

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report January 2010

GCE Psychology 6PS03

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results
www.resultsplus.org.uk

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

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

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com. If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2010

Publications Code UA024570

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Introduction

Centres and candidates should be commended on the standard of answers given in this second session of the new unit three examination. Candidates navigated the paper well and found questions accessible and the marks available equally accessible. There was a greater level of maturity than the January exam, which is expected after only one term of study, and a noticeable improvement in candidates ability to apply their knowledge.

The majority of candidates found no difficulty in finishing the paper in good time, those who did less well in managing their time often spent too long on short answer questions than necessary, often extending into the white space below the question or providing additional paper. Relevance rather than length is the key to achieving high marks within the answer space available, high marks may be gained through saturation but this inevitably has a negative effect on the essay at the end of each topic. Highlighting the key injunctions and emphasis of the question served as a useful strategy for many candidates who organised their answers well and maintained relevance throughout.

Centres should be reminded that the answer space available is recommended for the type of question and mark allocation. Although there was little evidence of candidates failing to complete the paper in time, candidates did rush the essay questions and this often led to almost illegible handwriting for candidates for whom extended writing is an issue.

As seen in January, the most popular topic was criminological psychology, with centres choosing child as the second application. There were still a significant number of centres teaching health psychology, with few selecting sport as a second topic. Regardless of topic choice, candidates should be assured that they have the breadth and depth of knowledge and skill to extend to the synoptic unit. Indeed the progression from AS to this application unit was very encouraging as candidates clearly dealt with both the straightforward and application based questions confidently.

Individual comments will be made on each topic and question as the examiners report progresses, exemplification material will be discussed and examiners advice offered. However, a few key comments are summarised here that were common across all topics and may be of some benefit to centres.

- Categorical statements: candidates are often making categorical 'sweeping' statements in their answers where there is clear ambiguity, or not offering categorical comments where they clearly could. This was an issue with research method questions in January that is echoed in this session for question B2b and to a lesser extent on C2b. Candidates often cited that case studies are unethical, but only the stronger candidates suggested that they 'could' have ethical implications such as confidentiality issues or cited the case of Genie as an example where there were ethical issues. Similarly for question B1ai candidates claimed that all autistic children are savant, only the stronger candidates clearly defined what was typical of autism as opposed to what characteristics they 'could' display. Question A1a is a clear example of a question that requires candidates to be clear about their knowledge of Loftus and Palmers study findings, but many skirted around how leading questions affect recall without any clear direction of the effect.
- Although there was marked improvement on application questions, some candidates are still using generic knowledge rather than specific detail. Question A1b and A1c required candidates to assess the reliability and validity of a specific study. Some candidates offered generic evaluation of a laboratory experiment, such as 'lab based so artificial

environment', and as a consequence had to work harder to achieve full marks than those candidates that referred specifically to the study detail, for example, 'the study was artificial because participants watched a video and were given a questionnaire which does not have the same emotion, consequence or spontaneity of witnessing a real car accident'. Candidates did better in questions B2a, B2b, C2a, C2b, C2c, D2a, and D2b, where answers were clearly contextualised within the topic.

- Candidates continue to struggle with comparison questions. Question B1a_{iii} specifically demanded the comparison of two explanations of a developmental disorder studied. This clearly fazed a few who did not attempt the question, whilst the majority simply described one explanation and then the other for little credit. Only a minority were prepared for comparison, using terms such as 'whereas', 'similar to', 'different from', to aid comparison. Comparing is a high level skill that will become increasingly commonplace in this paper; candidates should be more prepared in the future.
- The essay questions were, as in January, fairly straightforward. Centres should be mindful that essay questions may not be as straightforward in future series. Candidates who were organised performed well. Encouragingly candidates were citing research in their evaluation, however there was often an imbalance in the level of detail offered, some candidates only mentioning the name of the researcher, whilst others described the entire study. Clearly neither strategy is useful as references gain no credit without explanation and longwinded descriptions waste time and distract candidates from the actual essay question. When citing research only the study findings and/or conclusion need be described with a clear and succinct explanation of how it is, or is not, supporting evidence.
- Practical investigations were a focus in this paper, with both the criminological and health topics asking practical based questions. Centres should be mindful that practical investigations may be a stronger focus in future series and candidates should always be prepared to answer questions on both topic practicals. There seemed to be a mixed bag of teacher led and candidate led investigations. Successful candidates had clear guidance on strategy and topic but independently sourced and studied the material.

Question 1 (a)

This question focused solely on a compulsory and well cited research study. Candidates generally performed very well on this section and were able to focus on the research findings/conclusions rather than describing the method. Some candidates referred to both parts of the study although a few confused this with the study of Loftus and Zanni by referring to 'a' and 'the' broken headlight/glass rather than accurately describing the participants in the smashed condition being more likely to report seeing broken glass in the second part of the study. There was some excellent citing of actual mean speeds recorded and percentage of participants reporting glass for the higher marks, although many misreported the order of the verbs, the figures obtained and some used other verbs (crashed being common).

SECTION A: CRIMINOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Answer ALL questions.

A1 (a) Loftus and Palmer (1974) investigated the effect of leading questions on eyewitness testimony.

Outline the findings (results and/or conclusions) of Loftus and Palmer's experiment.

(3)

Loftus and Palmer found that in the first part of their experiment the people asked the question using the word "smashed" estimated the speed highest with an average of 41 mph. However those given the words "bump hit" and "contacted" estimated the speeds much lower at 34 mph and 32 mph respectively. This shows that the adjective used in a question can make speeds estimates inaccurate and effect Eye Witness Testimony.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Given a marginal leeway with regards to actual mean speed estimates, this candidate accurately describes the findings of three verbs used in the study and offers a conclusion which could have achieved a fourth mark if more than three marks were available.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Tip

Remembering specific figures can boost the description of results as long as they are accurate.

SECTION A: CRIMINOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Answer ALL questions.

A1 (a) Loftus and Palmer (1974) investigated the effect of leading questions on eyewitness testimony.

Outline the findings (results and/or conclusions) of Loftus and Palmer's experiment.

(3)

The findings of Loftus + Palmer's experiment was that when the questions which had the changed word in it was asked to the participants, they answered differently to the ones that weren't asked.

(b) Evaluate Loftus and Palmer's (1974) experiment in terms of validity



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Unlike the first example, this candidate's answer is far too vague and inaccurate for any credit.

Question 1 (b)

Although limited marks could be achieved for a generic evaluation of the research method it was only the candidates that referred to specific detail or evaluated the validity of the study directly that gained higher marks. There were an encouraging number of candidates who understood why the second part of the study was conducted with regards to the validity of reconstructive memory over demand characteristics. Some candidates confused validity with reliability

(b) Evaluate Loftus and Palmer's (1974) experiment in terms of validity. (2)

As Loftus and Palmer was a laboratory experiment, this means that it has high internal validity. This is due to the high levels of controls, meaning that there is no chance of extraneous or confounding or situational variables occurring, so we know only the independent variable affected the dependent variable i.e. leading questions affected recall.

It also lacked ecological validity as it was not a measure of real life behaviour - participants knew it was an experiment and there would be no consequences eg. testimonies do not go to the police.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate has made a very good point concerning internal validity, which gained maximum credit as it is stated, well explained and specific example given. The second comment concerning consequences of testimony would have also gained maximum marks as it was specific to the study.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

'It measures what it claims to measure' and other validity comments are not creditworthy without explanation. SEE - State, Explain, Example.

Question 1 (c)

It was more typical to see generic AS level comments regarding laboratory experiments here, so candidates referring to the actual study in detail were given higher credit. There were a good number of candidates that were able to explain reliability in terms of replicability rather than simply jumping straight to reliability. Candidates need to be aware that control does not simply result in reliability, but that control aids replicability so that reliability can be verified.

(c) Evaluate Loftus and Palmer's (1974) experiment in terms of reliability.

(2)

Loftus & Palmer's experiment is very reliable, as it was very controlled, with clear variables, making it replicable & able to test for reliability.

(d) Criminal psychologists often use the findings of research when advising the police



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a typical answer to the question of reliability. The candidate has given a generic evaluation of a laboratory study, and although reliability is qualified by explaining control and replication, there is no specific study detail, such as the 7 video clips, standardised questions, critical question manipulation, for the second mark.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

It is not enough, even for a basic mark at A2, to say that there was reliability/replicability because it was conducted in a lab, candidates need to be explicit about the features of a lab that make it reliable/replicable, eg controls, standardisation, cause and effect.

Question 1 (d)

Most candidates were able to advise the police to avoid the use of leading questions but many did not develop any more comments. Those candidates that realised they did not have to focus just on Loftus and Palmer offered advice about crime or state reconstruction, weapon focus issues, time lapse and emotion. Some candidates tried to tackle Yuille and Cutshall in their answer but many were unsuccessful.

Unsuccessful candidates described the research without giving any real advice, which was what the question asked them to do. More able candidates offered the advice and backed this up with supporting research.

Question 2

A2a

Candidates seemed under prepared for this question, often leading to ambitious aims or unwieldy answers. Many candidates ambitiously claimed to be testing the effectiveness of offender profiling or investigating the effectiveness of EWT personally without referring to the fact that they were looking at secondary sources or others opinions on this subject. As many were not actually testing EWT or offender profiling as such they only gained half the available marks.

A2b

Candidates often restated the question stem, commenting on seeking two sources and summarising them, higher marks were achieved by describing how the sources were gathered, what the sources were and why they were selected, the strategy used to review/tally the sources - including specific coding/theme detail, controls used to ensure objectivity/reliability and how the sources were compared. Few candidates were able to achieve the level of detail required for all three marks, most achieved two marks.

A2c

Candidates who independently researched their sources were able to give the detail of findings required for all the available marks. Candidates who used extracts or figures from their content analysis were able to offer this detail but many devoted too much time to describing psychological theory and research in detail without making clear and explicit links to their own findings.

A2 During your course you will have conducted a practical investigation on a topic in criminological psychology using **either** a content analysis **or** a summary of two article sources.

(a) What was the aim/purpose of your practical investigation?

(2)

To conduct a content analysis on the TV program concerning Fred West called 'Real Crimes - killer born or made?' and to see if there was any underlying bias expressed by the program to any particular view point in the born or made argument.

(b) Describe how you went about gathering and/or analysing the data for your practical investigation.

(3)

Before analysing the content of the program it was decided exactly what categories to rate on a category sheet - and each category was designated to a pair of researchers. This was to ensure that they could have greater focus on that area due to their one area of focus, and to ensure interresearcher reliability by having two people rate the same things down and then compare them afterwards. The categories were 'Born' and 'Made' which were then divided into subcategories such as 'environmental factors', 'biological factors of the birth' and 'family life'.

(c) Outline the findings (results and/or conclusions) you have drawn from your practical investigation. You may wish to use research, theories and/or concepts from criminological psychology to outline your findings.

(3)

There seemed to be a slight bias towards the 'made' argument, but mainly focused upon 'biological factors after birth'. For example, Fred West's head trauma following a motorcycle accident was mentioned several times; it was implied that this made a great change to his personality and could account to his murderous behaviour. There were also several environmental factors frequently mentioned, especially 'family life'. It was explained how his mother often beat him and his brothers and how incest was common, suggesting a cause for his abnormal behaviour as an adult.

(Total for Question A2 = 8 marks)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The aim of this study is clear in terms of conducting a content analysis, the topic of study and the purpose. Candidates could describe the gathering and/or analysis of data, this candidate focused on information gathering which was typical of the vast majority of candidates. The source is mentioned in section a, so the candidate goes on to detail the coding used and establishing inter-rater reliability. The coding units are operationalised in the last sentence. This level of detail was uncommon and many candidates failed to detail their themes/coding units and/or the sources used.

The answer clearly summarises the main finding and then details clearly the link between 'born' and 'made' to what was found in the film. This answer gained maximum marks.

Question 3

Self fulfilling prophecy was the most common alternative theory, and candidates seemed more able to evaluate the theory than describe it, often neglecting to include detail about how others treat the labelled person or internalisation, which resulted in a rather simplistic description of SFP as a 'name calling' theory. Evaluation was much stronger and most candidates were able to use Rosenthal and Jacobsen, Madon, Jahoda and Flouri and Hawkes. Higher level candidates were able to appreciate the ethical issues with SFP research, acknowledging that studies such as Rosenthal and Jacobsen are in the realms of education not crime, and explaining individual differences in the impact of labelling. Eysenck's personality theory was popular; conversely the description was far better than evaluation for this theory. Able candidates were able to confidently describe the role of the ANS and RAS for neurotic and extrovert personalities. Psychoticism was often missed out in the description, and only high level candidates acknowledged the role of the environment/conditionability for this theory. There was some supporting research, e.g. Bartol, and many focused on alternative theories and methodological issues with the personality inventory.

Question 1 (a)

B1ai) Credit was given for characteristics of one disorder; as such features, prevalence and diagnostic category were perfectly acceptable. Credit was not, however, given to categorical claims, particularly for autism. Generally candidates wrote more than necessary for the three marks and often scored highly.

B1aii) Autism was the most common developmental disorder described in part ai, so the theory of mind and extreme male brain were typical explanations followed by the 'refrigerator mother' and other social explanations. Typically candidates described each explanation, which if followed concurrently achieved minimal marks. However, very few were prepared to extend their knowledge base and draw comparative conclusions. Those who did compared cognitive and biological views, the explanation of male prevalence and cause/effect. Candidates should be more prepared for comparison questions in future series.

If you answer the questions in Section B put a cross in this box .

SECTION B: CHILD PSYCHOLOGY

Answer ALL questions.

B1 During your course you will have studied one developmental issue from the following:

- severe learning difficulties
- autism
- ADHD.

(a) (i) Outline characteristics of the developmental issue you have studied. Make it clear which developmental issue you are referring to.

(3)

Developmental issue Autism

Autism is part of the ~~the~~ Autistic Spectrum Disorder, and can ~~or~~ occur in varying degrees of severity. The main characteristics of autism are that sufferers lack empathy and are high systemisers. This means they find it hard to identify with others and are usually very ~~good~~ gifted in a particular area such as math. Sufferers also either find it hard to make eye contact or have ~~an~~ abnormal eye contact.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer accurately describes autism as a spectrum disorder, a feature that many candidates neglected, and as such the answer is less categorical about the characteristics of the disorder - using the term 'usually' implies the candidate realises savant is not a typical expected feature of autism. The other features described are more definite because they are expected features/main characteristics of autism.

Question 1 (b)

Many candidates were able to identify the positive effects of daycare; emotional, intellectual and social being common, however the requirement of the question was to 'explain' the positive effects. The explanation was often achieved through a description of how the effect was achieved, the impact of the effect or supporting research. Typically candidates used a stimulating environment for intellectual development, peer interaction for social development and other caregivers for emotional development.

(b) Many children attend daycare. Explain the possible **positive** effects of daycare for children.

(3)

It teaches the child to become independent and how to deal with things when their main caregiver is absent.

It enables children to learn, play and communicate with other children and adults they are not familiar to.

Studies such as Andersson show that children in daycare are more likely to score higher on intellectual and social tests.



This example is a basic outline of three positive effects and gains all available marks. This is the minimum accepted as identification and explanation/elaboration for each mark.



Explain questions require more than identification/statement. Candidates should be prepared for elaboration/expansion/example/evidence.

Question 2 (a)

A significant number of candidates described Genie rather than focus on a case study as a research method. It was common for those who did describe a case study, to then slip into evaluation. Successful candidates described the in depth case of one/small group of individuals, triangulation, an example and longitudinal nature. Encouragingly most focused on the case study.

B2 (a) Describe the case study as a research method used to study child development.

(4)

A case study involves looking at an individual or ~~small~~ small group in great depth and detail. It is often retrospective and uses a number of different research methods within it. These can be things like observations or interviews, it also gathers data from other sources like doctors notes. The wide range of methods means case studies can gather both qualitative and quantitative data. Case studies are normally used to look at unique cases, like deprivation, that would be unethical to create with a lab experiment.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer manages to refer to child psychology in one way so has access to the higher marks. This is slightly disappointing as child psychology could have been more explicit throughout the development of this question.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When asked directly about a research method in context of the application, ensure that the answer refers explicitly and continually to the application, in this case child psychology, in the answer. Making reference to an example, such as Genie, would contextualise an answer.

Question 2 (b)

This question seemed more focused on the method than B2a, and was generally more successful. Candidates needed to evaluate in the context of child psychology and most did. Typically candidates evaluated generalisability, reliability and ethical issues. Many did well to identify confidentiality as the main ethical issue associated with case studies, such as Genie, and a minority mentioned pseudonyms and triangulation validity. Most evaluation points were well explained.

Question 3

Bowlby's study was most popular, followed by Belsky and a minority choosing Rutter. Bowlby's study was generally described and evaluated well, although there was a general lack of detail regarding the procedure. There was good detail of the control group and the results. Candidates who used the APRC structure gained good coverage for description. Evaluation varied using methodological critique of the sample, interview and researcher bias and supporting/opposing research such as Harlow, Rutter and institutionalisation/adoption studies. Candidates were effective in using research findings only to evaluate the study.

Unfortunately a minority of candidates described and evaluated Bowlby's theory of attachment; credit could be only given for mention of the 44 juvenile thieves study and any evaluation relevant to the study.

Belsky's study also suffered from a lack of description beyond that of the strange situation being used as a form of assessment. Evaluation seemed stronger as a range of daycare research was cited and candidates often questioned the validity of using the strange situation with daycare attendees and individual differences.

*B3 Describe and evaluate **one** of the following research studies:

- Bowlby (1946)
- Belsky and Rovine (1988)
- Rutter and the ERA team (1998).

(12)

Study Belsky and Rovine (1988).

The aim of the study was to look at the effects of day care on social development and to compare rates of insecure attachments with the amount of day care used. The procedure was that 149 12-13 month old babies were used they were from married heterosexual parents, these children and parents then underwent the Strange Situation, where special attention was paid at the reunion stage as this identified what attachment was formed, then the mothers were asked to conduct an interview where they were asked how many hours of work they completed a week and whether they used day care and how many hours of day care was the child exposed to.

The results found that children's whose mothers worked more than 20 hours a week and used day care formed insecure attachments with mother. Mothers children's

considered not truly valid, this is because the child's temperament or personality is not accounted for, for example if the child was naturally independent and bold as a character then this could be wrongly interpreted as an insecure attachment when in fact it is ^{the} child's temperament, hence due to all factors not being considered results may be invalid. Also the procedure was conducted in an artificial environment as part of a structured observations (Strange situation), hence the child may have been more conscious and fascinated about the change in environment than the parents, hence results may not consider the natural behaviour of the child therefore not true to life.

On the other hand results are deemed reliable as a strict procedure was used and the interviews can easily be completed again, therefore the procedure is replicable in order to gain accurate and reliable results.

Also results can be considered generalisable as a large sample size of 149 participants were used therefore a range of characteristics was upheld hence can be applicable to society.

Furthermore the study has strong application as it shows the negative effects of day care on social development and therefore working mothers can be warned of this fact and can prevent the child from suffering the same consequences, hence it has

strong application to society

In conclusion the results of this study provide a detailed insight to the effects of day care on social development and can prevent mothers from sending their child to day care to stop these negative influences continuing.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This example achieves level 4 as there is very good breadth (APRC) with very good detail/depth in its description across all elements. Evaluation is very good, concisely stating strengths and weaknesses with sound explanations given for each point made.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Describing a study requires good breadth and depth. Breadth can be achieved by describing Aim, Procedure, Results and Conclusion (APRC). Depth requires more thorough knowledge of the study detail, such as how many participants were used, how the procedure was conducted, controls used, apparatus, detailed results and an overall conclusion.

Question 1 (a)

For a demanding biological question, this was answered very well by most candidates. The most common drug described was, unsurprisingly, heroin and candidates were able to describe the mode of action at the synaptic level and effect of behaviour.

If you answer the questions in Section C put a cross in this box .

SECTION C: HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY

Answer ALL questions.

C1 (a) Describe the mode of action (how it affects brain functioning) of **one** drug you have studied. Make it clear which drug you are referring to.

(3)

Drug Heroin

Heroin is an opiate and effects dopamine levels in the brain. Heroin is converted to morphine in the brain and fits to receptors. It reduces the inhibiting effect of GABA on the dopamine releasing neurone. This results in more dopamine being released to the brain which helps act as a painkiller.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Although the first sentence is rather vague in terms of how dopamine is effected, the subsequent comments are accurate and clear for all available marks.

Question 1 (b)

Candidates were able to competently describe their findings and make a clear link to concepts, theory and/or research. More able candidates were able to link their findings systematically (each finding being linked in a stage like fashion) and with the depth of detail required for the higher marks. Commonly practical investigations studied drug use or treatments and linked to social learning theory/modelling.

(b) During your course you will have conducted a practical investigation on a topic in health psychology using **either** a content analysis **or** a summary of two article sources.

Explain the findings (results and/or conclusions) of your practical investigation using research, theories and/or concepts you have learned about in health psychology.

(4)

I found that methadone maintenance therapy is less effective than portrayed by health organisations. It had been shown in my articles that more often than not, methadone can replace the previous drug in addiction. Whilst many people have come off of heroin by this programme, many people end up with a long term addiction to methadone. Ethically the study is questionable due to using an addictive drug to substitute another. Heroin had a shorter withdrawal than methadone, so to a certain extent, it is easier to drop than methadone.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Although the candidate here has detailed the findings of the investigation well it does not link the findings to concepts, research and/or theory to access the higher marking levels.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

For practical investigations candidates could be asked to simply describe their findings or, as in this case, explain them in terms of theory, research and/or concepts. Candidates will limit their access to higher marking levels if they do not make links explicit and clear.

Question 2 (a)

Candidates offered a range of ways that animals could be used in research, often citing laboratory experiments and developing this with detail on the procedure for using animals for the second mark. Candidates interpreted the mark allocation and answer space here and very few wrote too much, in future they may be expected to write more.

Question 2 (b)

Candidates seemed well prepared to justify, or not, the use of animals in drug research specifically. It was encouraging to see that some candidates argued their case in the context of animal drug research rather than a generic animal research evaluation although most did not. Commonly candidates commented on generalisability, gestation/life span, caging/size/number. Very few candidates exclusively discussed animal ethics but often candidates who started discussing practical issues slipped into ethical issues. No credit was given for ethical issues. More able candidates systematically assessed practical issues linking to drug research continually throughout their answer e.g. life span shorter so long term physiological effects of drugs can be studied.

(b) Explain the practical advantages and/or disadvantages of using animals in psychological research to investigate the effects of drugs.

(3)

Animals are cost-effective as the amount of drug consumed is minimal and buying rodents are cheap, whereas a human would be unethical & expensive. It is easy to control an animal environment (keeping them in caged conditions) so removes any confounding variables. Animals have a shorter-life span than humans so you can experiment them over a month-2 month period rather than years with humans - true effective. Not practical as the results are not 100% generalisable to humans as our genes/DNA differ to animals.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There was no limiting factor for this question for candidates who did not relate their answer to drug research as practical issues may be more demanding than ethical issues for candidates. This example does achieve full marks, though it may be expected that the answer be linked more explicitly to drug research in the future.

Question 2 (c)

Like the previous question, candidates were generic in their description of this research method. Answers, therefore, were more AS in style and failed to achieve the higher marks. Candidates offered a range of research methods, notably laboratory research, PET scans and surveys. Candidates should be cautious when describing laboratory research as, although drugs can be given to participants, they are often long term drug users. Often candidates' descriptions felt as though they thought it was fine to give anybody heroin for the purpose of psychological research.

Question 2 (d)

Generally a well answered question, with candidates using their key study to evaluate. Blättler was the most popular choice of study and candidates often commented on generalisability, reliability, urine test checks and ethics. Although, many candidates confused ethics and regarded the study as highly unethical, this is not true. More able candidates focused on the positive ethics of the study. Ennett, Scott and Wareing were covered by a minority of candidates and it is encouraging to see that teachers are using studies to broaden candidates' understanding of health psychology.

(d) Evaluate **one** study you have learned about that has used human participants to investigate the effects of drugs. Identify the study you are evaluating.

(3)

Study Ennett - Smoker study.

Ennett looked at the connection between smoking and friendship cliques. He found that (contrasting his hypothesis) friendship cliques contributed to not smoking rather than smoking. His study was well structured and so has good reliability. The study used children from 5 schools and so has a degree of generalisability, however all schools were in America and so the results may be specific to one culture - reducing generalisability. The study only let students identify 3 friends and so may not show the full effects of being in a clique. Also, one friendship was assumed to be reciprocated, however this may not have been the case.

**ResultsPlus****Examiner Comments**

The first part of this answer is a conclusion, which gains no credit, and the comment concerning reliability is simply stated, the answer accurately explains generalisability for this study, the problems with clique identification and the issue of measuring reciprocation. Making comments specific to the study resulted in concise and clear marks that were quickly rewarded.

**ResultsPlus****Examiner Tip**

To move beyond AS level evaluation each point should be explained e.g. why does the study lack reliability? Why can't we generalise the findings? Limiting responses to a set of statements that read more as a list will gain no credit at A2.

Question 3

Candidates clearly understood the demands of the question and the majority described and evaluated two drug treatments; drug replacement therapy, TEP's and aversion therapy being common. If candidates failed to describe or evaluate one of the treatments they rarely achieved more than level 2. Candidates who achieved level 4 accurately detailed the principles and procedure of their chosen treatments and offered accurate and well explained strengths/weaknesses/research evidence.

Question 1 (a)

The majority of candidates were able to define intrinsic motivation as coming from within and extrinsic as external motivation. This was often supported by an example for the third mark.

Question 1 (b)

A disappointing number of answers simply referred to extrinsic and intrinsic motivation or goal setting without linking it to Nach in any way. More successful candidates systematically described how Ian's coach would use all needs e.g. N-aff - offer team member support, N-ach - set up a suitable goal to succeed in, N-pow - offer him power over own choreography. More able candidates were able to discuss how Ian's coach would assess his needs to find if they were high or low and set motivational strategy accordingly.

(b) Ian is a trampolinist who came third in a recent competition and is feeling low. His coach needs to improve his motivation before the next competition.

Explain how Ian's coach would use achievement motivation theory to improve Ian's motivation.

(3)

Achievement motivation theory states that we have 3 needs. The need for achievement, need for power and need for affiliation. The coach could help increase the levels of all 3 to improve motivation. He could emphasise how he has achieved quite a lot already by coming third. He could increase his power by allowing the Ian to set his own goals and be in charge of his training. He could improve his levels of affiliation by allowing him to train with a team or becoming a good friend to him. His motivation is equal to his intrinsic motivation over his fear of failure. So he could try to reduce Ian's fear of failure.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a really good example of a candidate 'using' the theory to suggest ways that Ian's coach could improve motivation. Working through each need and suggesting a strategy that the coach could use.

Question 1 (c)

The most common evaluation was application, in terms of how it can be used by a sporting coach, which is unsurprising considering the previous question. However, very few progressed beyond basic evaluation with only a handful offering research evidence. Many candidates poorly attempted to link N-ach with arousal and other stated alternative theories without creditable development.

Question 2 (a)

Most candidates achieved both available marks by referring to open-ended questions and opinions and beliefs. Some candidates mistook qualitative for quantitative in their answer and wrongly referred to closed-ended and Likert style questions.

Question 2 (b)

The majority of answers achieved one mark for commenting in depth and rich detail and a further mark for allowing free response/unrestricted answering but only more able candidates were able to develop their answer for higher marks. Those who did extend their answer often discussed the usefulness of qualitative information for sporting professionals to understand beliefs and develop new motivational/competence related techniques to improve performance.

(b) Explain why sports psychologists might choose to use qualitative data in their research.

(3)

Qualitative data ~~is~~ is more detailed ~~the~~ and has more depth, meaning that it could lead to new or further research taking place. It is also more valid and useful than quantitative data ~~is~~ due to the amount of detail gathered ^{from athletes}, meaning that it can provide true and ~~is~~ rich ~~is~~ results for a study. Particularly in sports psychology, where attitudes are needed to be ~~found~~, it is better if athletes can provide information in their own words, as ~~given~~ ^{more} the choices given though closed questions are true ~~is~~.



This example is a little repetitive with regards to gathering in depth detail, which overall gained a mark. A further mark was achieved for explaining how options can be limiting. The answer would have received a further mark if the comment about 'further research' had been developed.

Question 2 (c)

The majority of answers referred to the correct study, although some were confused about whether the climbers or athletes were questioned individually or as a group (despite being quite obvious in context). There was sound understanding of the use of the SIQ and CIQ and some understood the construction and purpose of each questionnaire.

(c) Describe how the questionnaire as a research method was used in the Boyd and Monroe (2003) study.

(3)

In Boyd and Monroe's study questionnaires were used to see the different uses of imagery between climbers and track-and-field athletes. The athletes were given a standardised SIQ questionnaire which was slightly modified for the climbers (CIQ). They included questions about their use of imagery and their expertise levels but also included filler questions to reduce demand characteristics. They found that climbers differed significantly better from athletes in their use of the 5 functions of imagery (egms).

(Total for Question D2 = 8 marks)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer shows a very sound understanding of how the questionnaire was used by Boyd and Monroe. There is clear knowledge about each questionnaire and on whom it was used, including the structure of the questionnaire.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Depth of understanding and detail gains higher marks at A2. It is important to use ongoing revision as cramming towards the end of the course often results in condensed knowledge that lacks this level of detail.

Question 3

This was a straightforward essay question; centres should be reminded that essays may not be as straightforward in the future. Cottrell and Koivula were popular studies, and candidates were competent in their description of procedure in particular. Higher achieving candidates described both parts of Cottrell's procedure and often detailed the difference between word pair associates for the competition and non-competition lists and the mere-presence and blindfolding. The results tended to be weaker than procedure, often describing an overall conclusion without any results detail. The description of Koivula was also strong, however a minority of candidates missed out any reference to the BSRI or thought that it was used to sex type the sports rather than the participants. This led to some confusion with their results, which failed to distinguish between the participant's sex type and sports rating. Some candidates describing Craft's study picked out self confidence as an indicator for sporting performance, but often became muddled with cognitive and somatic anxiety or missed these out.

Evaluation in this essay tended to be brief, lacking detail and offering short under explained points. Some candidates attempted generic evaluation that seemed not to relate to the study described.

*D3 Describe and evaluate **one** of the following research studies:

- Cottrell et al (1968)
- Koivula (1995)
- Craft et al (2003).

(12)

Study Koivula (1995)

Koivula studied the extent to which gender and "sex-type" affected views on gender participation. The experiment was carried out in Sweden and used 103 males & 104 females. Primarily a questionnaire was given called the Bow Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was given which contained 20 male questions, 20 female questions & 20 filler questions using a likert-type scale. This found a person's gender assignment e.g. if a male had strong male characteristics he had a strong 'sex-type' if he was relatively androgynous he had a weak sex-type. A second questionnaire was given regarding perceptions of correct gender participation for example should a girl play rugby, or should a male dance. This again used a likert-type scale. A correlation occurred between the two results to investigate whether sex-type affected gender participation perceptions. It was found that those who were androgynous or had a weak sex-type were neutral regarding gender participation and those with strong sex-type were less neutral than weak-sex types but not by a large extent.

The study was said to be reliable as it used quantitative data which was standardised meaning Koivula's results were comparable. The BSRI also contained 20

gender question meaning demand characteristics may have been created. However, as the study occurred in Sweden it may not apply to other cultures. Also the sample size was mainly young, white students so the results cannot be generalised to the whole population. As the questionnaire included self-report data it may have lacked validity as participants altered results to fit in with social desirability as they may have not wished not to seem sexist although it could be said the BSRI was valid. Also quantitative data was used which is reliable & analysable, however it is not valid as participants may have wished to put an answer not written already.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a very good description of the study, with sound understanding each element (APRC) and showing knowledge of both aspects of the study; gender typing and sports perception. The evaluation made is accurate, but some of the points made lack the depth of explanation required for level 4. This answer is a high level 3 as the quality of written communication is good.

Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	N	U
Raw boundary mark	60	45	41	37	33	29	25	21	
Uniform boundary mark	80	72	64	56	48	40	32	24	

a* is only used in conversion from raw to uniform marks. It is not a published unit grade.

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA024570 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

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

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

