

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2013

GCE Psychology (6PS03/01)

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk) for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson. Their contact details can be found on this link: [www.edexcel.com/teachingservices](http://www.edexcel.com/teachingservices).

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at [www.edexcel.com/ask](http://www.edexcel.com/ask). You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

### **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2013

Publications Code UA036699

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

## General Guidance on Marking – GCE Psychology

All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last

Examiners should look for qualities to reward rather than faults to penalise. This does NOT mean giving credit for incorrect or inadequate answers, but it does mean allowing candidates to be rewarded for answers showing correct application of principles and knowledge.

Examiners should therefore read carefully and consider every response: even unconventional answers may be worthy of credit.

Candidates must make their meaning clear to the examiner to gain the mark. Make sure that the answer makes sense. Do not give credit for correct words/phrases which are put together in a meaningless manner. Answers must be in the correct context.

Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the Team Leader must be consulted.

### Using the mark scheme

The mark scheme gives:

- an idea of the types of response expected
- how individual marks are to be awarded
- the total mark for each question
- examples of responses that should NOT receive credit (where applicable).

1 / means that the responses are alternatives and either answer should receive full credit.

2 ( ) means that a phrase/word is not essential for the award of the mark, but helps the examiner to get the sense of the expected answer.

3 [ ] words inside square brackets are instructions or guidance for examiners.

4 Phrases/words in **bold** indicate that the meaning of the phrase or the actual word is **essential** to the answer.

5 TE (Transferred Error) means that a wrong answer given in an earlier part of a question is used correctly in answer to a later part of the same question.

### Quality of Written Communication

Questions which involve the writing of continuous prose will expect candidates to:

- show clarity of expression
- construct and present coherent arguments
- demonstrate an effective use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Full marks can only be awarded if the candidate has demonstrated the above abilities.

Questions where QWC is likely to be particularly important are indicated "QWC" in the mark scheme BUT this does not preclude others.

## Unit 3: Applications of Psychology

### Section A – Criminological Psychology

	Guidance	
	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p> <p><b>Except A2a, A2c and A3, which are marked according to the levels indicated.</b></p>	

Question Number	Question	
<b>A1 (a)</b>	<p>Criminal psychologists develop theories to try to understand and explain anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Explain what is meant by 'anti-social behaviour'.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Max 1 mark for examples of anti-social behaviour (being loud at night). Do not credit definitions of unsociable behaviour or illegal behaviour (burglary, graffiti/criminal damage, violence). Must be attempt at a definition somewhere in the response before any further marks can be given.</p> <p>Definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anti-social behaviour is behaviour that offends/distresses others/decreases the quality of life of others/disrupts (max 1 for any of these comments)/eq;</li> <li>• It goes against the norms and values of society/undesired behaviour/not expected (max 1 for any of these comments)/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Further marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ASBO was introduced to control anti-social behaviour/eq;</li> <li>• Anti-social behaviour is not criminal/illegal activity/eq;</li> <li>• [examples such as this gain max 1 mark] Anti-social behaviour can involve any behaviour such as being a noisy neighbour/loitering/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(3 AO1)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>A1 (b)</b>	Evaluate <b>one</b> theory that can be used to explain criminal/anti-social behaviour. In your answer make it clear which theory you are evaluating.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore description. If more than one theory evaluated, mark all and credit the best. Suitable examples include; Eysenck's personality theory, Self-fulfilling prophecy, biological theory, Social learning theory (ignore references to James Bulger as supporting SLT), there are others please consult your team leader if unsure.</p> <p>Evaluation may include supporting research, opposing research, critique of the validity of such research, practical applications of the theory, different explanations, wider issues and debates.</p> <p>Max one per evidence point used as evaluation (even if the research is described at length), but further credit can be gained if the research methodology (not ethics) is critiqued well (e.g. Bandura, but demand characteristics may have been at play as the children may have acted how they thought they should have).</p> <p>Eg Self-fulfilling prophecy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is more to SFP as acceptance of a label can be affected by the self esteem of the individual, if low they are more likely to accept the label ascribed/eq;</li> <li>• Rebellion against a label is very possible which SFP does not predict/eq;</li> <li>• Jahoda (1954) found that children born on a Wednesday and given a name meaning that they are considered to be aggressive are more likely to have a criminal record later in life than those born on Monday/considered mild and meek/eq;</li> <li>• Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) found that children randomly labelled bloomers were recorded to have a higher IQ than those labelled non-bloomers due to perceived teacher expectation/attention/eq;</li> <li>• Madon et al (2003) found that children predicted to be alcohol users by their parents were more likely to use alcohol, fulfilling the prophecy of their parents/eq;</li> <li>• We cannot experimentally test the effect of SFP because of ethical reasons so conclusions are unclear/eq;</li> <li>• There are other reasons for anti-social behaviour, such as the way we are raised by parents in terms of them being role models that we identify with/genetic reasons that may account for why criminality runs in families as we inherit a genetic predisposition from parents known as a criminal, warrior, MAOI gene/cortical under arousal, that may account for anti-social behaviour other than SFP/eq; (these should be well explained or evidenced)</li> <li>• Evidence for SFP may not be criminological (eg Rosenthal and Jacobson, which is educational) but they can be assumed to happen for a variety of behaviours so the evidence is transferable here/eq;</li> <li>• The individual may not conform to that given label unless it is believed by many people or fairly accurate anyway/eq;</li> </ul>	<b>(6 AO2)</b>

- cannot explain why people labelled as criminal do not commit crime or why those not labelled do commit crime (1 mark as brief reverse argument)/eq;
- Cannot explain why people do not commit a crime despite being labelled, for example those stereotyped as a vandal decide to rebel against the label (explained 1 mark)/eq; Cannot explain why people commit crime and yet have not been labelled as criminal for example someone who is genetically aggressive and such is a biological reason for criminality (2<sup>nd</sup> mark)/eq;

Personality theory (Eysenck)

- Hare (2001) found that there were significantly more psychotic individuals who have a tendency to be violent than the rest of the population/eq;
- Grann (1999) found that individuals scored higher on the PCL-R if they had anti-social behaviour previously/eq;
- Grann (1999) also found that 48% of ex-offenders rated as psychotic were likely to reoffend compared to those rated as not highly psychotic/eq;
- Center and Kemp (1998) found that there was a relationship between anti-social behaviour and psychoticism in a sample of 11 delinquents/eq;
- Raine and Venables (1987) found no relationship between conditioning (as measured by skin conductivity) and socialisation (teacher rated) not supporting Eysenck/eq;
- Alternative explanations for anti-social behaviour take a wider social explanation such as social construction of criminality/social learning theory suggests that behaviour is a result of a learning experience/eq;

Social Learning Theory

- It does not explain why an individual may commit crime in the absence of a criminal role model (not reverse argument)/eq;
- Supported by Bandura who showed that children were more likely to copy an aggressive role model/eq;

**Look for other reasonable marking points.**

	Guidance	
	Use the levels below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information. Giving marks for elaboration where appropriate is particularly important where questions such as this are suitable to stretch and challenge candidates, so that the full range of marks are available.	

Question Number	Question	
<b>A2 (a)</b>	As part of their course, psychology students at a university were required to conduct a field experiment to test the effectiveness of eyewitness testimony.  Describe how the students might go about conducting their research.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Mark according to the levels given below. Ignore references to strictly lab experiments (even if the response claims to be a field experiment but clearly is not), these involve a structured setting in a situation where behaviour being studied would not normally occur. Some research employ an experimental paradigm, such as Maas and Köhnken, and descriptions similar to this can be treated as field research for the purpose of this question.</p> <p>Max level 2 marks overall if no reference to witness testimony. Any form of testimony acceptable e.g. ear.</p> <p>Reference to field studies e.g. Yarmey should be explained and not just named – we need to know what the students will do. No credit for studies as examples.</p> <p>If definitely unethical (major car collisions or staged murder) then no credit for the element of 'procedure'. However, if ambiguous e.g. car crash, then it may be the intention of the candidate to describe a minor carpark collision, so give benefit of the doubt.</p> <p><b>Elements</b> that could be used: variables, apparatus, sample/participants, design, procedure, ethics, controls, location, gathering and analysis of results.</p> <p>Levels</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No rewardable material</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Basic and brief information about how a field experiment might be conducted. Includes an attempt at one or more of the above elements.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> Basic detail about how a field experiment might take place with reference to more than one basic idea. Includes at least one well explained element from above.</p>	<b>(4 AO3)</b>

	<p><b>3 marks</b> Good detail about how a field experiment might investigate EWT in the field. <b>Partial replication possible.</b> At least two of the above elements well expressed.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> Very good detail of how a field experiment might be used to investigate EWT on a range of ideas expressed well/three or more elements. Replication possible within the time constraints of the paper.</p>	
--	--	--

Question Number	Question	
<b>A2 (b)</b>	<p>Evaluate the field experiment as a research method in terms of reliability.</p> <p>You must evaluate the research method with reference to criminological psychology.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore reference to validity, ethics and generalisability.</p> <p>Take care with <b>categorical answers</b> eg, field experiments do not have control, field experiment participants do not know they are being tested. These are too categorical and do not gain credit.</p> <p>Max 1 mark for a study/research used as an example.</p> <p><b><u>Max 1 if no reference to criminological psychology.</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field experiments into eyewitness testimony have less <b>control</b> over <b>extraneous</b>/participant variables as they are conducted in a <b>natural</b> environment/eq;</li> <li>• Field experiments into EWT have low reliability as there is limited control over extraneous variables that may affect the study results/eq;</li> <li>• With limited <b>control</b> over <b>variables</b> the findings may be unreliable because exact <b>replication</b> is unlikely/eq;</li> <li>• So they are less likely to be exactly replicable due to varying participants/circumstances/witness attributes/eq;</li> <li>• Lack of <b>replication</b> means that the findings cannot be <b>cross checked</b> for reliability/eq;</li> <li>• Less control over the witnessed environment means that variables that are unexpected can have an anomalous effect upon results/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Bold is necessary OWTTE</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points related to reliability.</b></p>	<b>(3 AO3)</b>

	Guidance	
	Use the levels below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information. Giving marks for elaboration where appropriate is particularly important where questions such as this are suitable to stretch and challenge candidates, so that the full range of marks are available.	

Question Number	Question	
<b>A2 (c)</b>	Explain <b>one</b> reason why criminological psychologists might prefer to use a laboratory experiment rather than a field experiment to study the effectiveness of eyewitness testimony.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Mark according to the levels below. If more than one way, mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>Answers may include ethics, control, reliability, cause and effect, <b>internal</b> validity, sampling, time.</p> <p><b>0 mark</b> No rewardable material.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Basic/ brief explanation of preference of lab over field experiment, may be no reference to EWT/criminological psychology. Eg. Conduct the study in a lab so there is more control and extraneous variables do not have as much of an effect.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> Detailed explanation of preference of lab over field experiment. Refers at least once to ETW/Criminal psychology. Eg. Conduct the study under lab conditions so that witness/witnessing environment variables can be controlled so that the results are not confounded by unexpected variables leading to inconsistent findings.</p>	<b>(2 AO3)</b>

Question Number	Question	
*A3	<p>Yellowside Prison currently uses a token economy programme to manage the behaviour of the prisoners. The prison manager has been considering other treatments/therapies to use with the token economy programme.</p> <p>Describe and evaluate <b>one</b> treatment/therapy, <b>other than</b> token economy, that could be used in Yellowside Prison.</p> <p>Your evaluation <b>must</b> include <b>at least one</b> comparison with the token economy programme in terms of effectiveness.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Other treatments may include psychotherapy, CBT, anger management, social skills training. There may be others check with your team leader if you are not sure.</p> <p>The answers must be relevant to a prison context but need not refer to Yellowside.</p> <p>If the candidate has chosen to describe token economy, please ignore the description but read the whole answer as there may be creditable comparison.</p> <p>Mark according to the levels below.</p> <p>Indicative content Eg Anger management/CALM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offenders can be helped to identify the triggers that cause anger.</li> <li>• Thought patterns associated with the anger are challenged.</li> <li>• Alternative thinking and behaviour is considered.</li> <li>• Therapists help offenders understand the consequences of their anger on others.</li> <li>• Relaxation/coping mechanisms are taught to deal with physiological response to triggers.</li> <li>• Offenders are taught assertiveness to help talk through their problems rather than respond angrily.</li> <li>• Role play is used to practice new skills to deal with anger.</li> <li>• Takes place in small groups or one-to-one for a long period of time</li> <li>• Is carried out by a profession trained in anger management that visits the prison.</li> </ul> <p>Possible AO2 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Psychologists question the assumption that anger causes aggression.</li> <li>• Loza and Loza-Fanous (1999) found no relationship between anger and violent and non-violent offenders.</li> <li>• Dowden (1999) showed reduced recidivism after anger management in high risk offenders.</li> <li>• Ireland (2009) found significant behavioural improvements in violent offenders using the programme/lower anger scores.</li> <li>• It can only be used on offenders self motivated and willing to change their behaviour.</li> </ul>	<p>(6 AO1 6 AO2 = 12)</p>

	<p>Comparison points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unlike TE there is a real change in behaviour due to cognition change.</li> <li>• TE is only used to control behaviour in prison and has little application in real life as tokens are not given outside of prison.</li> <li>• AM teaches skills, such as relaxation and assertiveness, that can be used in the real world unlike TE.</li> <li>• It is more expensive than token economy as it requires trained staff/can only be done in small groups rather than the whole population.</li> <li>• TE can treat a variety of behaviours, whereas AM only treats anger.</li> </ul>	
	Look for other reasonable content	

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		AO1: Knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works. AO2: Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works.
	0	No rewardable material
<b>Level 1</b>	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce <b>brief</b> answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempted description of one appropriate therapy other than token economy.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt at the evaluative demands of the question.</li> <li>• No comparison attempt.</li> </ul> <p>Lack of relevant evidence. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. The writing may have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but lack both clarity and organisation. High incidence of syntactical and /or spelling errors.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	4-6	<p>Description <b>OR</b> evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR one is in less detail than the other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited description of one appropriate therapy (or good description but no evaluation). May not refer to prison context.</li> <li>• Limited evaluation of one appropriate therapy (or good evaluation but no description).</li> <li>• Limited comparison with TEP OR no comparison but description and evaluation are level 3.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of <b>mostly accurate</b> and relevant factual material. There are likely to be passages which lack clarity and proper organisation. Frequent syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present. Limited clarity organisation in the response.</p>
<b>Level 3</b>	7-9	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered both of the injunctions of the questions well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good description of one appropriate therapy and used within the context of the prison situation.</li> <li>• Good evaluation of one appropriate therapy. Comparison is evaluation. At least one very well explained comparison/evaluation or more than one comparison/evaluation explained.</li> <li>• Good comparison with TEP.</li> <li>• <i>One comparison counts as a comparison point and further</i></li> </ul>

		<p><i>comparison can count as evaluation.</i></p> <p>The candidate will demonstrate most of the skills needed to produce effective extended writing but there will be lapses in organisation. Some syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
<b>Level 4</b>	10-12	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b><i>both of the injunctions</i></b> in the question <b>very well</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good description, including depth of detail and a range of descriptive elements, of one appropriate therapy used in a prison context.</li> <li>• Very good evaluation of one appropriate therapy using strengths and/or weaknesses. Comparison is evaluation. A range different evaluation points, some well expressed e.g. some of supporting studies, opposing studies, weaknesses, generalisability, strengths.</li> <li>• Very good comparison with TEP, clearly identified and explained.</li> <li>• <i>One comparison counts as a comparison point and further comparison can count as evaluation.</i></li> </ul> <p>The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning.</p> <p>Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the indicative content is present.</p>

## Section B – Child Psychology

	Guidance	
	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p> <p><b>Except B3 which is marked according to the levels indicated.</b></p>	

Question Number	Question	
<b>B1 (a)</b>	<p>In child psychology deprivation is defined as a loss of attachment with a main caregiver.</p> <p>Identify <b>one</b> cause of deprivation <b>and</b> explain possible effects of this deprivation on a child's development.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. One ID mark. Accept legitimate sources of deprivation rather than privation e.g. daycare, hospitalisation, short term fostering, death, divorce, mother in hospital.</p> <p>No credit for 'loss of attachment with a main caregiver' as just repeating stem. Research used as examples need not be named. Max 1 for a list of three or more undeveloped effects. In terms of daycare, effects can be negative or positive.</p> <p>ID Daycare/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment/bond disruption may occur so the child suffers maternal deprivation/eq;</li> <li>• Belsky and Rovine (1998) found that extended early daycare cause attachment problems in children/eq;</li> <li>• Attachment problems in early life can affect later adult relationships/eq;</li> <li>• Bowlby (1944/1946) argued that some individuals with poor attachment/deprivation in childhood can develop affectionless psychopathy/eq;</li> </ul> <p>ID hospitalisation/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The child may suffer the effects of short term deprivation such as protest, despair, detachment/eq;</li> <li>• The child may become initially very distressed and reject the substitute care of others, such as nursing staff (protest)/eq;</li> <li>• The child may, after time, become depressed and quiet/apathetic towards others (detachment)/eq;</li> <li>• The return of the caregiver may be ignored and their affection shunned by the child (detachment)/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Consider other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(3 AO1)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>B1 (b)</b>	<p>In child psychology privation is defined as a complete absence of attachment.</p> <p>Using psychological research, explain whether the negative effects of privation can be overcome.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration.  Max one mark overall if no reference to psychological research/findings/general conclusions from research, even if not named.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Genie showed some reversibility of privation, however, she never fully recovered (accept reverse answer if qualified) (Curtis 1977)/eq;</li> <li>• The Czech twins showed reversibility of privation due to the excellent care they received (Koluchova, 1972)/eq;</li> <li>• The Czech twins probably only recovered as they attached to one another/eq;</li> <li>• It is often difficult to establish the conditions the child endured prior to being discovered to fully understand whether the effects of privation are reversible/eq;</li> <li>• Genie was said to have learning difficulties identified very early on, so the lack of reversibility could be due to this/eq;</li> <li>• Sleep spindle studies suggested that Genie was mentally retarded which would account for the lack of reversibility/eq;</li> <li>• The Bulldogs Bank children showed how attachments to other children can buffer the effects of privation (Freud &amp; Dann 1946)/eq;</li> <li>• Rutter (1998) and the ERA team showed that reversibility is more likely if early substitute attachments can be made/eq;</li> <li>• From limited case studies it is difficult to ascertain whether privation can be reversed/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(4 AO2)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>B1 (c)</b>	<p>Research into privation has led to ethical concerns for the participants.</p> <p>Explain <b>one</b> ethical issue that may affect participants in privation research.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration.            If more than one ethical issue, mark all and credit the best.            No credit unless it refers to privation in children in one way.            No ID mark for ethical issue.            Ignore responses that refer to a researcher causing privation as unethical.</p> <p>e.g. Informed consent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be issues of informed consent with regard to access to privated children/eq;</li> <li>• The children may be under legal guardianship of another (non parent) who may give consent on their behalf/eq;</li> <li>• The child itself cannot give informed consent as they are not competent to be informed/eq;</li> <li>• Genie was under hospital guardianship who were the instigators of the research/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Extensive testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants are studied intensively for a long period of time which may be distressing/eq;</li> <li>• Genie was subject to extensive psychological testing, such as experiments and scans, which may have caused distress/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Research funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Withdrawal of funding for psychological research can lead to attachments being broken/responsibility for the child being neglected/eq;</li> <li>• Genie's study involved a withdraw of funding rendering her left in foster care and removing her attachment with a researcher/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Right to withdraw</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The child is not competent enough to withdraw themselves from the study/eq;</li> <li>• Typically a private child is not able to understand the research aims or have the ability to withdraw from the care/study such as Genie/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Confidentiality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Privation studies are rare, so the child is likely to be identifiable through research/eq;</li> <li>• Despite a legal order of anonymity, Genie has been identified later in life/eq;</li> <li>• Pseudonyms are often given to protect the child's identity/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Accept other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(2 AO2)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>B2(a)</b>	<p>Longitudinal research is often used to study the development of children.</p> <p>Explain <b>one</b> strength of the longitudinal research method as a way of studying children in psychology.</p> <p>You must refer to child development in your answer.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. If more than one strength mark all and credit the best. Ignore weaknesses. Examples can gain credit if they are used to strengthen the response or add additional information. <b>Max 1 mark</b> if no reference to child development in the answer.</p> <p>e.g. Length</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As they are conducted over an extended period of time changes in development can be studied/eq;</li> <li>• Variables that affect development can be systematically studied/eq;</li> <li>• Genie's progress as a result of psychological treatment could be accurately mapped/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Volume of data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lots of data is collected over a long period of time rather than a snapshot of behavior/eq;</li> <li>• Qualitative and quantitative data can be gathered and cross checked/eq;</li> <li>• This allows for developmental changes to be tracked/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Comparison with cross sectional design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unlike cross sectional studies any difference in social and cultural changes are not likely to affect the group /eq;</li> <li>• 7up studied the impact of social and cultural variables on individuals that could not have been achieved cross sectionally/eq;</li> <li>• Individual and participant differences are controlled as it is the same group that is studied throughout the study/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Ongoing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unlike many studies, it gathers ongoing data concerning development rather than retrospectively/eq</li> <li>• This an advantage because it does not rely upon memory/eq;</li> <li>• This makes the findings current and valid/cause and effect can be more easily established/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(3 AO3)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>B2 (b)</b>	<p>The case study is a research method used to study the development of children in detail.</p> <p>Explain the validity <b>and</b> reliability issues associated with the case study research method in child psychology.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Up to 4 marks for either validity or reliability issues. Some validity and reliability issues can be expressed as one or the other and should be credited (but not twice if used as both validity and reliability as separate issues, triangulation can be both reliability and validity, credit once and go with the intention of the candidate, but do not credit twice).</p> <p>Reliability issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case studies are unique cases and not likely to be repeatable under the same circumstances/eq;</li> <li>• Unique case results cannot be cross checked for reliability/eq;</li> <li>• Under different circumstances it is unlikely the same outcome will be found again/eq;</li> <li>• Genie was unique and her circumstances so extreme that a similar situation is unlikely to occur, so we cannot be sure her treatment will result in the same outcome/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies are typically naturally occurring circumstances that can be affected by many uncontrolled variables that may affect reliability/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Validity issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all factors can be controlled or accounted for in a case study, so cause and effect cannot be established/eq;</li> <li>• Based on unique individuals that cannot be generalised to others/population validity is low/eq;</li> <li>• The case study is often conducted under naturalistic conditions so real life can be examined/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies often use a variety of research methods so triangulation can establish validity of findings/eq;</li> <li>• Observations, psychological tests, interviews etc can be used to ensure findings from one method are validated by findings from other methods/eq;</li> <li>• Often more than one researcher is involved to maintain objective findings unaffected by researcher bias/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(6 AO3)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>*B3</b>	<p>During your course you will have learned about one of the following studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bowlby (1944/1946)</li> <li>• Belsky and Rovine (1988)</li> <li>• Rutter and the ERA team (1998).</li> </ul> <p>Describe the procedure of <b>one</b> study from the list <b>and</b> evaluate this study.</p> <p>In your evaluation you must explain <b>one</b> way in which the findings of the study might be used to promote good childcare practice.</p>	
	Indicative content	Mark
	<p>Mark according to the levels below. ONLY accept the studies listed above.</p> <p>Indicative content e.g. Bowlby (1944/1946)</p> <p>Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He used a sample of 88 children attending a clinic for behavioural problems</li> <li>• 44 were identified as thieves and 44 had emotional issues</li> <li>• The children were interviewed and a case history was built up of all the children</li> <li>• An independent social worker was used to conduct the interviews and assessments as well.</li> <li>• Backgrounds of the children were checked by interviews with parents.</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study was non-experimental so no causal relationship between maternal deprivation and emotional adjustment can be concluded</li> <li>• Bowlby conducted the interviews himself so can be criticised for researcher bias</li> <li>• Other reasons could be responsible for the affectionless psychopathy in the families where deprivation occurred</li> <li>• The reason for the maternal deprivation may have been the cause of emotional problems rather than the separation itself</li> <li>• The study used retrospective data which may be unreliable</li> </ul> <p>Application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is advised that some children may be affected by separation so this should be avoided.</li> <li>• Bowlby's findings led to better hospital policies with regards to parents being able to frequently stay with their child.</li> <li>• Bowlby's finding led to a key worker attachment figure in daycare establishments.</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Belsky and Rovine (1988)</p> <p>Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Used the findings of two American longitudinal studies to assess effects of daycare</li> <li>• Children had experienced daycare within the first year of life and attachments to the mother and father were examined</li> </ul>	<p>(6 AO1 + 6 AO2 = 12)</p>

- The strange situation procedure was used to classify attachment types

#### Evaluation

- The strange situation may not be an appropriate tool for measuring attachment in daycare children who are used to separation
- Children may not be avoidant, but used to stranger care
- Daycare can also have positive effects upon children's intellectual and social development
- Factors other than daycare may account for the findings, such as resilience of the child
- The procedure was highly controlled/standardised and reliability was established
- DiLalla (1998) found that children who spent no time in daycare were more prosocial than children who attended daycare
- The EPPE project suggests that children who attend daycare can have positive benefits – which goes against Belsky's findings

#### Application

- Belsky and Rovine's study suggests that prolonged intensive daycare is not advisable.
- At an early age children should be spending more time with their mothers.
- The study implies that extended maternal care and financial support for mothers should be provided by the state.

e.g. Rutter and the ERA team (1998)

#### Description

- A longitudinal study of 111 Romanian orphans who were institutionalised within a few weeks of life
- The children were either adopted before 6 months old or after six months and before two years
- Compared to a control group of 52 English adoptees

#### Evaluation

- A longitudinal study enabled the long term effects of care to be studied
- The adoptees were matched with a group of English children so fair comparison could be made
- We can never fully match a control group and experimental group so comparisons may not be valid
- Research cannot establish cause and effect between the care and resulting behaviour, there may be other influences involved

#### Application

- Advises that children who are orphaned should be rehomed as soon/early as possible.
- Institutional care does not offer the same quality of care as adoption.

Look for other rewardable material.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		AO1: Knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works. AO2: Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works.
	0	No rewardable material
<b>Level 1</b>	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce <b>brief</b> answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempted description of one study from the list.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt at the evaluative demands of the question.</li> <li>• No application evident.</li> </ul> <p>Lack of relevant evidence. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. The writing may have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but lack both clarity and organisation. High incidence of syntactical and /or spelling errors.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	4-6	<p>Description <b>OR</b> evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR one is in less detail than the other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited description of one study procedure from the list, only a small amount of detail is presented with little breadth and depth.</li> <li>• Limited evaluation of one study which may include an appropriate strength/weakness not well explained.</li> <li>• Limited application, may not be offered.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of <b>mostly accurate</b> and relevant factual material. There are likely to be passages which lack clarity and proper organisation. Frequent syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present. Limited clarity organisation in the response.</p>
<b>Level 3</b>	7-9	<p>Good and accurate description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good description of one study procedure from the list, some breadth and or depth of description. Answer may not be focused solely on procedure.</li> <li>• Good evaluation of the study done well and explained in more than one way.</li> <li>• Attempted application of study in terms of child care practice that makes good sense and is clearly identified.</li> </ul> <p>The candidate will demonstrate most of the skills needed to produce effective extended writing but there will be lapses in organisation. Some syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
<b>Level 4</b>	10-12	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b>both of the injunctions</b> in the question <b>very well</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good description of study procedure – depth and detail but weigh up in terms of scope of study. The majority of the answer must be focused on the procedure of the study.</li> <li>• Very good evaluation of the study on a range of evaluative issues or some done very well.</li> <li>• Explained application of study findings in terms of child care practice.</li> </ul> <p>The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning. Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the indicative content is present.</p>

## Section C – Health Psychology

	Guidance	
	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p> <p>Mark according to levels on question C1a and C3.</p>	

	Guidance	
	<p>Use the levels below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information. Giving marks for elaboration where appropriate is particularly important where questions such as this are suitable to stretch and challenge candidates, so that the full range of marks are available.</p>	

Question Number	Question	
<b>C1 (a)</b>	<p>A research team found an interesting result when testing heroin on rats. They wanted to investigate this further by conducting human trials.</p> <p>Describe a procedure the team might use when investigating the effects of heroin on human participants.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Mark according to the levels given below.</p> <p>Ignore references to animal research. Max 2 marks overall if no reference to heroin. No credit for blatantly unethical research.</p> <p>Examples of human research into the effect of heroin can include, surveys, laboratory experiments, brain scans, cognitive tests, observations. Ignore generic descriptions of maintenance programmes.</p> <p>The answer may include more than one research method.</p> <p><b>Elements</b> that could be used: variables, apparatus, sample/ participants, design, method, ethics, timings, instructions, controls, location, type of questions/questionnaire/interview schedule used.</p> <p>Levels</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No rewardable material</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Basic/brief information about the procedure of how the effects of heroin can be studied on humans (Ask them how they feel when they use drugs). Includes an attempt at one or more of the above elements.</p>	<b>(4 AO3)</b>

**2 marks**

Basic detail about the procedure of how the effects of heroin can be studied on humans with reference to more than one basic idea. Includes at least one well explained element from above.

**3 marks**

Good detail about the procedure of how the effects of heroin can be studied on humans (at least two of the above elements well expressed). Partial replication possible.

**4 marks**

Very good detail about the procedure of how the effects of heroin can be studied on humans. A range of ideas expressed well/three or more elements. Replication possible within the time constraints of the paper.

Indicative content

- Existing heroin users can be interviewed about their use
- Interviews can be used to generate quantitative and qualitative information about the effects of heroin use and effectiveness of prevention/rehabilitation programmes
- Interviews can gather essential information about the individuals experience of heroin use, social conditions and rehab/relapse conditions
- Qualitative information can be gathered about experiences of drug use/lifestyle
- Quantitative information can be gathered about amount of substance abuse, age of commencement etc
  
- Blättler et al (2002) used questionnaires to assess the effectiveness of prescription heroin
- Questionnaires can be used to gather a lot of information about the prevalence, experience and causes of heroin use
- Questionnaires can gather qualitative and quantitative information based on the type of question asked (closed or open)
- Questionnaires will be given to existing heroin users
  
- PET scans can be used on human participants to understand the effects of heroin use on brain structure and functioning
- Blood flow to a particular area of the brain can be detected/imaged to show the active parts of the brain during/following heroin use
- Damage from prolonged use of intensive heroin users can be established
  
- Laboratory experiments can be used to administer placebo drug use to investigate perception of experience or expectation
- Participants may be told what to expect or have their own belief of how heroin will affect them, but do not receive the real drug
- Their behaviour and perception of heroin effects are recorded
- Drug users, ex-users and non-users can be tested on a variety of measures, such as cognitive performance
- Underperformance on a cognitive task might indicate how heroin effect information processing or cause brain damage

**Look for other rewardable material.**

Question Number	Question	
<b>C1 (b)</b>	<p>Following the human trials the researchers found a difference in the effects of heroin on humans compared to the effects on rats.</p> <p>Explain why the use of animals compared to the use of humans might lead to different results.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Explicit comparison is not necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Animals are more reliable to use than humans as their behaviour can be monitored closely in confined situations over long periods of time/eq;</li> <li>• Human behaviour is very different from animal behaviour, so the results of such study may not be generalisable to humans/eq;</li> <li>• Animals have no knowledge of partaking in experiments, whereas humans do which may affect responses/social desirability/demand characteristics/eq;</li> <li>• The brains of animals are much simpler than humans which may explain the different findings/eq;</li> <li>• Humans are affected by emotions that are complex compared to animals, so the effect of drugs between them will differ/eq;</li> <li>• Humans take and experience drugs under social conditions so effects may differ/eq;</li> <li>• Drugs can be given repeatedly to animals and not to humans so more reliable conclusions can be drawn from animal studies/eq;</li> <li>• Humans have a right to withdraw so there may be a loss of participants which would not be the case for animals so more results can be obtained/eq;</li> <li>• It is unethical to repeatedly trial drugs on humans, whereas this may be considered more appropriate on animals/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(5 AO3)</b>

Question Number	Question	
C2 (a)	<p>During your course you will have learned about two studies in detail in health psychology. One of these studies was Blättler et al (2002), the <b>other study</b> investigated one of the following drugs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• alcohol</li> <li>• cocaine</li> <li>• ecstasy</li> <li>• marijuana</li> <li>• nicotine.</li> </ul> <p>Describe the findings (results and/or conclusions) of the study you have learned about that investigates one drug from the list.</p> <p>Do <b>not</b> use Blättler et al (2002).</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore aims and procedure. No credit for Blattler or a non-health study.</p> <p>Acceptable examples include Stacy et al, Wareing et al, Anderson, Brook et al, Morgan and Grube, Ennett et al. There may be others, consult your team leader if unsure before marking. No ID mark</p> <p>Tolerance of 5% for the percentages</p> <p>E.g. Ennett et al (1994)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slightly under half of the participants were regarded as cliques by the researchers, the remainder being clique liaisons or isolated individuals/eq;</li> <li>• 89.9% of the clique members were non-smokers/eq;</li> <li>• 2% of cliques were entirely smokers/eq;</li> <li>• 68% of cliques were entirely non-smokers/eq;</li> <li>• Cliques that were similar (race/sex/mothers educational level) were either all smokers or non-smokers, and dissimilar cliques included both smokers and non-smokers/eq;</li> <li>• Peer groups tend to discourage smoking, and only the small number of similar smoking groups encourage smoking/eq;</li> <li>• Girls are more likely to be in smoking cliques than boys/eq;</li> <li>• The mothers educational level affected adolescent smoking/eq;</li> </ul> <p>E.g. Brook et al (1999)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A history of using marijuana was associated with later unconventional adult roles being adopted/eq;</li> <li>• Frequent marijuana use is associated with later marriage, having children out of wedlock and unemployment/eq;</li> <li>• Early marriage also decreased the risk of later marijuana use/eq;</li> <li>• Adolescent marijuana users were 1.8 times more likely to be unemployed in their 20s/eq;</li> <li>• Heavy marijuana users were twice as likely to be living in a non-traditional family setting (co-habiting, living with friends or alone)/eq;</li> </ul> <p>E.g. Wareing et al (2000)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compared to the control group, users of MDMA had some impaired executive functioning/eq;</li> <li>• Users of MDMA were more anxious than the control group/eq;</li> <li>• Prior users of MDMA scored higher on arousal than current users/eq;</li> </ul>	(3 AO1)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• MDMA users processed information as quickly but less accurately than non-users/eq;</li><li>• MDMA users showed a higher rate of vowel intrusions in the random letter generating task than non-users/eq;</li><li>• MDMA users generated few letters and a higher degree of redundancy (repetitions)/eq;</li></ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points related to findings/conclusions.</p>	
--	--	--

Question Number	Question	
<b>C2 (b)</b>	Evaluate the study you have described in (a) in terms of issues <b>other than</b> generalisability.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration.</p> <p><b>No credit</b> for generalisability.  <b>No credit</b> for non-health studies.</p> <p>TE: If a is blank, but b evaluates an appropriate health study, max marks can be given. If a is incorrect (Blättler or not a study relating to the listed drugs but is a health study) and b evaluates the material in (a) max 2 marks can be given (only if it is a study, not a theory). If a evaluates a different study to that described in b, no marks can be given (take into account generic evaluation that may apply <b>Max 3</b> for generic).</p> <p>Issues may include ethics, validity, reliability, practical application, scientific, objectivity, credibility, additional supporting research.</p> <p>Eg Ennett (1994)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The survey gathered in depth information about friendship cliques using a variety of methods to ensure validity before establishing smoking behaviour/eq;</li> <li>• The results were restricted to three best friends, our behaviour is often affected by more than a limited range of individuals/eq;</li> <li>• Reciprocation may have been mis-measured as one person's view of friendship may not be reciprocated by another/eq;</li> <li>• Friendship, particularly best friends, is transient and results may vary over time/eq;</li> <li>• Self report data was backed up by carbon monoxide testing/eq;</li> <li>• The study results are confined to the US and may differ cross-culturally where friendship and attitudes to smoking differ so <u>may lack population validity</u>/eq;</li> <li>• Social factors such as socio-economic status were measured and accounted for in the survey/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Brook et al (1998)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study controlled for factors, such as employment, making the study more reliable/eq;</li> <li>• The longitudinal study was prospective so allowed for control over variables that would not be possible with a retrospective longitudinal study/eq;</li> <li>• Being prospective it was not affected by deficits in memory that is a problem with retrospective designs, so is more accurate/eq;</li> <li>• The participants were randomly selected so researcher bias is not likely to affect the reliability of the findings/eq;</li> <li>• Ethically there was an emphasis on informed consent and confidentiality of the information and this was supported by reputable institutions/eq;</li> <li>• The measures of use and adult roles was collected by self report data that may not be reliable and was not verified by other sources/eq;</li> <li>• The study was a correlation, so no causal relationship can be established/eq;</li> </ul>	(6 AO2)

- The measures of successful adulthood were limited to a small range of conventional roles at the expense of other roles that could have equally been defined as conventional eg higher education/eq;
- Marital status and employment were measures of conventional adult roles but the study did not measure how successful these variables were, i.e. was the marriage a successful one? Were they good at their jobs?/eq;

Wareing et al (2000)

- The researchers consulted with the Drugline organisation to ensure ethical procedures were adhered to with regards to their participants/eq;
- The researchers were responsible in their actions and gave Drugline leaflets to all participants following the study highlighting the dangers of drug use/eq;
- Two user participants were distressed by the speedy random letter generation task and were withdrawn from this section of the study/eq;
- The exclusion of vowels in the random letter generation task controlled for the possibility that participants could have simply spelt out words, making the procedure more valid as a measure of central executive functioning/eq;
- The measures of drug use were based on self report, so participants may have lied about their prior and current drug use/eq;

**Look for other reasonable marking points.**

	Guidance	
	Use the levels below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information. Giving marks for elaboration where appropriate is particularly important where questions such as this are suitable to stretch and challenge candidates, so that the full range of marks are available.	

Question Number	Question	
<b>*C3</b>	<p>The Biological Approach can help explain drug action and why drugs are addictive. The Learning Approach offers different explanations.</p> <p>Describe the mode of action of heroin, for example at the synapse, <b>and then</b> compare the relative strengths <b>and</b> weaknesses of <b>both</b> the biological and learning explanations of drug/substance misuse.</p>	
	Indicative content	Mark
	<p>Mark according to the levels below.</p> <p>This is a two part question.</p> <p>Mode of action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases the level of dopamine in the brain.</li> <li>Acts upon the opioid receptors sites.</li> <li>Morphine produced by taking heroin is a depressant and painkiller.</li> <li>GABA activity is inhibited.</li> <li>The drug increases the feeling of wellbeing/euphoria.</li> </ul> <p>Compare the biological and learning explanations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The biological and learning explanations of drug misuse can be scientifically tested using objective measures and experimental methods which is a strength of both approaches.</li> <li>Brain activity using and not using the drug can establish the biological effects of drug misuse which the learning approach do not test.</li> <li>Animal studies have demonstrated the neurological effects of drug misuse on biochemical activity which is a strength of the biological approach that the learning approach does not use.</li> <li>Genetic research has isolated the Mu-opioid gene implicated in addiction, which is an explanation that has strong scientific support compared to the learning approach.</li> <li>Animal studies have limited generalisability as human behaviour differs, which is a weakness of both biological and learning explanations/research.</li> <li>Isolating brain functioning and neural transmission is incredibly difficult and the brain is too complex to yet be understood fully, which is a weakness of the biological explanation.</li> <li>The biological approach ignores social and cognitive factors associated with drug misuse such as peer pressure, whereas the learning explanation only considers environmental factors.</li> <li>Withdrawal symptoms experienced seem to support the idea that the brain has adjusted and is reliant on the drug for normal functioning, an explanation consistent between the biological and learning explanations.</li> </ul>	<p>(6 AO2 + 6 AO1 = 12)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If we are all neurologically vulnerable to addiction, why are all that experience a drug not misusers of that drug, there is incredible individual variation which neither the biological nor learning explanation can account for.</li> <li>• Culturally, specific drugs are more likely to be misused due to cultural norms and variations, which would be a strength of the learning explanation as it accounts for environmental conditions.</li> <li>• The learning explanation cannot account for why an unpleasant first drug experience then leads to further drug use, whereas the biological approach can explain this at the neurological level.</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other rewardable material</b></p>	
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		AO1: Knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works. AO2: Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works.
	0	No rewardable material
<b>Level 1</b>	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce <b>brief</b> answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempted description of the mode of action of heroin – very basic.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An attempt at the comparison demands of the question.</li> </ul> <p>Lack of relevant evidence. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. The writing may have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but lack both clarity and organisation. High incidence of syntactical and /or spelling errors.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	4-6	<p>Description OR evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR one is more basic than the other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited description of the mode of action of heroin.</li> <li>• Limited comparison between the learning and the biological explanations of drug misuse. May evaluate the explanations without explicit comparison OR compare without reference to strengths and weaknesses. May offer descriptions of each approach without explicit comparison.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of <b>mostly accurate</b> and relevant factual material. There are likely to be passages which lack clarity and proper organisation. Frequent syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present. Limited clarity organisation in the response.</p>
<b>Level 3</b>	7-9	<p>Good and accurate description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good description of the mode of action of heroin (may be brief but good).</li> <li>• Good comparison between the learning and biological explanations that may focus on a strength or a weakness OR a limited comparison of both strength and weakness that is explicit.</li> </ul> <p>The candidate will demonstrate most of the skills needed to produce effective extended writing but there will be lapses in organisation. Some syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

<b>Level 4</b>	10-12	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b><i>both of the injunctions</i></b> in the question <b>very well</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Very good description of the mode of action of heroin (may be <b>brief</b> but very good) that refers explicitly to the synaptic action using good biological terminology and is largely accurate in description.</li><li>• At least one good comparison that focuses on a strength and one good comparison that focuses on a weakness between the biological and learning explanations of drug misuse/addiction, comparison is explicit in terms of BOTH strength(s) and weakness(es) of each explanation.</li></ul> <p>The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning.</p> <p>Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the indicative content is present.</p>
----------------	-------	---

## Section D – Sport Psychology

	Guidance	
	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p> <p>Except D1a, D1b, D2b and D3 which are marked according to the levels indicated.</p>	

	Guidance	
	<p>Use the levels below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information. Giving marks for elaboration where appropriate is particularly important where questions such as this are suitable to stretch and challenge candidates, so that the full range of marks are available.</p>	

Question Number	Question	
<b>D1 (a)</b>	<p>Alan, a sports psychologist, is planning to conduct a questionnaire into motivation in sport by collecting quantitative data from a sample of sports people.</p> <p>Describe how Alan might go about gathering <b>and</b> analysing quantitative data for his questionnaire.</p>	
	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Mark</b>
	<p>Mark according to the levels given below.</p> <p>Levels</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No rewardable material</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Basic/brief information about how Alan might go about gathering quantitative data. Eg – use a questionnaire using closed ended questions. <b>Or</b> just describe a published study with no reference to Alan.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> Basic detail about how Alan might go about gathering quantitative data with reference to more than one basic idea (eg sample and closed ended qs).</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> Good detail about how quantitative data might be gathered (more than one idea well expressed). Partial replication possible. Must refer to motivation data gathering.</p>	<b>(4 AO3)</b>

**4 marks**

Very good detail of how quantitative data might be gathered in sports psychology using a range of ideas expressed well. Replication possible given time constraints of exam. Must refer to gathering data on sporting motivation.

Question Number	Question	
<b>D1 (b)</b>	<p>Alan found a difference in motivation between different sports people. He wanted to investigate these differences further to gather more detailed information, such as how the different sports people felt about their sport.</p> <p>Explain how Alan might go about gathering <b>and</b> analysing more detailed information from the sports people.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Mark according to the levels given below.</p> <p>Levels</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No rewardable material</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Basic/brief information about how qualitative data may be gathered. Eg use interview/case study instead.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> Basic detail about how Alan might go about gathering qualitative data with reference to more than one basic idea (eg interview and open qs, case study using variety of methods).</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> Good detail about how qualitative data might be gathered instead (more than one idea well expressed). Partial replication possible. Must refer to motivation data gathering. Examples of questions (open) can gain credit.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> Very good detail of how qualitative data might be gathered in sports psychology using a range of ideas expressed well. Replication possible given time constraints of exam. Must refer to gathering data on sporting motivation.</p>	<b>(4 AO3)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>D2(a)(i)</b>	<p>During your course you will have learned about one of the following studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cottrell et al (1968)</li> <li>• Koivula (1995)</li> <li>• Craft et al (2003)</li> </ul> <p>Describe the findings (results and/or conclusions) of <b>one</b> study from the list.</p>	
	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Mark</b>
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore aims, procedure. Credit results and/or conclusions.</p> <p>e.g. Koivula (1995)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most participants were sex typed from the BSRI score/eq;</li> <li>• Most participants were stereotypical when rating sports as male or female/eq;</li> <li>• Androgynous and undifferentiated participants from the BSRI were less likely to rate certain sports as male or female/eq;</li> <li>• Men were more likely to sex type a sport than females/eq;</li> <li>• The results support gender schematic information processing/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g Cottrell et al (1968)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Audience improved performance on non-competitive tasks in terms of speed of learning/eq;</li> <li>• Error rate was highest with an audience on competitive task/eq;</li> <li>• Slow learners produced a higher mean error rate on competitive lists than fast learners with an audience, suggesting that audience hinders performance on less proficient individuals/tasks/eq;</li> <li>• In the second part of the study, mere-presence and audience was tested by using a blindfolded participant/eq;</li> <li>• Mere-presence had little effect on performance but with practice it showed that audience improved performance/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g Craft et al (2003)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They found that only self confidence was a useful indicator of sporting performance and this was marginal/eq;</li> <li>• The subscales alone are not useful indicators of performance, but together show a useful interrelationship/eq;</li> <li>• They concluded that cognitive and somatic anxiety are interdependent/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(3 AO1)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>D2(a)(ii)</b>	Evaluate the study you have described in (a)(i) in terms of <b>either</b> reliability <b>or</b> ethics.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore reference to validity or practical applications or generalisability. If the candidate has commented on BOTH reliability and ethics, mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>TE: If ai is blank but aii correctly evaluates an appropriate sport study, full credit can be given. If ai is incorrect (but still a study in sport but not from the list) but aii correctly evaluates that study max 2 marks can be given. If aii does not correspond with ai, no marks can be given. If not a sports study <b>no credit</b>.</p> <p>e.g. Koivula (1995) Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaires that ask a judgement of gender may either encourage traditional or modern views of gender so results may be unreliable/eq;</li> <li>• Despite being instructed to ignore the number of males and females who play a sport, results may be unreliable as social desirability may have been in play regarding different sports/eq;</li> <li>• The BSRI is a well established sex type inventory with a significant number of filler items to prevent demand characteristics/eq;</li> <li>• The sample was large but biased and the attitudes of Swedish, white undergraduates may not be reliable/eq;</li> <li>• Rating scales used by these questionnaires may reflect opinion on the day rather than an enduring attitude/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Ethics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaires are voluntary and rarely raise any ethical issue regarding consent/eq;</li> <li>• The nature of the investigation was partly masked so informed consent was not established/eq;</li> <li>• Asking questions about sex roles and sport is not likely to lead to issues of distress/eq;</li> <li>• Confidentiality is maintained as questionnaires can be completed and submitted anonymously/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g Cottrell et al (1968) Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The type of performance is cognitive and unlikely to demonstrate real audience effects within sport so findings will be unreliable in comparison to real sporting performance/eq;</li> <li>• An audience during sport is more active and encouraging (or not) so affects an athlete more than the audience in this study/eq;</li> <li>• The sample of male undergraduates is biased and does not represent all individuals well, particularly as individual differences would have a great effect upon performance with or without an audience/eq;</li> </ul>	<b>(3 AO2)</b>

- Laboratory based research such as this is highly controlled and repeatable to show whether the results are reliable/eq;
- The measures taken were objectively taken and quantifiable so avoids subjective interpretation/eq;

#### Ethics

- The participants were put under stress as some performed under audience conditions and felt they were being pressured to perform/eq;
- Participants were not informed about the true nature of the study/eq;
- The competitive groups suffered more stress as they had to make no mistakes compared to the non-competitive groups/eq;

e.g Craft et al (2003)

#### Reliability

- The CSAI-2 may not be a useful psychometric measure of anxiety as it is context dependent so unreliable in different contexts/eq;
- Like any meta-analysis only comparable groups of athletes/samples/similarity of measures were used but matching for all properties is clearly not possible and variation may distort results/eq;
- For example some studies administered the CSAI-2 some time before the event and some immediately before/some were administered in groups and some individuals so findings may be unreliable/eq;

#### Ethics

- A meta analysis does not directly gather data from participants so ethical issues are minimised/eq;
- There was no need to gain informed consent or right to withdraw as participants had already agreed to these stipulations in the original study/eq;
- Meta analysis does not distress participants as secondary data is used/eq;

**Look for other reasonable marking points**

	Guidance	
	Use the levels below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information. Giving marks for elaboration where appropriate is particularly important where questions such as this are suitable to stretch and challenge candidates, so that the full range of marks are available.	

Question Number	Question	
<b>D2 (b)</b>	<p>You have conducted a practical investigation (a content analysis or a summary of two article sources) into a key issue in sport psychology.</p> <p>Imagine you have been asked to present the conclusions of your practical investigation at a student conference.</p> <p>Explain your conclusions about the key issue using concepts, theories and/or research drawn from sport psychology.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Mark according to the levels given.</p> <p>Using the levels credit explanations of the key issue. Ignore key issues unrelated to sports psychology.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No rewardable material.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Brief <b>and</b> basic comments about results and/or conclusions of practical investigation as it relates to a key issue in sports psychology.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> Basic and clear comments about results and/or conclusions of the practical investigation concerning a key issue in sports psychology with some attempt to link to theories, research and/or concepts but this is done in a brief and basic manner.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> Clear and accurate comments about results and/or conclusions concerning a key issue in sports psychology that are explained. There a good attempt to link to theories, research and/or concepts drawn from the approach, but links may lack explanation/depth.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> Thorough, clear and detailed comments about results and/or conclusions of the practical investigation concerning a key issue in sports psychology. There will be a good/detailed explanation of the findings with reference to research, theories and/or concepts drawn from the approach.</p>	<b>(4 AO2)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>*D3</b>	<p>Following a lecture on achievement motivation theory, Bella discussed alternative theories of motivation in sport with her friends. Bella explained that there were reasons for sporting motivation other than a high need for achievement.</p> <p>Describe <b>one</b> theory, <b>other than</b> achievement motivation theory, that Bella might use to explain sporting motivation to her friends <b>and</b> evaluate this theory.</p> <p>You must refer to Bella in your answer.</p>	
	Indicative content	Mark
	<p>Mark according to the levels below. Ignore reference to achievement motivation theory. Suitable examples include cognitive evaluation theory, self efficacy theory. Ignore inverted U, imagery. Consult your team leader before marking if unsure.</p> <p>Reference to Bella must be implicit in the answer if not made explicit e.g. Bella might use/she might suggest/to her friends/explaining sporting motivation can be done by... etc</p> <p>Self efficacy (Bandura, 1977)</p> <p>Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self efficacy is the belief in being able to do well that encourages self motivation.</li> <li>• Belief in one's ability/competence is a cognitive motivation.</li> <li>• Self efficacy/self confidence will be sport specific.</li> <li>• Self efficacy is dependent on past performance in a sport, so failures lower it and successes improve it, based on probability of success.</li> <li>• Self efficacy is dependent on vicarious experience, the modelling of successful role models and belief that they can do equally well.</li> <li>• Self efficacy is dependent on social persuasion, when coaches and others persuade /give favourable feedback concerning performance is a motivating factor.</li> <li>• Self efficacy is dependent on perception of physiological state, which the sports person sees prematch nerves as inability compared to normality.</li> <li>• Self efficacy is related to perceived control over destiny and performance, so low control and performance lowers motivation and vice versa.</li> <li>• Individuals with high self efficacy will try out tasks that are above their level, persist in tasks but not prepare enough and externally attribute failures.</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jourden et al (1991) found that self efficacy was raised when success was attributed to individual effort rather than innate ability.</li> <li>• Practical application suggests that athletes should be exposed</li> </ul>	<p><b>(6 AO2 + 6 AO1 = 12)</b></p>

to successful role models.

- Practical application suggests that praise and encouragement from coaches should be optimised to improve self efficacy.
- Schunk (1989) found that self efficacy can be improved on measures of reinforcement, modelling and goal setting in maths tasks, which has application to sports psychology.
- Vicarious learning is not an adequate explanation as sports requires motor skills which may not be possible.
- Much of the available data on self efficacy is via self report data, which may not be reliable.
- Correlational studies do not establish cause and effect between self efficacy and motivation/performance.

#### Cognitive evaluation theory (Deci and Ryan, 1985)

##### Description

- CET explains the influence of external factors on internal motivation to perform well.
- External factors either promote or undermine intrinsic motivation.
- External motivators, such as prizes, increase intrinsic motivation through enhanced belief in competence.
- The theory explains that verbal praise over tangible rewards (which are controlling and lead to the perception of loss of control) increases intrinsic motivation.
- Athletes use information available from an event to judge competence and causality (eg, difficulty of race, strength of competition, conditions of race) and if they did well, based on this information, it increases intrinsic motivation.
- Athletes assess the controlling factor of the situation, if control was external to the athlete (eg referee decisions, team tactics) it can have a negative impact on intrinsic motivation.

##### Evaluation

- The theory explains the variability in intrinsic motivation based on external factors that other motivational theories neglect to explain.
- The application of the theory can be used to promote intrinsic motivation through specific external rewards to promote intrinsic motivation/encouraging autonomy/engaging in activities for intrinsic reasons.
- Deci and Ryan's research on puzzle solving showed increased performance when completing the puzzle for pleasure than reward.
- Goudas et al (1994) supports the theory by finding that children reported higher levels of intrinsic motivation when given decision making choices in a PE class compared to those classes that were teacher led decisions.
- Vallerand and Reid (1984) found that positive feedback over negative feedback improved college students' performance.
- Kruglanski et al (1982) studied the motivation of fifth grade children when playing games and found that tangible rewards decreased intrinsic motivation, furthermore only 2 of the children cited reward as a reason for game playing one week later.
- Carton refutes the negative impact of rewards and criticises the research for not controlling factors (such as temporal continuity and number of rewards given), arguing instead that rewards

	<p>are legitimate and operant conditioning theory still applies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phillips and Lord (1980) found only changes in perceived competence but not intrinsic motivation following receipt of rewards.</li> <li>• The theory does suggest that competition (as a highly controlled activity) will have a negative impact upon intrinsic motivation, but as most sport is competitive, it is hard to apply this theory well to sporting performance.</li> </ul> <p>Look for other rewardable material.</p>	
--	---	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		<p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works.</p> <p>AO2: Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works.</p>
	0	No rewardable material
<b>Level 1</b>	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce <b>brief</b> answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempted description of one theory of motivation.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt at the evaluative demands of the question. May be no attempt to address the scenario given in the question stem.</li> </ul> <p>Lack of relevant evidence. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. The writing may have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but lack both clarity and organisation. High incidence of syntactical and /or spelling errors.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	4-6	<p>Description OR evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR one is in less detail than the other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited description of one theory of motivation (other than achievement motivation).</li> <li>• Limited evaluation of the theory.</li> <li>• May or may not be an attempt to address the scenario given in the question stem.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of <b>mostly accurate</b> and relevant factual material. There are likely to be passages which lack clarity and proper organisation. Frequent syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present. Limited clarity organisation in the response.</p>
<b>Level 3</b>	7-9	<p>Good and accurate description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good description of a theory of motivation (not achievement motivation). Clear description points made with some breadth and/or depth.</li> <li>• Good evaluation of the theory including well expressed strength and/ or weakness. The answer may be limited to one evaluation comments expressed very well with depth of explanation or a few evaluative comments made clearly with little depth of explanation.</li> <li>• Some understanding that the answer should address the scenario in the question, so makes reference to explain the best theory to friends/what Bella might say etc.</li> </ul> <p>The candidate will demonstrate most of the skills needed to produce effective extended writing but there will be lapses in organisation. Some syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

<p><b>Level 4</b></p>	<p>10-12</p>	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b><i>both of the injunctions</i></b> in the question <b>very well</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good description of one theory of motivation (not achievement motivation). Description has breadth and depth of detail that, within the time constraints of the paper, expressed the theory in a well-rounded and detailed fashion with good accuracy.</li> <li>• Very good evaluation of the theory including well expressed strengths and weaknesses. More than one evaluation point expressed well and explained is expected for this level, but balance should be given to those who have made more superficial but plenty of evaluative comments.</li> <li>• Very good understanding of the question in which the answer clearly addressed the scenario (Bella/friends) in the question stem and maintains that focus through the answer.</li> </ul> <p>The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning.</p> <p>Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the indicative content is present.</p>
-----------------------	--------------	---

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA036699

Summer 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website  
[www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

