gained full marks; marks were lost for a lack of link to the investigation.

- (d) As in an earlier question, many candidates struggled with confusing validity and reliability. Other candidate lost marks for describing a type of validity rather than explaining what the issue was with their investigation. If the explanation of the issue was inaccurate then no credit could be given for dealing with the issue. Some candidates presented a very basic way of dealing with the issue, for example, the issue was the time of day and the way of dealing with it was to use the same time of day, which did not achieve full marks. Some candidates suggested changes to the design or method, which does not receive credit as it does not deal with the issue in this research.

Q.11 This question asked about the novel scenario. As in all previous series, no credit can be awarded if the response does not link to the scenario.

- (a) Many candidates could provide a hypothesis, although not always with both the IV and DV fully operationalised. Many candidates presented findings (e.g. there is no difference) which was not credited. Candidates should be reminded that a hypothesis must be a prediction of findings and as such, attention should be paid to the wording of the sentence in order to be accurate.
- (b) Many candidates could identify the mode with a reasonable justification. Where marks were lost, it was for a description of what the mode is rather than why it was appropriate.
- (c) The style of question allowed candidates to achieve credit for each point separately, so many candidates achieved highly if they knew how to use the critical values table accurately. Many candidates identified the correct values but then chose to accept the null hypothesis, despite this information being provided in the table.

Q.12 This question asked about the novel scenario. As in all previous series, no credit can be awarded if the response does not link to the scenario.

- (a) Many candidates could answer this question correctly.
- (b) As in other questions on the paper, candidates could not differentiate between reliability and validity. Many seem to have misread the question and provided ways of dealing with the issue rather than explaining how the issue could have been assessed, so very few candidates received full credit for this question.
- (c)
 - (i) This question required the correct calculation (52%) which many candidates could do, but the working out did not always show how this figure had been calculated.
 - (ii) Most candidates achieved full marks for this question.
 - (iii) Most candidates could correctly identify an appropriate graphical representation.

- (d) This question required an evaluation of two disadvantages of qualitative data. Many lost marks for simply stating that qualitative data does not use number, graphs or statistical analysis (i.e. it is not quantitative) which was not credited. Vague or generic answers, such as 'difficult to analyse' or 'more time consuming' received minimal credit. Responses that evaluated qualitative methods (e.g. interviews have researcher effects, researcher uses open questions) did not receive credit as the question asks about data. Responses related to generalisability were also not credited as this is dependent on the sample not the type of data.

PSYCHOLOGY

GCE A level

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 3: IMPLICATIONS IN THE REAL WORLD

Overview of the Component

Most candidates engaged fully with the requirements of this component, attempting all necessary questions and generally demonstrating a broad understanding across the three applications and the associated controversies. A wide range of responses was observed, reflecting varying levels of ability in addressing the demands of AO1 (knowledge and understanding), AO2 (application), and AO3 (analysis and evaluation).

It should be noted, however, that a small number of candidates did not follow the rubric, providing more responses to Section A than required. Centres are advised to reinforce the importance of adhering strictly to the instructions provided in the examination paper.

A notable number of candidates opted to begin with the Section B controversies question. This strategic choice appeared to benefit many, enabling candidates to allocate time effectively and produce well-developed responses. Encouragingly, there was also a decline in the number of unfinished Section A responses compared to previous years, suggesting improved time management—a likely result of focused preparation by centres.

Despite these positive developments, some scripts were affected by poor handwriting, which at times rendered responses difficult or impossible to read. As marks cannot be awarded for illegible responses, centres are strongly encouraged to consider access arrangements—such as the use of a word processor or scribe—for candidates whose handwriting may impede clarity.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Q.1 Addiction continues to be a popular choice with approximately 55% of candidates attempting this question.

- (a)** The most common explanations described were peer pressure and role of the media. Better answers used social norms in detail, with examples of descriptive and injunctive norms. SLT was also common - however in some cases used too repetitively across peers and media to gain much credit. Key terms, such as vicarious reinforcement, were used but not often explained. Role of the media answers tended to be list-like regarding studies. Some answers missed the connection to explicitly explain addictive behaviours.
- (b)** The most common explanations evaluated were dopamine and addiction genes. AO2 was often reasonable with candidates using 'limited' and 'best way of understanding' well within their answers. Most answers successfully identified the need for two biological explanations. Answers typically displayed better range than depth. There were lots of brief paragraphs on reductionism and determinism but not then discussing why these are strengths/weaknesses of the specific explanations. Studies used were often vague with little specific detail/evidence. Conclusions were often repetitive and did not offer anything new.

Q.2 With approximately 20% of candidates attempting this question, autism remains one of the least popular of the Section A: Applications.

(a) + (b) The most common social psychological explanations briefly described and evaluated were empathising-systemising theory and refrigerator mother. The most common biological explanations briefly described and evaluated were amygdala dysfunction and genetic predisposition. Overall, candidates performed better on the biological explanations than the social psychological ones. Marks were higher on both questions for AO1 than AO3. A common issue with evaluation was that terms like "reductionist" and "determinist" were thrown in without any real link back to the explanation. It's worth centres noting that if the evaluation point could be lifted and applied to any other explanation without changing anything, then it's likely to only be awarded superficial marks. The strongest evaluations developed a clear chain of reasoning and explicitly linked back to ASD – using phrases like "this is a strength because...".

(c) The most common explanations were theory of mind and weak central coherence applied to PECS and Relationship Development Intervention. Some candidates applied theory of mind to joint attention, and this tended to be done reasonably well. A lot of candidates covered two explanations, but their application of these to the MOMB was often thin, which impacted their marks.

Q.3 Bullying remains the least attempted application, with approximately only 10% of candidates answering this question.

(a) Narcissistic personality and theory of mind were the most popular explanations. The responses to this question were quite mixed. While there were some strong answers, a significant issue was that many candidates described one explanation in great detail and the other very superficially or only included one explanation so were capped at a maximum of half marks.

(b) Most candidates were able to correctly identify an individual differences explanation of bullying (usually narcissistic personality or theory of mind) and an appropriate method of modifying the behaviour (usually CBT, CAPSLE or Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme). Common errors included providing a lot of detail about the explanation and/or the MOMB without much application at all.

(c) The most common explanations analysed were bullying genes and evolved gender differences. A number of candidates provided generic evaluations of biological explanations rather than evaluating specific explanations that had been studied. At times, it seemed candidates had memorised 'model answers', as many responses followed a similar pattern. When responses were generic and failed to link directly to a specific explanation, they were classed as superficial.

Q.4 Criminal behaviours was the second most popular of the Section A: Applications, with almost 80% of candidates attempting this question.

- (a) The most frequently used explanations were inherited criminality and role of the amygdala. The role of the amygdala was the stronger of the two explanations in most answers, with clear outline of its role in explaining criminal behaviours. Inherited criminality often included list-like studies but then not connected to how this explains criminal behaviour. There was an ongoing issue with some candidates' marks capped by writing in detail about one explanation and including only a very brief account of a second explanation or missing out the second explanation altogether.
- (b) This was evenly split between anger management and restorative justice. AO2 was often reasonably well done. Better answers made links to the entire statement such as 'effective', '46%', 'reoffend' and this was embedded throughout the whole answer. Stronger answers evaluated the MOMB by including a range of points from effectiveness, ethical and social implications. It was clear that a structure had been taught for some candidates, which was pleasing to see. However, many answers fell into description of how the MOMB works rather than being evaluative, so this often resulted in AO3 being superficial or basic.

Q.5 Answered by nearly 90% of candidates, schizophrenia is the most popular of the Section A: Applications.

- (a) On the whole, this was a well answered question. Many answers were at the top of the reasonable or into the thorough band. The better answers had a clear structure which included both the positive and negative symptoms outlined with examples. Weaker answers listed names of symptoms but then did not describe them. Some answers began to outline the biological explanations for schizophrenia or describe appropriate treatments, but this was not creditworthy.
- (b) AO2 was often reasonable with students using 'cause unknown' and 'strongest' well within their answers - very few answers linked to 'many psychologists'. Answers most commonly evaluated the dopamine explanation. Answers typically displayed better range than depth. There were lots of brief paragraphs on reductionism and determinism but not then discussing why these were strengths/weaknesses of the specific explanation. Studies used were often vague with little specific detail/evidence. Conclusions were often repetitive and did not offer anything new.

Q.6 Stress declined in popularity this year, with approximately 30% of candidates responding to this question.

- (a) A common issue was candidates writing a lot of detail for one method of modification and then missing the second or putting considerable detail into one and then very briefly referring to the second. BBs were sometimes quite vague and answered with very little detail. SIT often had range, however, there were some quite list-like answers and some which gave generic descriptions of CBT. Better answers were able to combine detailed psychological knowledge with clear reference to stress.

- (b) Candidates seemed to struggle with this application question. Often writing a lot of repetitive detail about the MOMB without bringing in the explanation or writing about the explanation without making any application clear other than naming the MOMB. Some good responses used both life events and daily hassles and linked these to BBs (LEs) and SIT (DHs). Some made attempts to apply with assertions but then did not elaborate enough to really demonstrate much knowledge of application.
- (c) Adrenaline/acute stress and cortisol/chronic stress were the explanations that were evaluated the most frequently for this question. There seemed to be fewer candidates missing the second explanation with this question though this was still sometimes the case. Some candidates muddled terminology between the different explanations. Rather than evaluating specific explanations, many simply discussed 'biological explanations' in general terms. This often made it unclear which explanation was being evaluated and, as a result, these responses tended to fall into the lower mark bands.

Q.7. – Sexism

This question required both AO2 and AO3 skills and was the less popular of the two controversies questions, with approximately 40% of candidates attempting the question.

The stronger responses were often structured by the approaches as an effective way to take the reader through a discussion of arguments around gender bias and heterosexism to both support and contradict the statement. Many answers focused on using Freud and Kohlberg as their main pieces of evidence, highlighting alpha and beta bias. Androcentric samples were also a common element to answers and were often used well to demonstrate the gender bias issue. Students typically focused on the gender bias element of the answer, but higher bands also included excellent discussion of heterosexism, often by using evidence such as Duck and Wood and Buss to support. However, some candidates seemed to miss the heterosexism element of the question, though whether this was due to time or a reading error is hard to say.

Q.8. – Ethical Costs

This question required both AO2 and AO3 skills and was the more popular of the two controversies questions, with approximately 60% of candidates attempting the question.

Many responses fell into 'reasonable interpretation' - this was often due to a list-like structure of studies with ethical issues. Some candidates spent a lot of time describing ethics content with little consideration for application to the statement. In some cases, there were very thorough outlines of studies such as Milgram and Watson and Rayner, with very little connection to the actual question. Candidates often showed a lack of awareness regarding the historical development of ethical guidelines, referring to classical studies in a way which implied they were modern examples. There were frequent inaccuracies regarding these studies breaking guidelines despite being carried out prior to the ethical guidelines being published. Students typically focused on the risk management element of the question and failed to engage or very superficially engaged with the potential negative consequences.

Supporting you

Useful contacts and links

Our friendly subject team is on hand to support you between 8.30am and 5.00pm, Monday to Friday.

Tel: 02922 404 284

Email: psychology@eduqas.co.uk

Qualification webpage: [AS and A level Psychology Eduqas](#)

See other useful contacts here: [Useful Contacts | Eduqas](#)

CPD Training / Professional Learning

Access our popular, free online CPD/PL courses to receive exam feedback and put questions to our subject team, and attend one of our face-to-face events, focused on enhancing teaching and learning, providing practical classroom ideas and developing understanding of marking and assessment.

Please find details for all our courses here: <https://www.eduqas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/>

Regional Rep Team

Our regional team covers all areas of England and can provide face-to-face and online advice at a time which is convenient to you.

Get in contact today and discover how our team can support you and your students.

[Regional Support Team | Eduqas](#)

Eduqas Qualifications

We are one of the largest providers of qualifications for schools, academies, sixth form and further education colleges across England, offering valued qualifications to suit a range of abilities. Each and every one of our qualifications is carefully designed to engage students and to equip them for the next stage of their lives.

We support our education communities by providing trusted qualifications and specialist support, to allow our students the opportunity to reach their full potential.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk