

Examiners' Report

June 2013

GCE Psychology 6PS03 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. 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 or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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.

June 2013

Publications Code UA036697

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

Now a well established paper, it is expected that the availability of past papers and mark schemes can support the examination technique of new cohorts. With some progress being made, some fundamental issues still need addressing. For many methodological questions candidate responses tend to be generic and not applied to the wider context of the application studied. Attempts made by many to contextualise their answer are flimsy, often citing a name of a study rather than incorporating the context throughout the response. Similarly, some evaluation of theory and research is generic and not linked to the study/explanation. Candidates need to work on explaining the implications of their comment for the study/theory being discussed. Strategies such as PEEL could be usefully employed to ensure that points are clearly stated, explained/exampled and linked back to the question at hand. Clarity was also an issue for many responses; there were under-developed answers, muddled methodological issues and comparisons.

More positively, there have been some excellent responses from candidates that demonstrate high level skill and excellent understanding of the applications. Many candidates have focused on essay skills and done well to meet the demands of these extended writing questions.

The following report concerns specific issues as they relate to specific questions, although the general issue of lack of clarity and contextualisation should be noted as an area for improvement across the whole paper.

Question A 1 (a)

Many candidates accessed all available marks for this question. Examples of anti-social behaviour were given credit if appropriate and after defining antisocial behaviour. Examples of illegal behaviour, such as shop lifting, graffiti, murder, were not credited. A minority of candidates confused antisocial behaviours with unsociable features, referencing personal hygiene as an example. Good examples included loitering and being noisy at night.

Anti-Social behavior is the act of committing crimes or going against the law by conducting acts such as shoplifting, vandalising buildings, violence etc and it is stereotypical labelled that the people who have anti-social behaviour are usually teenagers or young adults. This stereotype is heavily influenced by the media and the news.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The question asks for an explanation of anti-social behaviour. This response does not attempt to define anti-social behaviour and the examples are poor. Shop lifting and vandalism are illegal rather than anti-social, so this response did not gain any marks.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

For a three mark 'explain' question it is useful to use 'point, elaborate, example' as a vehicle for answering the question.

Anti-social behaviour is not necessarily illegal, but it may not be accepted by other people as socially acceptable. It can harm another person's psychological well being. One example of anti-social behaviour is abusive swearing.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a rather neat answer that managed all three available marks without extensive writing. The candidate has defined anti-social behaviour as being not socially acceptable and may harm another, and then has given an appropriate example that is regarded as anti-social.

Question A 1 (b)

Self-fulfilling Prophecy and Social Learning Theory were popular answers and often research evidence was given as evaluation. Candidates need to be reminded that exhaustive descriptions of research studies do not gain additional credit, the findings and implications for the theory are all that is necessary. Although credit was given for a critique of the methodological issues of the stated research, none was given for ethical issues or generic methodological issues as responses tended to be too sweeping. For example, many responses referred to all research into SLT being laboratory based. This is far too generic and not accurate. Some responses did not access marks through not focusing on evaluative content or including speculative references such as 'SLT is supported by children who copy superheroes'. Many responses incorrectly claimed that SLT does not explain why children may not imitate someone they have observed, so candidates should be aware of the role of identification and vicarious reinforcement as motivation for imitation. Too many candidates cited James Bulger as evidence for SLT. This is incorrect and published work clearly nullifies the claim that the boys were exposed to and copied a violent film. However, other real life cases, such as Columbine, can be used as published work is less categorical.

Theory Se18 - Bullying prophecy (SFP)

SFP has research support from Zohoda, in which he found that boys from the Ashanti tribe in west Africa are given labels of being docile or aggressive depending on what day they were born, and the boys had lived up to their label and fulfilled their prophecy, e.g. ~~meanest boys~~ ^{weekest} boys ~~labelled~~ ^{22% of} ~~as~~ ^{This is} ~~most~~ ^{high} aggressive committed the most crime. In validity as secondary data was used in the form of court records, which is highly accurate. However, this is one tribe in Africa it isn't representative and not generalisable to others. // Rosenthal and Jacobsen also provides research support, ~~however~~ ^{as children labelled} 'about to bloom' did better at school as they were treated differently. This study is highly unethical, as it is wrong to label children ~~just~~ ^{to see if they are} treated differently. Also, a lot of research into SFP is in the educational system where teacher-student relationships are ~~studied at~~ ^{studied}, education is ^{criminality} ungeneralisable to ~~crime~~. Se18 - Bullying prophecy ignores the biological explanations ~~such as~~ ^{such} as aggressive

gene theory and brain differences found by raine et al that shows that having a small corpus callosum and less activity in the parietal lobe can lead to more aggressive and criminal behaviour, and some people have a

predisposition for aggression due to the inheritance of genes, so from mom and dad.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer achieved all of the available marks. It has outlined the research by Jahoda and gained additional credit for evaluating the validity/credibility of this research. The ethical commentary was not credited as it does not directly address the question. The research by Rosenthal and Jacobsen is credited, as is the awareness of educational research maybe being limited and therefore not applicable to criminological understanding of anti-social behaviour. The answer also achieves credit for Raine's research. The final commentary on the role of genes is a little underexplained for credit.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When evaluating explanations/theory candidates should be encouraged to use supporting and opposing research, a skill that is required for undergraduate study. They can also consider the methodological issues of such research but should be strongly encouraged to link the issues back to the explanation. It is often a weak attempt to merely critique the methodology of a study without commenting on the implications of such critique for the explanation being evaluated. Again, this skill is a requirement for undergraduate study. Candidates using alternative explanations in evaluation should try and offer some detail on this alternative explanation and how it is opposing/different. It is not enough to state the alternative explanation without any justification for doing so. Candidates can also use wider issues and debates relevant to the topic, such as reductionism, determinism, nature/nurture. These debates should be applied to the question and justified in terms of the implications of the debate for the explanation.

Question A 2 (a)

Good responses were able to address the question in the context of criminological psychology and offered a range of procedural and design comments with good explanation/detail. Often candidates drew upon their knowledge of an existing field experiment, such as Yarmey, and tailored it to the question. Less successful candidates simply described Yarmey or Yuille and Cutshall without reference to how the students would go about conducting their own research or outlined a field experiment with no criminological psychology context. A minority of candidates offered a wholly unethical study or described a laboratory experiment. The best answers gave the detail required for reasonable replication eg stage the experiment in a shopping centre, use 20 participants by opportunity sampling who are passing through the shopping centre, get a confederate to ask the participant for directions to a shop. The researcher can approach them immediately after this and ask for a description, the IV being whether they asked for a description or used a photo ID. In contrast to the basic detail eg stage a crime in the field and ask participants to remember what they saw. Replication of basic answers such as this would be impossible.

They could sample a group of volunteers and show them a clip of a crime, then ask them a set of questions about the crime they just witnessed.

They could use a self select/volunteer sample by advertising around the university, and conduct the study ~~as~~ ~~lab~~ as a field experiment by not telling the participants the reason they are watching the crime. Making sure the response to the questions was the natural response, which would make the experiment valid.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There were a minority of responses such as this one that did not adequately embed the research proposal in the context of a field experiment. Clips of crimes is distinctly laboratory based.

The students might set up an incident in a public place at the university, such as a handbag being stolen, where they would have many potential witnesses. They might have asked the police to help them in their experiment, by arriving at the scene and questioning the witnesses using provided questions from the students. The students might ask ^{neutral, open} questions, such as: "Describe the incident" but also ask some particular questions such as: "Did you see a weapon?" or "Did you see the weapon?". By changing the critical word, the students will be able to see if leading questions affect the recall of the witnesses. The neutral open questions can be ^{analysed and} compared against the details from the incident to see how much ^{detail} the witnesses can remember. After the research, the students would have to explain to the participants about the true aim of the research, and also ~~ever~~ give them the option to withdraw their data from the study.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a level 4 response; the answer is specific, detailed and covers a range of elements necessary to be able to replicate a field experiment proposal with reasonable competence. The procedure is detailed and well explained, the apparatus and results are explained and the ethical issues considered. Analysis of results was not a requirement of the question as such, but considered a useful addition in terms of how the researchers may go about conducting their research. Within the time constraints of the paper, this is a very good answer.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

There were far too many candidate responses not offering the level of description required to partially replicate the research proposal. A proposal should contain some of the following elements; variables, control, procedure, apparatus, location, timings, ethical considerations. Three or more of these elements that are well explained should achieve a top level answer.

Question A 2 (b)

Typically responses were limited to one reliability issue that was repetitive, not adequately explained, or indeed in the required context of criminological psychology. Many answers referred to a complete lack of control/standardisation, which is far too categorical as most field experiments do have control and standardisation. Better answers made explicit which variables may be difficult to control, or at least acknowledged that control would be difficult but not impossible, or made a case for replication being possible because of good controls. Some candidates scored no marks for commenting on issues of ecological validity or misunderstood the question and evaluated the reliability of eyewitness testimony itself.

Field experiments can have controlled variables such as, the length of time between interviews of eyewitnesses. This makes them reliable as you can do a repeat and get similar results. However, extraneous variables, such as the viewpoint of the eyewitness, cannot be controlled. This lowers reliability as ~~each~~ in each re-run eyewitnesses will have different viewpoints which could ~~affect~~ the results.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer gained two marks for an awareness of the issue of control, reliability and replication, and an example of differing viewpoints offered elaboration and contextualisation into criminological psychology. For further credit a different reliability issue could have been attempted or an additional extraneous variable example could have been commented upon.

The answer nicely embeds the answer in the context of the application of criminological psychology. Many answers did not contextualise the answer or simply name dropped a published study. It is expected that candidates progress from AS level, where generic answers are sometimes acceptable and move to understanding the nature of research method/methodology and ethics within the application being studied.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Too many responses simply mentioned a researcher name to embed the answer in the context of criminological psychology. In future series it will be expected that responses are fully embedded in the application, such as this answer does, to gain any credit.

Question A 2 (c)

Overall this question was well answered with comments concerning replicability, control, ethics and some cause and effect. Some candidates did not access level 2 because they failed to contextualise their answer. Again, candidates should be reminded to take care with categorical answers such as 'consent is not possible with a field experiment'. In fact consent must be gained at some point in the research. Good responses identified an appropriate reason why laboratory experiments may be preferable, applied their answer to criminological psychology and explained the implications eg more ethical; video less distressing than real car accident staged for opportunistic witnesses; so informed consent can be gained and causes less distress. Many candidates referred to Loftus and Palmer, which did give superficial context to the answer. However, some simply proffered their names and some generic study detail. Candidates should be reminded that an example must add to the response in some way and be appropriately applied to the question asked.

Field experiments are done in ones natural environment and participants are often not aware they are taking place in a study till after. It would be unethical to put your participants under such stress and also make them believe it is a true event (making them witness a crime). In a laboratory experiment the conditions are artificial and they know they are part of an experiment.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer achieved a level 2 credit for contextualising a useful ethical consideration that directly addresses the question. The answer is explained with sufficient detail to access level 2.

Question A 3

It was pleasing to see that many candidates engaged fully with the scenario given in the question and most were able to offer an appropriate treatment/ therapy and evaluate that therapy. Some responses omitted a comparison with Token Economy Programmes. A number of responses referred to aversion therapy and punishment (fines and community service). These are not appropriate treatments for the scenario given that the prisoners were incarcerated and aversion therapy is not used. These responses were generally limited to creditworthy comparisons made. The most popular answer was anger management, many explaining the stages that could be applied in a prison setting and using good examples in context. It was pleasing to see a range of research studies being used to evaluate and compare (Law, Dexter and Towl, Serin and Blanchette, Ireland, Pearson). A range of evaluative points such as methodological, moral, cost, training, ethical and validity issues were credited, and candidates offering a range of well explained evaluation, with good balance, often scored well. Poorer answers tended to muddle the cost effectiveness and training required for their chosen therapy and TEP's.

An Anger management programme could be used as a therapy that can help shape behaviour. It is based on the belief that thoughts lead to anger. The first step of anger management is called cognitive preparation. This involves the ~~client~~ prisoner becoming aware of their thoughts and understanding why they get these thoughts that precede anger. Secondly, the ~~prog-~~ treatment involves skills acquisition which would involve the prisoner learning how to control the thoughts that precede their anger and they use ~~to~~ this control to turn themselves away from their original learned aggressive responses that they had in the past. This can involve the use of role plays, self-report data and modelling. Lastly, anger management involves doing application practice. This is when situations are set up so that individuals can practice becoming aware of their thoughts and practice overcoming the aggression that the thoughts could have led to. This can also involve using role plays where the prisoner would for example be antagonised to act in their usual aggressive manner.

but instead now they know what thoughts lead to aggression, they can control their thoughts and overcome aggressive behaviour.

An initial strength of the treatment is that prisoners are taught about triggers which means that the treatment could have a long term effect compared to TEP's where once tokens and rewards are taken away, the desired behaviour could disappear. Moreover, the treatment uses self-report data which means that information is coming from a primary source - the prisoners themselves, this would make the details valid because they are measuring what was intended to measure. However, a weakness of using self-report data is that prisoners can easily lie in order to make themselves feel/look better. This would affect the validity of the treatment. Moreover, the study by Losel (1995) found that when looking at 500 studies, there was a 10% drop in recidivism which suggests that the treatment does have a significant positive effect. As well as this, Ireland (2004) found that anger levels fell after the treatment was conducted on youth offenders. This supports the effectiveness of the treatment. McDougall et al (1987) also found similar results as after 18 offenders undertook anger management, the rate of reoffending dropped which showed that the treatment was

successful. On the other hand, prisoners may revert to emotional and verbal aggression instead of physical aggression which suggests that the treatment has not really solved anything with regards to positive behaviour. The TEP is similar to the anger management programme in the sense that it is unclear as to the long term effects of either treatment, the treatment may only be effective within the confines of the prison rather than in reality, and this is supported by the fact that there are very few studies that show the long term success of either treatment.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This essay achieved level 4. The description is detailed and organised, although missing a bit of information about relaxation techniques. The evaluation contains lots of research and critique on a range of different issues and the comparison with Token Economy Programmes is clear and explained. With good explanation, comparison, range and balance, this essay achieved all 12 available marks.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

To prevent rote learning of content, it is typical to encounter an essay that has more than 'describe and evaluate' elements. Comparison is a higher level skill that stretches the top ability candidates. Some candidates failed to compare during the essay, only the stronger responses compared clearly and communicated evaluation fully.

It is strongly recommended that candidates using research studies as evaluation, comment upon the implications of the research for the treatment being evaluated.

Question B 1 (a)

The majority of responses clearly identified a source of deprivation, such as hospitalisation, daycare and divorce or death of a parent. Some simply repeated the question and such tautological answers were not credited as identification. Candidates often struggled to explain the effects of such deprivation, often confusing short term and long term deprivation, describing the effects of privation, or merely listing possible effects without elaboration. Developmental retardation and dwarfism are not appropriate effects of deprivation. Some candidates were able to look at the positive effects of daycare on children as well as the negative, enabling them to gain more marks.

(5)

Deprivation may come around if a child is left in care for too long a time during their critical period of development (Belsky & Rovine found that over 20hrs a week could be damaging) This could possibly effect a child's emotional development, causing ^{acts of} affectionless psychopathy in later life



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer could have been more explicit about the type of care provided for the child, but it is implied that the source is that of daycare. There is a useful link to Belsky and Rovine's findings that serves as elaboration for the point that time spent away during the critical period can affect emotional development/affectionless psychopathy.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Too many answers confused short term and long term deprivation and privation, some stating that daycare caused developmental retardation or anaclitic depression. Fewer still mentioned research or if they did, referred to sources of privation. This is a question that could be used to practise 'point, elaborate, example' as a strategy for revision.

Question B 1 (b)

There were some very focused answers to discuss the issue of reversibility, many using Genie, the Czech Twins and Freud and Dann to good effect. Others simply described the research at length as a study in detail and therefore squandered the answer space. Good answers briefly outlined the relevant aspects of the research to support their argument and commented upon the critical period, Genie's possible mental retardation, the Czech twins having each other, quality of after care or problems with retrospective cases.

Using the case study of Genie, we can see that the negative effects of privation cannot fully be overcome. Genie was locked in a room up to the age of 13 years old without any contact from anyone apart from her father that used to beat her or give her left over food. She was also tied to a potty chair all this time as well which made her unable to walk like a human being. Researchers carried out many experiments to encourage her back into society by giving her speech lessons and teaching her how to engage with others and learn about emotions. However, none of these techniques worked properly and she could still only make a few noises and could not put sentences together properly. Researchers have said that this is because she had been in these bad conditions since birth and she was privated through the first 2 years of her life meaning she had passed the critical period to far and they say that once this has happened it is impossible to reverse.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a fairly typical response for this examination series. The answer does gain credit for the findings of Genie and explanation of the critical period with regards to reversibility. However, the candidate has spent far too long describing the case of Genie and lost valuable answer space, which could include other research of issues relating to whether Genie is a useful case to discuss the issue of reversibility.

Genie (1977) suggests that the effects of privation can't be overcome as she was privated until she was 13 and she was taught social skills and how to talk but she only developed a small vocabulary and her IQ was below average, hence showing the effects aren't reversible. However, it is questioned whether she was mentally retarded from birth distorting the effects of privation.

The Kucholova twins are evidence for the negative effects can be overcome as they were privated until the age of 6 and went on to achieve high levels of IQ and be successful. They, however, had each other to attach to suggesting they weren't fully privated.

Further to this, Freud and Dann studied 6 war orphans who all grew up normally and went on to lead normal lives therefore giving more evidence that privation can be overcome. Although it's suggested they all form attachments with each other.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer better understands the issue of reversibility and does not waste answer space exhaustively describing the case studies. As such it is more focused but has adequate detail for credit. Marks were achieved for the findings of Genie, critique that she could have been retarded at birth, the findings of the Czech twins and critique that they had each other. Further credit could have been achieved had more marks been available. The answer neatly links the research back to the issue of reversibility.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

This type of question could have demanded more of candidates in terms of marks available so candidates should be reminded that firstly they need not exhaustively describe a study to gain credit, secondly to ensure they relate the research back to the question/issue of reversibility and thirdly to discuss whether or not the case actually does contribute to the understanding of reversibility.

Question B 1c

Many candidates simply outlined an ethical issue without explaining the relevance of this issue for research into privation. There were some rather muddled informed consent answers. A noticeable minority of answers did not address the question but explained how it is unethical to impose privation deliberately on a child. Overall, accurate responses tended to offer over-testing as an ethical issue but many did not elaborate sufficiently for the second mark. Those that did, tended to use Genie as an example and select appropriate material from the case study to support their argument.

Because cases of privation are rare/unique, it may be that when a case is found, the participant may feel forced into continuing to be studied, as the researchers may pressure them because of the limited opportunities. This may distress the participant, and may even lead to them being seen as more of a 'subject' than a 'participant'.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer was awarded both available marks for the understanding that cases are rare so participants may be forced to continue and be pressured which may cause distress and therefore be seen as a subject. A reasonably well explained package of ideas that was expressed as one ethical issue.

To do research into privation you must have a participant who has experienced this. It would be very unethical to deprive a child of love or attachment for an experiment as the effects may last for their whole lives.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer was seen with relative frequency and shows either a misunderstanding of the question or, more likely, a misunderstanding of the nature of privation research. The question did not imply that researchers deliberately impose privation, yet many candidates felt that psychologists may have done so for research gain.

Question B 2 (a)

It was pleasing that the majority of responses referred to child development in some way, so could access all the available marks. Lack of elaboration of one strength was the issue for many candidates, often resulting in repetition of the same comment. Some candidates resorted to offering more than one strength, the best being credited. Most responses referred to length or volume of data, often elaborating just enough for a second mark. Again, examples such as Genie or the EPPE project were proffered but often not effectively explained with relevance to the strength discussed. More focused answers compared longitudinal and cross sectional research, focusing on using the same child, minimising individual differences and avoiding cohort effects/cause and effect more reliably established.

A Strength of longitudinal research is that it is carried out over a long period time, long enough to witness the development of a child yourself to see a clear cause and effect. It is also a strength because you are able to collect a lot of data such as qualitative and quantitative ~~method~~ and you have more time to do so. This allows you to conduct interviews, carry out surveys and look at school reports and medical reports which help to make a clear conclusion on what you are studying.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The candidate tried hard here to package two strengths as one strength but is not quite successful. The first strength concerns duration and cause and effect, which is creditworthy but a little weak in terms of explaining how this could be achieved and the strength it offers to research into child development. The second strength offered concerns types of data gained and offers examples, which gains the credit as a stronger answer for two marks. A further mark could have been achieved if there was some elaboration or example, eg triangulation, inter-rater reliability, example of Genie.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Questions that offer 3 marks for one feature, such as this question, demand a comment to be well explained and elaborated - 'point, elaborate, example' works well as a strategy on these types of questions.

It was common for candidates to offer more than one strength, which needs to be discussed during exam technique lessons. Often candidates use of the word 'also' within this type of answer is a clue for them to understand that they are offering more than one feature.

Question B 2 (b)

Few candidates struggled to gain marks for issues of validity and reliability; often describing that replication would be impossible in such cases but that qualitative data could be obtained. However, there was lots of repetition with weaker responses that seemed to struggle to describe more than three or four evaluation points. Candidates achieving the higher marks often referred to issues of subjectivity, researcher bias, population validity. Some candidates evaluated the case study research method with no reference to privation research and therefore gained minimal credit.

Case studies are valid as they gather in-depth, ~~the~~ rich and detailed data about the individual. They are also ecologically valid as the data ~~is~~ ^{is} gathered from the child in their natural setting such as a nursery. Case studies in child psychology use various research methods such as structured observations to compare findings which is triangulation making the findings more scientific and valid. However in these research methods, the independent variable is still being manipulated so the findings may not be valid as the behaviour shown by the child may not be naturally occurring.

In terms of reliability, some case studies such as Genie, ~~etc~~ follow a unique individual in an equally unique situation which most likely will not occur again. Because of this, the situation may never arise again and cannot

be tested for reliability so the findings of case studies can be said to be unreliable. However the research methods used within a case study, e.g. ~~structured~~ Structured observation can be replicated again to test for reliability so to that extent they case studies are reliable.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response achieves five marks and is evidence of a well versed candidate on issues of reliability and validity. Although the first mark was achieved for a comment of detail and richness, caution should be used with such statements, as depth and detail alone do not qualify as validity. Further credit was given for ecological validity, triangulation (which would have reinforced the validity point with detailed and rich), unique and structured observations being replicable.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Case studies invariably imply many different research methods within the analysis. Candidates referring to the validity and/or reliability of such methods typically used within a case study gained credit, but sweeping statements concerning case studies being reliable and valid without such detail and qualification gained no credit. This was another example of a question which required contextualisation within the domain of child development, some candidates did not tailor their answer appropriately and lost valuable marks. Some responses simply mentioned Genie as an example without contextualising their whole response. Candidates should be reminded that they are studying research methods that are typically used within a particular application and should express and explain their responses accordingly.

Question B 3

Bowlby's research was a popular choice seen in many responses. Strongest answers described in detail and with accuracy, the sample obtained for both the thieves and control group, including reference to both boys and girls being used. Detail was also given regarding the tests, interviews and use of the social worker. Very strong answers referred to the categories of personality the participants were placed in during assessments. Weaker answers tended to give rather general information in a brief manner. Similar parallels can be drawn for those answers describing the other study options. Far too many candidates described the findings of the research, which was not required, or omitted the implications for child care practice. Evaluation tended to be rather generic. Candidates should be reminded that a study in detail should be accurate, detailed and evaluation should be specific. Stronger answers referred to researcher bias, subjectivity and sample in a balanced and considered way for Bowlby responses. There was some good evaluation of Belsky and Rovine, often referring to standardised procedures due to the use of the strange situation, though they should be reminded to evaluate the study as a whole and not just evaluate the strange situation procedure.

Study Bowlby 1944

Bowlby wanted to see if maternal deprivation led to problems later in life.

He attended the Trachscov youth clinic where he researched 44 juveniles. Many there due to schools sending them in, parents requesting schools to, parents themselves or probation officers. They were all there for a mixture of reasons, ~~big~~ big offences and petty offences.

There was also a control group who were matched for intelligence and age but had no offences.

The boys were interviewed and took part in questionnaires on their behaviour and offences. These results were given to

Boulby who then interviewed mothers on their relationships with their child and any separations they had during infancy. He did many tests on the 44 juveniles such as retrospective tests, personality tests, questionnaires, interviews and case studies. He used a range of researchers but all results were back to him to draw conclusions.

He found that 19/44 were affectionate psychopaths

~~researcher~~ before the age of 15 but 14/17 prolonged separations.

12/14 had separations of two years before age of 5. He concluded maternal deprivation was the reason they offended.

However, the study cannot be seen as generalisable. It was a relatively small sample and unrepresentative of the clinic. He used 75% boys, 25% girls. When the ratio in the clinic was 68% boys, 40% girls. Also the range of different crimes they committed are so different, such as petty crimes can they really be compared to big crimes?

The study uses retrospective data which is hard to test reliability. As memory may be affected / contaminated.

The mothers he researched could have lied for social desirability and not want to look like bad mothers.

Validity is present as Bowlby used triangulation, a wide range of methods so it can be compared, repeated and tested. However he created the term 'attachmentless psychopath' so he could have unconsciously made his results fit to what he wanted to find, and it can't really be tested because he made it up!

The findings can be used to promote good childcare practice. As the study did show maternal deprivation had some effect on the behaviour of the child. The results could be used to make sure parents and children are not separated for prolonged periods of time such as in hospital or extensive time in day care, and if in day care for healthy attachments to be formed. So the study did have some

application to real life.

It can also be seen as valid as it took place in the environment, so avoided artificial behaviour (although social desirability and the halo effect could be factors that decrease the reliability).

It may also be unethical for participants to bring up stressful memories about childhood and right to withdraw needed to be given - did they give consent or did the clinic tell them as they were young (minors) did they have any say in consent?



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer achieved level 4 credit. The description of the study procedure is reasonably good, with detail regarding the types of tests and control group. Although there was an inaccuracy over the use of boys. The evaluation is very strong and a range of ethical and methodological points were made. There was clear application for good child care practice so all elements leaned towards a level 4 response. The description did contain results/conclusions, so could not achieve the top of the level, and with some omissions and inaccuracy 10 marks was awarded.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Candidates should be versed in separating out the elements of study description into aim(s), procedure, results and/or conclusions (findings), to be prepared for this type of question.

Question C 1 (a)

The majority of answers were appropriately applied to heroin research using humans, often commenting on gathering an ethical sample of heroin users (although a few did suggest giving heroin to non-users). Similar to Question A 02a, candidates drew upon their knowledge of existing research or methodology to frame their answer, but often failed to apply this knowledge to the question of how the research team might go about investigating heroin on human participants. Better responses offered a range of procedural and design features that gave a good overview of the research proposal with some explanation of decision being made. However, too many limited their response to one element, such as the procedure used in a PET scan, leaving the reader confused as to the nature of the investigation and rendering the proposal unreplicable.

Due to the difficulty in gaining consent to administer heroin to humans, it is likely the team would have to find heroin users, all of a similar age, weight and who have been using the drug for a similar time. Initial tests such as a urinalysis should be done as well as other tests such as heart rates before the study commences and then again throughout at random times to chart any changes. The team would have to select a dosage to administer and how frequently they do so and constantly monitor the ps for any changes in the baseline measures. They would then compare the results of each ps after the set time for the study and highlight any themes or common aspects or changes in the results from the beginning.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response achieved level 4 credit for a range of elements of a procedure being proposed with some level of detail that would allow for reasonable replication written within the time constraints of the paper. The response clearly uses an ethically appropriate sample, comments upon measures that would be taken, baseline measures, dosage and then comparison. It would have been good for specific measures to have been suggested, but reasonable replication and the gist of the answer could be followed.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

The procedure of any study should contain some of the following elements for reasonable replication: variables, controls, procedure, timings, apparatus, ethics, location. Knowledge of published reports may help students gain an awareness of the level of detail required in a study to ensure replication and scrutiny of original work.

Question C 1 (b)

Many candidates fell into a generic evaluation of animal research without addressing the question of how the results may differ compared to the use of humans in research. These responses typically stumbled across some credit for human and animal brains/nervous systems/behaviour being different. Generic animal evaluation such as cost, housing, gestation periods, were ignored as they did not address the question asked. Stronger answers referred to behaviour and nervous system differences, genes, benefits of isolation and cause and effect, emotionality and ability to gather qualitative data. An awareness of drug dosage should be noted, a human level of dosage would not be given to a mouse, some common sense needed to be exercised in some responses.

Animals are still different to humans despite sharing similar genes which would explain why different results were obtained. Context and cues can be investigated in humans to test the effects of drugs which is not possible with animals, leading to different results. Humans can provide self-report data on how the drug makes them feel which is not possible with animals so this can produce different results. Animals can be kept under controlled environments whereas humans have many intentional and extraneous variables producing different results. Mice, which are often used in experiments, live shorter lives than humans so animals tend to have shorter life spans. Because animals differ to humans they require a different dosage of drugs to humans. Results may differ. Human participants can provide invalid results due to demand characteristics or social desirability which is not possible with animals.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response achieved four marks for comments about genetics, self report issues, better control and experiment effects on humans that would not affect animals. The issue of context cues has been tested using animals (moving cages/rooms etc) so cannot be credited here and maybe would have been more fruitful if commenting upon social cues such as dealers and party context on existing drug users. No credit was achieved for dosage comments either as this is taken into account when determining the dose for an animal relative to size and nature.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

This question stretched candidates but stronger answers maintained focus on the question rather than slipping into generic evaluation of animal research. Candidates who focused on why results may be different tended to gain more marks (generic evaluation tended to only stumble across one or two issues by default) and wasted less time in their response. The tip is to read the question carefully, maintain focus on the question and save time which would be better spent on other questions in the paper.

Question C (2)

C02a: Commonly candidates described Ennett and Stacey, although some new studies emerged this year suggesting a wider scope of research for students to use. Unfortunately some stated a named study and a minority still described Blättler. It was pleasing to see that many candidates had revised figures, statistics and firm conclusions to a reasonable degree of accuracy, enabling the majority of candidates to achieve 2-3 marks.

C02b: On the whole candidates seemed to evaluate the study described quite well using a range of issues. Many still included issues of generalisability but were ignored as this issue was not a requirement of the question. Better responses focused on specific methodological and ethical issues associated with the study, drawing on relevant study detail in their answer. Some rather flimsy practical applications were offered, such as using friends as role models to prevent smoking. Weaker answers tended to offer rather generic evaluation without drawing upon specific features of the study being evaluated.

Study Ennett et al (1994)

Findings

Ennett et al found that 89.9% ~~of~~ ^{people in} cliques were ~~non~~ non-smokers. They also found that cliques comprising of entirely girls smoked more than entirely boys cliques and that 2% of ~~cliques~~ ~~that~~ consisted ~~of~~ of entirely smokers.

The results of this study may not be entirely valid. This is because when collecting data from the questionnaire, many of the friendships were ~~not~~ not reciprocated meaning that when in their cliques people may not have been influenced by other group member's behaviour. Furthermore, the ^{additional} data collected from the questionnaire was qualitative. This meant that it was ~~difficult~~ difficult to interpret and analyse in terms of presenting findings. In addition, it seemed as though from the results, girls were more affected by social status than boys because their

overall percentage of smokers was higher.

Furthermore, the ~~data from~~ was ethical considerations such as informed consent for the study. This meant that the data gathered was completely fine to be included in the study.

Also, the environment in which the study was carried out was in a natural setting. So it had ecological validity because it was not artificial. ~~However, demand characteristics~~ meaning there is a reduced chance of

demand characteristics. However, social desirability may have affected the study because people may have been embarrassed to admit that they smoked. This means the results may not be credible.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The description of the findings of Ennett gained all three available marks, as an impressive recount of the facts and figures achieved. The evaluation was not entirely focused on the study and included some generic but relevant material. Evaluation credit was given for issues associated with the use of the questionnaire, ethics and ecological validity and social desirability. There was a maximum amount of marks achieved for generic issues that should really be avoided where possible in evaluating a study that has many specific evaluation points that can be made.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Although many specific evaluation points can be found in student text books, it is often profitable to order the original published work and read the methodology and discussion sections for specific critique made relevant to the actual study.

Question C (3)

Many candidate responses outlined the mode of action of heroin at the synapse, but some gave inaccurate detail (heroin turns into dopamine, GABA is increased) or gave more general effects of heroin on tolerance levels, psychological addiction or euphoric effects without referring to mode of action. Whilst most did attempt the evaluative demands of the question, few successfully compared the relative strengths and weaknesses. Most tended to describe/evaluate one explanation and then describe/evaluate the other explanation, resulting in little explicit comparison and a rather lengthy essay. More successful comparisons assessed the ability of each explanation to give a plausible account of onset of drug use, tolerance and withdrawal and some responses referred to methodological issues with each approach.

Heroin acts by stimulating opioid receptors in the brain and mimics the effect of endorphins. Heroin causes an increase in dopamine, this triggers massive release of endorphins. Triggers reward system produces feeling of euphoria and analgesic effect. The area in the brain where this occurs is the nucleus accumbens.

The biological approach ^{supports} shows the idea of physical dependency on drugs, e.g. neurotransmitters need to work at normal levels to function with high levels of the drug so they become less sensitive to it, thus drug user develops a tolerance and increases the amount of drug intake in order to achieve the same effects they did as they did when first taking the drug, this also reduces chance of withdrawal symptoms developing such as vomit, diarrhoea.

However, the learning approach can prove why individual may develop a psychological dependency on the drug, ~~because~~ such as they may be suffering depression so choose to avoid this negative feeling by taking drugs to positively reinforce their moods into feeling happy. Both explanations of drug misuse are reductionists. The biological approach focuses mainly on the biochemical explanations, such as reward deficiency syndrome and the

idea of neurotransmitters ^{so} ignores other reasons such as social or cultural reasons as to why someone may take a drug. For example, in some parts of the world some drugs are seen as culturally avoid socially acceptable e.g. Ecstasy. On the other hand, the learning approach takes no account the social environmental factors being the main influence ~~of~~ on drug misuse so ignores other reasons such as neurotransmitters and the biochemical explanation.

=

The biological explanation can't provide reasons as to why someone may choose to take drugs but the learning approach can with the idea of positive and negative reinforcement. E.g. if the individual watches a drug user taking inhaing a drug, the instant response of taking the drug will be positive so the individual ~~of~~ taking will be encouraged to imitate the behaviour in order to feel the same feelings of pleasure.

The effects of withdrawal symptoms are in long term and the feelings of pleasure obtained from the drug are in short term. Thus, the drug user tends to ignore the effect that the drug will have on them later and choose to enjoy the pleasure taking from the drug instead.

The learning explanation is supported by laboratory experiments to explain the effect of drug controlling behaviour. e.g. skinner box showed rat had to self-administer drug.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This essay achieved level 3 credit. The description is brief but good and accurate, a little more explanation could have been offered here to ensure level 4. The comparison is very good and comments upon both strengths and weakness of the approaches in three ways. There is tapering off towards the end, but the evaluation firmly places the essay at the top of level 3 for 9 marks.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Essays are often judged on a balance between description and evaluation/comparison elements. Candidates need to be aware that the balance should be considered very carefully to ensure the top marking levels are achieved.

Question D 1 (a)

Many responses outlined an appropriate method to gather quantitative data; typically referring to using questionnaires containing closed ended questions or Likert scale style questions, gathering yes/no responses. Some described the sample and administration of the questionnaire at length. However many did not refer to sporting motivation or sport in the whole answer, thus limiting the level achieved. A few described an experiment using lap times as quantitative data, again not referring to sporting motivation but performance. Some also described the collection of qualitative data, which was ignored for the purpose of marking. Disappointingly few addressed the analysing data part of the question. Those that did so referred to graphs and statistics more successfully.

Alan could use a mixture of Likert scales and closed questions as both gather quantitative data. e.g. "on a scale of ~~>~~ 1 to 5 how motivated are you to score the most goals in a football match? one being ^{and} very motivated, 5 being not motivated" he ~~should~~ sent the questionnaire in the post or he could find a location ~~to~~ for all respondents to fill it ~~out~~ together to avoid situational variables. He should brief his respondents as there is no element of deception in his questionnaire. Quantitative data ~~is either nominal or ordinal~~ can be analysed by comparing the scores or ranking data using statistical tests (eg Spearman's Rank, chi-squared, Mann-Whitney-U). The data can be analysed objectively as it is quantitative.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a very focused response in terms of being relevant to sporting motivation and gathering quantitative data for analysis. Specific detail regarding how data is gathered is commented on and administration of questionnaire considered. The candidate answers the whole question, which was rare, by considering the ranking of data and possible use of statistical tests. It would have been good to have some qualification for an actual test being used, such as correlation of motivation and some other element for a Spearman's to be suggested, but there was sufficient detail for level 4 credit to be achieved.

Question D 1 (b)

Similar to D01a, few responses referred to sport or sporting motivation in the whole response. Many did show an awareness of how to gather more qualitative data, typically through the use of open ended questions and use of interviews, but again few addressed the analysis part of the question. More successful responses focused on themes and content analysis.

Open Questions that allow the person to expand and explain their answers would be used to gain detailed information known as Qualitative data. A typical question could be, 'Explain why you have chosen Rugby as your main Sport'. When analysing the data gained, one could draw up themes and categories which each answer would fit into. This allows the data to be analysed easier.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer achieved a level 3 for succinctly offering a way of gathering and analysing more detailed information by way of the use of open questions. There is some nice detail regarding what type of open question could be used and a useful commentary of themes to analyse the information.

Question D 2 (a)

D02ai: The most popular study described from the list was Koivula followed by Cottrell et al. It was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates focused on the results and conclusions of the research, producing some very focused answers and good use was made of statistics and figures. There was a range of marks that reflected the ability of candidates to understand the findings and conclusions of the study chosen. Some candidates failed to gain the third mark due to lack of information rather than accuracy.

D02aii: A minority of candidates did not attempt this question or did not focus exclusively on ethics or reliability and some offered a wholesale evaluation of the study using validity and practical application issues. When focused, reliability issues were most commonly evaluated, such as the reliability of the BSRI. Ethics tended to be rather generic and not specifically linked to the details of the study described.

'Sex typed' was the largest gender type for both male and female.
Most sports were labelled as 'neutral', then 'appropriate for men' and
finally ~~appropriate for women~~ only about 7 sports were described
as being appropriate for female as oppose to it being appropriate for men.
Age did not correlate with the BSRI results.
Sex typed men stereotyped ~~male~~ male sports as more masculine
than cross sex typed, androgynous or undifferentiated women.

In terms of reliability, Firstly, the questionnaires were standardised and so the procedure is the same for all participants which means it more reliable. Furthermore 20 filter items were added to the BSR1 questionnaire to avoid demand characteristics which would otherwise decrease the reliability of answers. However, self report data can be unreliable possibly due to either social desirability or the fact that people have different moods on some days compared with others.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response gained all of the available marks for description and evaluation. The description was accurate and detailed and the evaluation had three relevant issues of reliability explained for full credit. Many candidates limited their evaluation by referring to just one issue of reliability or ethics that was not explained well enough for all three available marks.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When teaching a prescribed study it is useful to break the elements of the study down into aim(s), procedure, findings (results and/or conclusions). Evaluation can be assessed in terms of generalisability, reliability, application/implications of research, validity and ethics. Although, the focus on evaluation should be of the specific study rather than generic issues.

Question D 2 (b)

Many responses read as a description of theories in sport psychology, such as the use of imagery and goal setting. This resulted from an omission of the conclusions of their practical investigation so the link between the conclusions and concepts, theories and research was difficult to establish. The most common key issue described was, 'What makes a good coach?' Some candidates described their practical investigation with little or no reference to the key issue and only a superficial attempt was made to link the findings to concepts, theories and research. Overall, responses were difficult to understand and inferences needed to be made about either the conclusions drawn or the key issue referred to.

Key issue Content Analysis on the gender male/female sport discussed in the media

We found that a considerable amount difference in the coverage of male and female sports.

The BBC website covered 48 male sports, compared with 12 female sports.

This is supported by Koivula's (1995) study that sports are gendered. They are gendered appropriately to cultural norms. This links with the theory of socialisation, where appropriate behaviour is reinforced. In many cultures sport is viewed as masculine, therefore the media may be inclined to cover only male sport.

Biological explanation suggests males are better at sport due to greater testosterone levels, this bias opinion could explain the lack of female coverage



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response did well to clearly cite the conclusions for the practical investigation before linking it well to theory and research. Too many candidates launched into theory and research, omitting the conclusions of their practical. This gained all available marks as clear and accurate, well explained links were offered that built upon their conclusions.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Spider diagrams are useful for candidates to practise linking their conclusions from the practical investigation to wider theory and research.

Many essays referred to the Bella scenario throughout the response. It was pleasing to note the depth of focus for the descriptive element of the question. The most popular choice of explanation was self efficacy and many were able to describe the features of this theory very well and use contextualised sporting examples to amplify their theory description. Disappointingly, some candidates did describe and evaluate achievement motivation theory under the guise of a different named theory. Levels were often determined by the quality of evaluation, which was variable as expected. Many cited a practical application of the theory for a coach, which was done particularly well by some candidates, whilst others focused on self report data. There was a virtual absence of research supporting/opposing the explanation, but some did compare the relative strengths and weaknesses with alternative explanations for sporting motivation. As a reasonably straightforward essay question it was expected that candidates would perform rather well. However, an imbalance between the descriptive and evaluative elements of many responses resulted in few achieving the top level.

Bella could explain self-efficacy theory to her friends. Self efficacy suggests that a person's belief in their ability in a task will affect their motivation in that task, in this case a sport. People ~~have~~ ~~are~~ ~~not~~ ~~high~~ self efficacy. Self-efficacy has been studied by Bandura who said that self efficacy can be affected by past experiences, parents or friends encouragement or peer persuasion. People ~~can~~ can have high self-efficacy in one sport and low in another, its a belief in ability in a specific task ~~rather~~ rather than a self-esteem which is a general view of self.

One strength of self efficacy theory is that it is studied using self report data. This gives it some validity as the data are opinions coming straight from the individuals themselves. Also only way to measure it. Self-report data is also replicable because it's

gathered ~~in the form of~~ by questionnaires which are standardised and can be replicated to test for ~~reliability~~ reliability. ~~A weakness is that self-efficacy theory~~

Another strength is that self-efficacy has practical application in improving people's motivation e.g. use by coaches to help motivate athletes. A weakness is that self-report data is used ~~in~~ in studies supporting the theory.

It's hard to be sure that self-report is reliable because there could be participant variables such as mood, fatigue that could effect responses.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The candidate has identified a correct theory and has given a clear and succinct description that clearly embeds the descriptive element of the answer into level 3. The evaluation is rather generic and largely concerning self report issues associated with gathering data for the theory. There is a nice link to a practical application but no other issues of validity, supporting or opposing research is used. The evaluation element is present and clear but not adequate for level 4. This response gained 8 marks.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Evaluation of theory and research seems to be an area of improvement for those studying sport psychology. Candidates do need to understand the theories in more than a descriptive way. Acronyms such as SODA (supporting research, opposing research, different theory/explanation and application) can be used to remind candidates that there is a range of evaluation issues which can be used. Candidates can draw upon wider issues and debates such as reductionism, scientific, cultural bias, gender bias, nature/nurture.

Paper Summary

Key issues that need addressing:

- Methodological responses, whether description or evaluation, should be contextualised in the application studied. This should be evident in the whole response, and techniques such as name dropping or mentioning a key word (witness, child) should be avoided.
- Any evaluation point should be stated clearly, explained and linked back to the question. The implications of the comment need to be clear.
- Candidates need to work on clarity. In some instances, the point a candidate is trying to make is not clearly established. As teachers we often make assumptions about our own students' work based on what we have knowingly taught. The same assumptions cannot be made by examiners.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

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

