

# Mark Scheme (Results)

June 2011

GCE Psychology (6PS03) Paper 01  
Applications of Psychology

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](http://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/>

June 2011

Publications Code UA028579

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## General Guidance on Marking

All candidates must receive the same treatment.

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

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

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

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

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

## Using the mark scheme

The mark scheme gives:

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

- 1 / means that the responses are alternatives and either answer should receive full credit.
- 2 ( ) means that a phrase/word is not essential for the award of the mark, but helps the examiner to get the sense of the expected answer.
- 3 [ ] words inside square brackets are instructions or guidance for examiners.
- 4 Phrases/words in **bold** indicate that the meaning of the phrase or the actual word is **essential** to the answer.
- 5 TE (Transferred Error) means that a wrong answer given in an earlier part of a question is used correctly in answer to a later part of the same question.

## Quality of Written Communication

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

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

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

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

### Unit 3: Applications of Psychology

#### Section A – Criminological Psychology

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

Question Number	Question	
<b>A1 (a)</b>	Define the term 'recidivism'.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Recidivism is either the act (does not have to be caught) of reoffending or the rate (figures).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recidivism is <b>reoffending</b>/eq;</li> <li>• When an offender gets prosecuted and <b>caught again</b>/eq;</li> <li>• The statistical/criminal rate of reoffending/eq;</li> <li>• When a criminal gets out of prison and starts doing the crime again/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(1 AO1)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>A1 (b)</b>	<p>Criminal psychologists use different techniques to treat offenders. Some techniques are intended to reduce recidivism. Techniques vary in their use and effectiveness.</p> <p>Evaluate <b>two</b> techniques psychologists might use to treat offenders.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. <b><u>Three marks for each treatment evaluation</u></b> – no credit for descriptions. Suitable examples include: token economy, punishment, anger management, social skills training, there are others.</p> <p>If more than one treatment in each section mark all and credit the best. If two in first section but second section blank up to full marks can be given.</p> <p>Evidence that is explained/conclusion/findings/<b>specific</b> to study given (not just ‘supports the treatment’/‘shows the treatment works’) gains credit, accept clinical evidence.</p> <p>Please look up evidence that you are not familiar with, or contact your team leader.</p> <p><b>Watch for repetition of general issues:</b> General issues associated with all treatments (e.g. lack of funding, ethics, cost, time, need for training) can only be credited once across both answers.</p> <p>Eg Token economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tokens are used to manage behaviour not rehabilitate/eq;</li> <li>• Tokens control behaviour in the short term making prison life more harmonious/eq;</li> <li>• Staff must be vigilant and consistent in implementing rewards otherwise it won't work/eq;</li> <li>• Staff and inmate interaction becomes more positive/eq;</li> <li>• Tokens can be abused by prison staff who may use their authority to manipulate a criminal's behaviour/eq;</li> <li>• They can be used as a form of contraband within prisons/eq;</li> <li>• Other forms of reinforcement in prison might override the value of tokens/eq;</li> <li>• Reinforcement in life outside prison is more subtle than tokens, so the long term effectiveness is limited/eq;</li> <li>• It could be the increased positive social interaction between staff and prisoners that creates good behaviour rather than the tokens themselves/eq;</li> <li>• TEP's are <i>cost effective/little training</i> as professionals are not needed to implement them/eq;</li> <li>• Allyon and Azrin found that token produces a significant</li> </ul>	<b>(6 AO2)</b>

	<p>improvement in the <i>personal care of patients</i>/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pearson et al (2002) <i>compared CBT and TEPs</i> and found little success of tokens within prisons/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Eg Anger management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Psychologists question the assumption that anger causes violence/eq;</li> <li>• Some criminals may use anger as a calculated tool, so they are not really angry, in which case AM would not be effective/this could also apply to anger in response to intimidation, which is not being about an angry person either/eq;</li> <li>• Unlike TEP it aims to change behaviour permanently so more likely to reduce recidivism/eq;</li> <li>• Some criticise this scheme as creating more calculating offenders so anger control leads to more effective criminals/eq;</li> <li>• AM can be more expensive as it can only be done on small groups/individuals with a trained professional/over an extended period of time/eq;</li> <li>• In real life offenders are carefully screened to ensure benefit from the programmes/eq;</li> <li>• Can only be used on offenders who have self motivated/want to participate/insight/able to self evaluate for there to be any success/eq;</li> <li>• Unlike TE there is real change in thinking so felt to be more successful/eq;</li> <li>• Dowden et al (1999) showed reduced <i>recidivism</i> in offenders/<i>high risk</i> offenders/eq;</li> <li>• Loza and Loza-Fanous (1999) found no significant link between <i>anger and violent or non-violent offences</i>/eq;</li> <li>• Ireland (2004) showed significant improvements in <i>violent offenders</i> using the programme/<i>lower anger scores</i>/eq;</li> </ul> <p>NB: AM and personality change is not an ethical issue.  <i>Italics indicate the type of specificity needed for a study to be identifiable.</i></p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	
--	---	--

Question Number	Question	
<b>A2 (a)</b>	<p>Violent media has often been suggested as a cause of teenage anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Outline the role of the media in the modelling of anti-social behaviour.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. No marks for a generic description of SLT without reference to aggression/media (TV, video's, games, literature, music). It must be the role of the media, not the role of the viewer (e.g. self reinforcement, copying) No credit for pro-social behaviour.</p> <p>Examples, even anecdotal, can gain credit if adds to the outline. Evidence gains credit only if it adds to the outline – the research evidence must follow on from the point made – see marking points one and two as they follow on. Research alone does not gain credit.</p> <p>The candidates need more than 'TV shows anti-social behaviour and it is watched and copied', as it is a repetition of question.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rideout calculated a high percentage of programmes containing acts of violence (70-80%) which are watched in high volume (38 hours for adults and 25 hours for children)/eq; [With bracket detail, 2 marks]</li> <li>2. E.g. Williams et al found that <b>increased media exposure</b> encouraged anti-social behaviour/eq;</li> <li>3. Role models seen on TV/media may be models of identification for viewers [not just provides a role model]/eq;</li> <li>4. Role models in the media are shown as powerful <b>and</b> likeable [not just provides a role model]/eq;</li> <li>5. Some video games/media glamorise violence making it more appealing/eq;</li> <li>6. Violence is shown without negative consequences/eq;</li> <li>7. Violent video games reward anti-social behaviour <b>with points</b>/eq;</li> <li>8. Role models are reinforced for violent behaviour on TV it might provide the vicarious reinforcement/eq;</li> <li>9. Role models are copied because they are rewarded for anti-social behaviour/eq;</li> </ol> <p>Bold indicates it is needed in the answer (OWTTE) Square brackets are for instructions. <b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(2 AO1)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>A2 (b)</b>	<p>Many psychologists believe that the media does cause anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Using your knowledge of psychological theory and research, explain <b>one</b> reason why these psychologists might hold this belief.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. If more than one reason mark all and credit the best.</p> <p><b>Max one</b> mark for any 'real' cases as evidence (Columbine/Jokela).</p> <p>Reasons can include SLT, OC, identification, role models, vicarious reinforcement, exposure to violence, research evidence. Look for depth <b>and/or</b> breadth as candidates may elaborate on a single concept/study or use entire theory/lots of evidence.</p> <p>No credit for celebrity examples unless qualified significantly with link to a point (e.g. vicarious reinforcement)</p> <p>Ignore evidence/alternative explanations that do not support the link between media and violence (including Bulger).</p> <p>Max 2 marks for an answer that does not refer to the psychologists belief/media/anti-social behaviour etc (e.g. a pure description of SLT).</p> <p><b>Possible marking points, look for one reason: e.g. 1,2,6 = SLT, or e.g. 6,7,8 = research evidence.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SLT explains why psychologists hold this belief because anti-social behaviour is seen and copied from violent media/eq; <b>[done very well and not part of a different sentence]</b></li> <li>2. Attention, retention, reproduction, motivation - explained/eq;</li> <li>3. People identify with the role models portrayed and look up to them and be like them/eq;</li> <li>4. Role models are more likely to be copied if rewarded/eq;</li> <li>5. Vicarious reinforcement as media rewards anti-social behaviour and does not punish it/eq;</li> <li>6. A handful of case studies, Ryan/Columbine, have been linked to violent media but are only speculative/some details of the case matched what they were supposed to watch on TV/play on video games/eq; (Max 1 for anecdotal evidence)</li> <li>7. Bandura, Ross and Ross (1961) demonstrated causal experimental evidence for copying violent behaviour/eq;</li> <li>8. Williams (1986) did find a two fold increase in Notel</li> </ol>	<b>(3 AO2)</b>



	<p>children's aggression following the introduction of TV in Canada/eq;</p> <p>9. Anderson and Dill (2002) found pps more marginally willing to harm another after playing Wolfenstein compared to pps who played Myst/eq;</p> <p>10. Bartol found higher aggression in people who played video games with more blood content/eq;</p> <p>11. Violent video games directly reinforce violent behaviour (operant conditioning) to motivate aggression/eq;</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	
--	---	--

	Guidance	
	Use the banding below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information.	

Question Number	Question	
<b>A2 (c)</b>	<p>Psychologists often use laboratory experiments to investigate whether media violence causes anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Describe <b>one</b> feature of the laboratory experiment as a research method used in criminological psychology.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Relevant examples include, controlled environment, reliability, standardisation, IV/DV, control, cause and effect.</p> <p>If more than one clearly defined feature, mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>Relevant examples can gain credit <b><i>if they add</i></b> to the description, e.g. giving Loftus' findings is not adding to the answer.</p> <p>The feature must apply to lab experiments generally (e.g. not just specific to Loftus e.g. her questionnaires). Please send to review if atypical answer.</p> <p>0 mark No rewardable material</p> <p>1 mark Clear identification of one feature e.g. the IV is manipulated and DV measured.</p> <p>2 marks Clear identification of one feature AND elaboration which may be further description or reason for feature or relevant example. e.g. The IV is manipulated and the DV measured and other extraneous variables are controlled to establish cause and effect</p> <p><b>Indicative content</b> Feature: Variables The IV is manipulated and the DV measured Other extraneous variables are controlled to establish cause and effect</p> <p>Feature: Control Lab experiments have highly controlled variables (<i>minimum</i>) The lab experiment is conducted in a tightly controlled environment To ensure that no other variables can have an impact on the findings They can be replicated to check for reliable findings</p> <p>Feature: standardisation Participants are given the same instructions/environment/procedure except the control condition. So everyone receives the same treatment and the experimental condition can be compared to the control</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(2 A03)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>A2 (d)</b>	<p>Social Learning Theory is not the only suggested cause of criminal behaviour; other psychologists may explain criminal behaviour through biological or social explanations.</p> <p>Evaluate <b>one</b> explanation of criminal/anti-social behaviour, <b>other than</b> Social Learning Theory.</p>	
	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Mark</b>
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. If more than one 'other' explanation, mark all and credit the best – biological theories (e.g. genetic, hormonal, neurological), can be treated as one theory.} Acceptable examples include: personality theory, biological theory(ies) and self fulfilling prophecy. There may be others.</p> <p><b>Max 1</b> for research not linked in the answer to anti-social behaviour directly e.g. Rosenthal and Jacobsen, Eden findings. If linked by candidate to criminal psychology this restriction does not apply.</p> <p>Ignore description. Supporting research and alternative theory should be <b>explained</b> (findings/conclusions).</p> <p><b>WATCH:</b> Procedure and findings of Jahoda – he did not tell the children they would be born a trouble maker, nor did he return to find out. The focus should be on criminal/aggression.</p> <p><b>Max 1</b> for alternative explanations.</p> <p>e.g. Self fulfilling prophecy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968) found that children randomly labelled bloomers improved their performance because of the way they were treated by teachers/eq; (Max 1)</li> <li>• Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968) found that children randomly labelled bloomers improved their performance because of the way they were treated by teachers, <i>this shows how SFP could affect becoming a criminal/eq;</i></li> <li>• Jahoda (1954) found that Ashanti boys born on a Wednesday were more likely to have been arrested because of the belief in name and character/eq;</li> <li>• Madon (2004) found that parents were able to predict the drinking behaviour of their children a year before being retested/eq;</li> <li>• Not all conform to their label, they may do the opposite/eq;</li> <li>• We cannot experimentally test for the effects of self fulfilling prophecy because of ethical reasons/eq;</li> <li>• There other reasons for antisocial behaviour, such as the way we are raised by parents, that could account for</li> </ul>	<b>(4 AO2)</b>

	<p>antisocial behaviour other than SFP/eq; [alternative explanations max 1]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In contrast to SFP, social learning theory states that we observe and model antisocial behaviour/eq;</li> <li>• Evidence for SFP may not be criminological but is still valid evidence for labelling and can be assumed to happen for a variety of behaviours (or counter argument)/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Personality theory (Eysenck)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hare (2001) found an over-representation of psychotic individuals have a tendency to be violent/eq;</li> <li>• Personality theories have been regarded as outdated as an explanation of antisocial behaviour because findings of studies have been inconsistent/eq;</li> <li>• Gran et al (1999) found that 48% of ex-offenders rated as psychotic were likely to reoffend compared to those not rated as highly psychotic/eq;</li> <li>• Gabrys et al (1988) found that children referred for conduct disorders scored highly for psychoticism and extraversion/eq;</li> <li>• Fonseca and Yule (1995) compared delinquent and non-delinquent boys and found no difference in extraversion, psychoticism and neuroticism scores as measured by the EPI/eq;</li> <li>• Center and Kemp (2002) found a relationship between antisocial behaviour and psychoticism in a sample of 11 delinquents so supports personality theory/eq;</li> <li>• Learning theory is an alternative explanation of antisocial behaviour using reinforcement to explain repeated antisocial behaviour/eq; [alternative explanations max 1]</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	
--	---	--

Question Number	Question	
<b>A3*</b>	Describe <b>one</b> field study you have learned about in criminological psychology. Evaluate the field experiment as a research method.	
	Indicative content	Mark
	<p>Refer to the levels at the end of the indicative content.</p> <p>Appropriate answers may include the following indicative content, but the list is not exhaustive so look for other reasonable points.</p> <p>If more than one study described, mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>Studies are any done in the field – Yarmey, Yuille and Cutshall, Maas and Kohnken, Charlton, Williams, if done in the field and not the lab then fine, but check with TL if unsure.</p> <p>Candidates can describe any field study/field experiment that they have learned.</p> <p>For evaluation candidates can evaluate the field experiment/field study as a research method or evaluate the described field study described – see level descriptions.</p> <p>Eg Yarmey (2004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aimed to see if eyewitness testimony was accurate in a field setting/</li> <li>• Approached public by opportunity and asked for help</li> <li>• Participants were asked to give directions or help find a piece of jewellery</li> <li>• They were then approached by a researcher and asked to recall the person they helped</li> <li>• Participants were asked to identify the person from a photograph line up</li> <li>• Participants were able to recall salient and obvious features well</li> <li>• Recall was overestimated by students</li> <li>• Preparation did not enhance eyewitness recall</li> </ul> <p>Eg Yuille and Cutshall (1986)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviewed real witnesses to a gun shop robbery months after the incident</li> <li>• The witnesses were real and the gunshop robbery was not staged</li> <li>• Compared the interview transcripts with the original police interviews</li> <li>• Used leading questions within the interview</li> <li>• Tested to see if the misleading questions altered witness account after 3 months</li> <li>• They found that recall was accurate in real life</li> </ul>	<p><b>AO1</b> <b>AO2</b></p>

- Eyewitnesses were not misled by leading questions

Evaluation (AO2) of field experiments

- It can be sometimes unethical to expose a participant to a real event if using a crime/incident scenario
- Field experiments are more realistic than laboratory experiments as the environment is natural and similar to what a real witness would experience
- Participants in laboratory experiments may focus their attention of the incident, and this may not happen in a realistic environment
- Field experiments may not be able to control extraneous variables that could affect participant testimony/memory
- However, a lack of control is realistic to what a real witness would experience

**Alternative level 3 evaluation as implicit to field experiment**

- Yuille and Cutshall used a natural environment which has ecological validity as real life
- The gunshop robbery was naturally occurring and not staged unlike a laboratory experiment
- Yarmey approached participants in their natural surroundings which may be less stressful than lab experiment procedure

**Look for other reasonable marking points.**

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		AO1: Knowledge and understanding of a named field study. AO2: Evaluation should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengths and/or weaknesses of the field experiment.</li> </ul>
	0	No rewardable material
<b>Level 1</b>	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce <b>brief</b> answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempted description of <b>one</b> study which may not be clearly identifiable and is likely to focus on one aspect of the study.</li> </ul> <p><b>AND</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little or no attempt at the evaluation of a field experiment as a research method</li> </ul> <p><b>or</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little or no attempt to evaluate the field study described.</li> </ul> <p>Lack of relevant evidence. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. The writing may have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but lack both clarity and organisation. High incidence of syntactical and /or spelling errors.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	4-6	<p><b>Good description <u>OR</u> good evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR either description or evaluation is in less detail than the other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited description of <b>one</b> field study. Study must be identifiable.</li> </ul> <p><b>AND</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited evaluation of the field experiment includes <b>some</b> appropriate strength(s) / weakness(es)</li> </ul> <p><b>or</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of the field study including strengths/weaknesses <b>and</b> one well expressed/range of less well expressed methodological points that can be relevant to the method of a field experiment even if implicit for the AO2 component of the question.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>OR</u> (as alternative to the two marking levels directly above)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good description of one field study OR Good evaluation of the field experiment as a research method.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of <b>mostly accurate</b> and relevant factual material. There are likely to be passages which lack clarity and proper organisation. Frequent syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present. Limited clarity organisation in the response.</p>

<p><b>Level 3</b></p>	<p>7-9</p>	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <i><b>both of the injunctions</b></i> in the question <b>well</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good description of an identified field study (including a range of aspects/details of the study, with regard to AMRC balance breadth with depth).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>AND</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses of the field experiment as a research method.</li> </ul> <p><b>or</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good evaluation of the study described that includes a range of methodological points that are very well explained and relevant to the method of a field experiment even if implicit for the AO2 component of the question. <b>SEE INDICATIVE CONTENT DESCRIPTION.</b></li> </ul> <p>The candidate will demonstrate most of the skills needed to produce effective extended writing but there will be lapses in organisation. Some syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
<p><b>Level 4</b></p>	<p>10-12</p>	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <i><b>both of the injunctions</b></i> in the question <b>very well</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good description with an accurate and detailed description of an identified study (you might expect A,M, R and/or C – balance breadth with depth – if M and R depth then OK).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>AND</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good evaluation includes appropriate strengths and/or weaknesses that are fully explained. Clearly understands the AO2 component of the question by explicitly evaluating the field experiment as a research method. Focused on the requirements of the question.</li> </ul> <p>The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning. Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the indicative content is present.</p>



## Section B – Child Psychology

	Guidance	
<b>QB1a and B1b</b>	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p> <p>Except B1c and B3 which should be marked according to the levels stated.</p>	

Question Number	Question	
<b>B1 (a)</b>	Define the terms 'deprivation' and 'privation' as they are used in child psychology.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. 2 marks for deprivation and 2 marks for privation. Explained examples can gain max 1 mark overall for each term (eg definition +1 explained example = 2 marks or well explained examples on own = 1) but examples must be clear for credit, e.g. not just 'because of divorce/hospitalisation'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deprivation is a <b>loss</b> of an primary attachment figure/eq;</li> <li>• Attachment formed is <b>broken</b>/eq;</li> <li>• Divorce involves one parent leaving the family home and often children do not have contact with the absent parent for extended periods of time/eq;</li> <li>• Hospitalisation is when a mother is <i>separated</i> from a child for a period of time/eq;</li> <li>• Can be short term or long term deprivation such as daycare or death/eq;</li> <li>• Privation is a <b>lack</b> of an attachment figure/eq;</li> <li>• Attachment is <b>never</b> formed/eq;</li> <li>• Cases of severe neglect, such as Genie, show privation as it is said that she never had the opportunity to bond with her parent as she was isolated from family members from a very young age/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(4 AO1)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>B1 (b)</b>	<p>It is rare for children to suffer extreme privation. Often psychologists use the case study as a research method in such situations.</p> <p>Describe the case study as a research method as it is used in child psychology.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore evaluation.</p> <p><b>Max three</b> marks for general description of a case study, unless reference made to a case study being used in child psychology in one way (overall).</p> <p>Examples/descriptions of Genie/Little Hans/Dibs or other child case studies, can be used <b>IF</b> the description <u>adds</u> to the detail of a case study as a research method in child psychology <u>up to <b>max one</b></u> mark.</p> <p>Ignore longitudinal research method, unless in <i>context</i> with the case study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case studies are in depth (rich and detailed) investigations <b>and</b> conducted on one or a small group of individuals/children/eq;</li> <li>• A variety of research methods (cognitive tests, observations) can be used (to assess a child's development)/eq;</li> <li>• Both qualitative and quantitative data can be gathered and analysed (about the child)/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies often look at rare or unique cases of <i>privation for example</i>/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies are used where it is unethical to conduct experimental research <b>and</b> e.g. privation cannot be deliberately brought about/it might involve harm/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies can take place over a long period of time to study the development of children and look for patterns/changes/eq;</li> <li>• Genie is a case study of an individual girl who was severely neglected and researched extensively by a group of psychologists involved in her rehabilitation and assessment/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Brackets = not needed in answer – see instructions</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(4 AO3)</b>

	Guidance	
<b>B1 (C)</b>	Use the levels below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information.	
Question Number	Question	
<b>B1 (C)</b>	Case studies are known to be useful in studying rare cases. Explain <b>one other</b> strength of using the case study as a research method.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. No marks for weaknesses – see previous question as description – exclude these type comments. If in doubt, look for the effect.</p> <p>Examples that add to the strength can be credited (e.g. Rich, therefore indepth + Genie: interviews, test, experiments to check validity of findings).</p> <p>If more than one strength mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>Ignore reference to being useful for unique/rare cases.</p> <p><b>Levels</b></p> <p><b>0 mark</b> No rewardable material</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Clear identification of one strength (other than useful in rare cases) e.g. Case studies gather rich and detailed information about a single case so the resulting findings are in depth.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> Clear identification <b>and</b> elaboration of one strength (other than useful in rare cases) e.g. Case studies gather rich and detailed information about a single case so the resulting findings are in depth because they use different research methods to collect and compare data.</p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Depth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case studies gather rich and detailed information about a single case <b>so the resulting findings are in depth</b></li> <li>• Different research methods can be used to gather <b>more</b> information on the same concepts</li> </ul> <p>Triangulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different research methods can be used to <b>validate</b> concepts under investigation</li> <li>• Different research methods can be used as triangulation to <b>ensure the validity</b> of the findings by checking data from each to ensure agreement</li> </ul> <p>Ethics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be unethical to conduct experimental research, so in this sense case studies can be regarded as ethical</li> <li>• It would have been unethical to subject a child like Genie to extreme privation as an experiment</li> </ul> <p>Ecological validity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case studies have ecological validity because they are about real life cases in context</li> <li>• E.g. Genie informed us of the nature of real life privation as she was isolated from a young age due to real life circumstances</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(4 AO3)</b>

	Guidance	
<b>B1(d) and B2 (a)</b>	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p>	
Question Number	Question	
<b>B1 (d)</b>	Describe the weaknesses of using the case study as a research method.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. If only one weakness <b>max 2</b> marks overall. No marks for strengths. Does not need to relate to child psychology.</p> <p>Examples can gain credit for elaboration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The researcher may become too close to the individual in the study so their interpretations become biased/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies can have ethical issues as the participant may be identifiable (even with a pseudonym)/eq;</li> <li>• If individuals are named they could be publicly exposed/eq;</li> <li>• Generalisability is limited to the case as it is unique and a one-off/eq;</li> <li>• The researchers may subjectively interpret findings/eq;</li> <li>• Loss of a participant due to withdrawal or death may affect results or the study has to be closed/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies can be time consuming <b>and</b> expensive research/eq;</li> <li>• We cannot generalise the finding of the case study to the wider population as they are based on a single one-off unique case for example, Genie can never be repeated /there may be individual differences, such as personality, that makes them different from anyone else/it is unrepresentative of the general population/eq; (2 mark answer)</li> <li>• Reliability can be affected by researcher bias as the researcher can become over involved in the case and lose objectivity/eq; (2 marks)</li> <li>• Researchers may interpret research differently so are therefore subjective and this may lower the validity/reliability of their findings/eq; (2 marks)</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(3 A03)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>B2 (a)</b>	<p>Key issues in psychology concern applications of theory that help us understand real life situations.</p> <p>Identify the key issue for child psychology that you have studied during your course.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark for identification of an appropriate issue. Do not credit 'non-issues'.</p> <p>Suitable examples include:  The issue of how daycare affects children/eq;  How deprivation effects can be alleviated/eq;  To what extent autism has a biological basis/eq;</p> <p>Reject:  Daycare/The issue of daycare  Privation  Deprivation  Autism/The issue of autism</p> <p>as single word identifications are unlikely to be issues by themselves.</p> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(1 AO1)</b>

	Guidance	
<b>B2b and B3</b>	Use the banding below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information. Giving marks for elaboration where appropriate is particularly important where questions such as this are suitable to stretch and challenge candidates, so that the full range of marks is available.	

Question Number	Question	
<b>B2 (b)</b>	Describe the key issue you have identified in (a).	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Mark according to the levels given below.</p> <p>Using the levels credit descriptions of their key issue.</p> <p>Descriptions may be of the key issue <b>with or without</b> reference to concepts, theories and research in psychology.</p> <p>If the key issue is blank or unrewardable – this should not prejudice B2b – go with the intention of the candidate.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No rewardable material or just repeat of identification.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> A brief and/or basic description of the key issue, may not be well expressed in terms of <i>describing</i> the key issue more than ID.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> A basic description of the key issue, at least one idea reasonably well expressed in terms of describing the key issue.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> A good description of the key issue. A range of ideas expressed well or one idea elaborated.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> A very well detailed description of the key issue. With breadth and depth.</p>	<b>(4 AO1)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>B3*</b>	<p>Rebecca and her one year old child participated in a child psychology study using the strange situation procedure. Her child was assessed as being securely attached. Her friend, who also had a small child, lived in a different country and Rebecca wondered if they were also securely attached.</p> <p>Using the work of Ainsworth, describe the behaviour that Rebecca's child might show, <b>and</b> explain cross-cultural issues regarding child-rearing styles.</p>	
	Indicative content	Mark
	<p>Refer to the levels at the end of the indicative content. Appropriate answers may include the following indicative content, but the list is not exhaustive so look for other reasonable points.</p> <p><b>First part of Q – where link to Rebecca is required (once referred to in some detail consider general descriptions as relevant).</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rebecca's child will play independently when the mother is present in the room during the strange situation</li> <li>• Ainsworth showed that a secure child would become upset when away from mother. Rebecca's child would be distressed when away from her.</li> <li>• Her child will display distress when she leaves the room</li> <li>• Her child will seek comfort when she returns to the room</li> <li>• Her child will quickly resume play after being comforted by Rebecca</li> <li>• Rebecca's' child will show stranger fear and avoid the stranger in the strange situation</li> <li>• Rebecca's child will not be comforted by the attempts of the stranger in Rebecca's absence</li> <li>• Rebecca's mother demonstrated a sensitive responsive parenting style</li> </ul> <p><b>Second part of Q</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Miyake findings can be explained by a culture of close parent-child proximity and desirability of non-crying children</li> <li>• Japanese children are kept close to their mothers much of the time, which would explain why no anxious avoidant/cry when separated</li> <li>• Grossman and Grossman's study findings can be explained by a cultural ideology of independent children</li> <li>• German parents encourage independence so don't cry when separated/avoidant type</li> <li>• Sagi's findings can be explained by the lack of close proximity between parents and children and the employment of the metapalet</li> <li>• Further studies of modern Israeli kibbutz where parents cohabit with their children show more secure attachment</li> <li>• However, a child's temperament may account for different attachment styles being demonstrated other than culture</li> <li>• The strange situation is affected by cultural differences</li> </ul>	<b>AO2</b>

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The strange situation may pose a huge distress for Japanese children who are unfamiliar with separation, that may explain these findings</li><li>• The findings cross culturally and at home may be an unfamiliarity with the situation which lacks ecological validity</li><li>• Children's temperament could be the cause of attachment type rather than maternal sensitivity</li><li>• Children in daycare may be accustomed to separation and so respond differently to separation, this does not mean their attachments are insecure</li></ul> |  |
|--|---|--|

**Look for other reasonable marking points.**



Level	Mark	Descriptor
		AO2: Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works in relation to Ainsworth and cross cultural research.
	0	No rewardable material
<b>Level 1</b>	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce <b>brief</b> answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempted description of securely attached child in the strange situation. No reference to Rebecca or child. May describe SS study and hit upon some relevant points. There will be little or no attempt at the cross cultural issues.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited description at cross cultural issues with little or no attempt to describe securely attached child.</li> </ul> <p>Lack of relevant evidence. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. The writing may have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but lack both clarity and organisation. High incidence of syntactical and /or spelling errors.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	4-6	<p>First part of question done well and attempt at second part <b>or</b> second part of question done well, or both limited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited description of the securely attached child, may focus on results of Ainsworth's study – so not focused on the requirements of the question. May not refer to Rebecca and child and limited reference to cross cultural issues but may not refer to relevant research.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good description of securely attached child and attempt at cross cultural issues</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good explanation of cross cultural issues regarding child rearing styles</li> </ul> <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of <b>mostly accurate</b> and relevant factual material. There are likely to be passages which lack clarity and proper organisation. Frequent syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present. Limited clarity organisation in the response.</p>
<b>Level 3</b>	7-9	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b>both of the injunctions</b> in the question <b>well</b> (the first part of the answer is expected to be shorter than the second part).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear description of the securely attached child, with an attempt to refer to Rebecca and child. Description is focused largely on requirements of the question [largely focused may mean a little unfocused content, e.g. about the strange situation procedure/attachment types]</li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good reference to cross cultural issues and will refer to relevant research and/or explanation of cultural issues regarding child rearing styles</li> </ul> <p>The candidate will demonstrate most of the skills needed to produce effective extended writing but there will be lapses in organisation. Some syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

<b>Level 4</b>	10-12	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b><i>both of the injunctions</i></b> in the question <b>very well</b> (the first part of the answer is expected to be shorter than the second part).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Very good description of the securely attached child, with an explicit reference to Rebecca and child. Description is focused on the requirements of the question – even if succinct.</li><li>• Very good explanation of cross cultural issues regarding child rearing styles and will explain more than one relevant piece of research very well.</li></ul> <p>The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning.</p> <p>Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the indicative content is present.</p>
----------------	-------	--

## Section C – Health Psychology

	Guidance	
<b>C1a to C2ai</b>	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p> <p>Except C1aii to C3 which should be marked according to the levels stated.</p>	

Question Number	Question	
<b>C1 (a)</b>	Arthur intends to give up heroin. Explain how Arthur might experience heroin withdrawal.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration.  For students producing long lists that are stated rather than described: A list of two of more one word symptoms gains one mark and a list of four or more one word symptoms gains two marks <b>max</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Withdrawal symptoms begin within 12+ hours following last fix of heroin and involve <i>agitation</i> [substitute for any symptom – this may not be in same sentence] / length of withdrawal/eq;</li> <li>• The severity of withdrawal is dependent upon the level of addiction/eq;</li> <li>• After a day without heroin, they become more agitated <b>and</b> restless,</li> <li>• hot and cold flushes <b>and</b> restlessness/eq;</li> <li>• The next phase involves skin crawl and often an addict sleeps/eq;</li> <li>• They experience cramps <b>and</b> vomiting/eq;</li> <li>• Diarrhoea <b>and</b> sweating/eq;</li> <li>• Twitching <b>and</b> shaking of the body is common/eq;</li> <li>• Depression <b>and</b> sensitivity in genital area/eq;</li> <li>• 'itchy blood' <b>and</b> need to scratch/eq;</li> <li>• Frustration <b>and</b> confusion/eq;</li> <li>• The psychological response is feeling they cannot cope without heroin/physiological response is that they cannot function without the drug [this may be vice versa but only <i>gets 1 overall</i> even if well expressed, for either/both]/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Ignore headaches  <b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(3 AO2)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>C1 (b)</b>	Arthur seeks help for his heroin addiction. Describe <b>one</b> treatment for heroin dependency.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Other treatments include CBT, aversion therapy, counselling, cold turkey, prescribed opiates, token economy, psychoanalysis, positive reinforcement, there are others.</p> <p>Ignore definite evaluation, e.g. avoids use of dirty needles so safer.</p> <p>Accept general prescription and mode of action as being of the treatment.</p> <p>Methadone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methadone is a synthetic opiate used to replace heroin (<i>not at the synapse</i>)/eq;</li> <li>• It works to block the effects of heroin at the synapse and reduce the withdrawal symptoms for 24 hours/eq;</li> <li>• Methadone reduces heroin cravings/eq;</li> <li>• If taken with heroin the heroin will not produce its euphoric effects/eq;</li> <li>• It is orally administered daily on a maintenance programme/eq;</li> <li>• The dose is systematically lowered to wean off/eq;</li> <li>• When trusted the drug can be taken away from the pharmacy/eq;</li> <li>• Urine tests are taken to check co-drug use/eq;</li> <li>• Methadone lasts for longer than heroin, up to 24 hours/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Token economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tokens are given for drug abstinence/eq;</li> <li>• This is linked to OC through positive reinforcement/eq;</li> <li>• Contingency management is a voucher system which gives vouchers for testing negative for heroin/eq;</li> <li>• Tokens/vouchers can be exchanged for primary reinforcers/healthy stuff/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(3 AO1)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>C1 (c)</b>	Evaluate the use of drug treatment for heroin dependency.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore description. Credit points that effectively compare drug treatments to others (e.g.hypnotherapy). The answer does not have to refer to heroin, but if a drug is mentioned it should be appropriate to use to treat heroin addiction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blättler et al (2002) found that those given prescribed heroin reduced their general use of cocaine and showed behavioural changes associated with abstinence/eq;</li> <li>• Biological drug replacement therapy can be costly to the health service/eq;</li> <li>• Drug replacement therapies often have withdrawal and dependency issues themselves/eq;</li> <li>• Drug replacement can involve a dangerous cocktail that is harmful in itself/eq;</li> <li>• Drug replacement can help take the addict away from the drug context that may reinforce an addicts lifestyle/eq;</li> <li>• Methadone is a synthetic opiate that can produce physical dependency/eq;</li> <li>• Less glamour when take orally so removes association between shooting up and high (which is a good thing)/eq;</li> <li>• Urine samples are taken to ensure that users are not taking other drugs as well/eq;</li> <li>• Drug replacement programmes reduce the risk of other infections associated with needle sharing/taken orally/eq;</li> <li>• Drug programmes also reduce the risk of crime related behaviours associated with financing drug habits/eq;</li> <li>• Addicts may sell the drugs on the black market/eq;</li> <li>• Ball and Ross (1991) found methadone effective in reducing illicit opiate use/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(4 AO2)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>C2 (a) (i)</b>	<p>During your course you will have conducted a practical investigation on a topic in health psychology using <b>either</b> a content analysis <b>or</b> a summary of two article sources.</p> <p>Identify the area of health psychology you investigated for your practical.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark for the correct identification of a health related practical as per specification.</p> <p>Suitable examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issue of how drug abuse can be treated</li> <li>• How to prevent drug abuse</li> <li>• Cross-cultural differences in drug taking</li> <li>• How drug taking is portrayed in the media</li> <li>• Drug related lyrics in popular music</li> </ul> <p><b>There are many others</b> but it must be related to the content of the spec.</p> <p>Reject answers that are not practicable in terms of a sources summary or content analysis.</p>	<b>(1 A03)</b>

	Guidance	
<b>C2aii to C3</b>	Use the levels below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information. Giving marks for elaboration where appropriate is particularly important where questions such as this are suitable to stretch and challenge candidates, so that the full range of marks is available.	

Question Number	Question	
<b>C2 (a)(ii)</b>	Describe how you carried out your content analysis <b>or</b> summary.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Mark according to the levels given below.</p> <p>The practical investigation may be a summary of two articles or a content analysis.</p> <p>Conducting a practical can involve a range of issues concerned with planning and conducting: sources, bias, procedure, sampling, apparatus, controls, coding decisions, reviewing/summarising the material and how conclusions were drawn.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No rewardable material.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Brief description of any part of what was done for the practical (see notes above).</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> A clear description of how data was gathered by referring to more than one procedural issue/one explained well.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> More depth, clearly describing a range of procedural issues with at least one of these issues explained well.</p>	<b>(3 AO3)</b>



Question Number	Question	
<b>C2(b)</b>	Explain the findings (results and/or conclusions) of your practical investigation using research, theories and/or concepts you have learned about in health psychology.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Mark according to the levels given below.</p> <p>The practical investigation may be a content analysis <b>or</b> summary of two sources. Findings refer to results and/or conclusions drawn from the content analysis or summary.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No rewardable material.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> A brief summary of the results and/or conclusions of the practical investigation with <b>NO</b> attempt at linking the findings to concepts drawn from health psychology.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> A summary/explanation of the results and/or conclusions of the content analysis with a brief attempt to link to concepts, research and/or theories drawn from health psychology <b>or</b> a good summary of the results.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> An explanation of the findings of the practical with a good attempt to link to concepts, research and/or theories drawn from health psychology in at least one way.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b> A detailed explanation of the findings of the practical investigation with accurate and detailed links made between the findings and at least two concepts, theories and/or research drawn from health psychology.</p>	<b>(AO3 = 4)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>C3*</b>	<p>During your course you will have learned about two studies in detail in health psychology. One of these studies was Blättler et al (2002), the <b>other study</b> investigated one of the following drugs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• alcohol</li> <li>• cocaine</li> <li>• ecstasy</li> <li>• marijuana</li> <li>• nicotine.</li> </ul> <p>Describe and evaluate the <b>other study</b> you have learned. In your answer make at least one comparison point with Blättler et al (2002).</p>	
	Indicative content	Mark
	<p>Refer to the levels at the end of the indicative content.</p> <p>Appropriate answers may include the following indicative content, but the list is not exhaustive so look for other reasonable points.</p> <p>Other studies include Wareing et al (ecstasy) Stacey (alcohol), Cumberbatch and Gauntlett (content analysis of alcohol/smoking/drugs), Cloninger (genetics and alcohol), Pickens and Thompson (Cocaine), Brook et al (Marijuana), Morgan and Grube (peer relationships and cigarettes), Ennett et al (Smoking and peers) there are many others, please look them up or check with team leader if unsure.</p> <p>Ignore AO1 descriptions of Blättler as the main study here – although it WILL be used in comparison.</p> <p>e.g. Ennett et al (1994)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To investigate adolescent smoking and the relationship between them and their peers and friends</li> <li>• 1092 Ninth grade students (aged 14-15 years old) from 5 schools in the US were questioned between August and December 1980</li> <li>• Mothers educational background was determined as well as a range of other possible mitigating variables</li> <li>• Ennett et al (1994) used questionnaires to gather information about smoking and peer group influence directly from the source by asking/self report method</li> <li>• Network analyses was used to determine friendship cliques within the school they attended</li> <li>• Friendship reciprocation was weighted more greatly than non-reciprocated friendships</li> <li>• Just under half of the participants were regarded as</li> </ul>	<p><b>AO1</b> <b>AO2</b></p>

cliques, the remainder were clique liaisons or isolated individuals

- 89.9% of clique members were non-smokers
- 2% of cliques were entirely smokers
- 68% of cliques were entirely non-smokers
- Cliques that were similar (race/sex/mothers educational level) were either all smokers or non-smokers, and the dissimilar cliques included both smokers and non-smokers
- Peer groups tend to discourage smoking, and only similar smoking groups encourage it
- Girls are more likely to be in smoking cliques than boys
- The mothers educational level affected adolescent smoking

#### Evaluation (AO2)

e.g. Ennett et al (1994)

- The sample of adolescents surveyed from the five schools was inclusive and large, so the results should be generalisable to this culture
- The survey gathered in depth information about the friendship cliques using a variety of methods to ensure validity before examining smoking behaviour
- It is supposed to measure the influence of friendship groups on smoking, but the findings were restricted to only three best friends – we are influenced by more than our closest friends
- Connectedness and reciprocal friendship may have been mis-measured as one persons view of friendship may not be reciprocated by the other person
- The self report data may have been affected by the lack of social desirability with regards to smoking
- This study is different to Blattler who actually administered replacement drug, this study just used self reports
- Blättler's study did not investigate the role of friendship groups in the formation of a drug habit
- Both Ennett and Blättler took self reports from participants
- Both Ennett and Blättler cross checked self reports with tests (urine/carbon monoxide)

**Look for other reasonable marking points.**

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		AO1: Knowledge and understanding of study AO2: Evaluation should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengths and/or weaknesses of the study.</li> <li>• Research evidence drawn from psychology</li> <li>• Comparison with Blattler</li> </ul>
	0	No rewardable material
<b>Level 1</b>	1-3	Candidates will produce <b>brief</b> answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempted description of <b>one</b> study which may not be clearly identifiable and is likely to focus on one aspect of the study.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt at the evaluation of the study</li> </ul> <p>Lack of relevant evidence. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. The writing may have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but lack both clarity and organisation. High incidence of syntactical and /or spelling errors.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	4-6	Description <b>OR</b> evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR either description or evaluation is in less detail than the other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited description of one study which includes more than one aspect of the study (e.g. aim and procedure). Study must be identifiable.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the study includes some appropriate strengths and/or weaknesses. <b>May</b> not include comparison with Blättler.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of <b>mostly accurate</b> and relevant factual material. There are likely to be passages which lack clarity and proper organisation. Frequent syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present. Limited clarity organisation in the response.</p>
<b>Level 3</b>	7-9	Candidate has attempted and answered <b>both of the injunctions</b> in the question <b>well</b> . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good description of an identified study (breadth and/or depth of procedure and 2 of <b>AR</b> and C )</li> <li>• Good evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses of the study. Comparison can be evaluation.</li> <li>• There <b>must</b> be a comparison with Blättler.</li> </ul> <p>The candidate will demonstrate most of the skills needed to produce effective extended writing but there will be lapses in organisation. Some syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
<b>Level 4</b>	10-12	Candidate has attempted and answered <b>both of the injunctions</b> in the question <b>very well</b> . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With an accurate and detailed description of an identified study (good breadth and depth, you should see <b>AMR</b> and C).</li> <li>• Very good evaluation includes appropriate strengths and weaknesses that are fully explained. Comparison can be evaluation.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Must include explicit good comparison with Blaättler in at <b>least one way</b>.</li></ul> <p>The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning.</p> <p>Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the indicative content is present.</p>
--	--	--

## Section D – Sport Psychology

	Guidance	
<b>D1 and D2</b>	<p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p>	

Question Number	Question	
<b>D1 (a)</b>	What is meant by 'sport psychology'?	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Credit can be given for and research/theory that <b>adds to a definition</b> of the main points below. Do not credit theory and or research that does not add to a definition as this does not answer the question – zero marks. Definition need not come first, please read whole answer.</p> <p>Definition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is about understanding how people choose certain sports/how sports performance can be improved/what makes someone a good sports person (or not)/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Elaboration (theory, research, concepts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For example, Eysenck would suggest that extroverts seek competitive sports as they are sensation seeking/eq;</li> <li>• For example, moderate parental involvement leads to likelihood of sporting success in athletes studied/eq;</li> <li>• For example, Feltz and Landers found that mental imagery improved performance compared to those who used no imagery/eq;</li> <li>• The inverted U hypothesis shows a drop in performance at a critical point/eq;</li> <li>• Attribution of success/failure can affect future performance/eq;</li> <li>• Climbers and track and field athletes use different forms of imagery/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(3 AO1)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>D1 (b)</b>	<p>After a team lost an important netball match, the team coach wanted to improve performance before the next game.</p> <p>Explain how the coach might have used achievement motivation theory to improve the performance of this team.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. <b>Max 1</b> for general description of achievement motivation theory – even if linked tentatively at the end ‘the coach should do this’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The coach would exploit the need for praise and offer the netball team encouragement/eq;</li> <li>• Self satisfaction can be increased by offering small achievements/goals that can be met during practice/eq;</li> <li>• The coach could assess their need for achievement and challenge them if this need was high/eq;</li> <li>• If the netball team has high nAch they will not be phased by setbacks so the coach can set high risk challenges/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(2 AO2)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>D1 (c)</b>	Evaluate achievement motivation theory.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p data-bbox="320 324 1273 427">One mark per point/elaboration. Accept comparisons with other theories that are evaluative (modifications to the theory e.g. Martens, Horner).</p> <ul data-bbox="368 468 1286 1070" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need for achievement is commonly recorded using self reports which may be unreliable/eq;</li> <li>• The research is based on a personality trait rather than a feature of sporting competition/interaction between personality and situational factors/eq;</li> <li>• Butt and Cox (1992) found higher levels of achievement motivation (N-Ach) in top class US tennis players in the Davis Cup compared to lower level competitors/eq;</li> <li>• The theory can be used to develop the need for achievement in sportspeople by coaches/eq;</li> <li>• Research suggests that high achievers take on more difficult tasks than low achievers, which is consistent with achievement motivation theory/eq;</li> <li>• Without sporting ability, achievement motivation theory is limited in explaining sporting success/eq;</li> <li>• The results of projective tests used to judge achievement motivation, are subjectively interpreted/eq;</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="320 1106 1023 1140"><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(3 A02)</b>



Question Number	Question	
<b>D1 (d)</b>	<p>The netball team also lost their next big game, so the coach decided to use a different method to motivate the team.</p> <p>Make <b>two</b> comparison points between achievement motivation and <b>one other</b> theory of motivation you have learned in sport psychology.</p>	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per comparison point. Reject personality theory, the inverted U hypothesis and evaluation apprehension theory as they are theories of performance not theories of motivation. Imagery and goal setting are performance enhancers, but can be used to improve motivation as well as skills.</p> <p>Eg Achievement motivation and self efficacy theory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In achievement motivation the underpinning motivation is drawn from the need for achievement whereas in self efficacy it is drawn from self confidence/eq;</li> <li>• Self confidence is more likely to predict success than need for achievement/eq;</li> <li>• Both rely on an internal mental state to explain achievement/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Eg Achievement motivation and cognitive evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement motivation has the underpinning motivation arises from a need for achievement whereas cognitive evaluation involves intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (evaluation of this) for achieving/eq;</li> <li>• Essentially the extrinsic and intrinsic motivation can be the same as a need for achievement- they can be the same thing/eq;</li> <li>• Both involve reward/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(2 AO2)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>D2 (a)</b>	Luanne conducted a questionnaire to investigate how sprinters felt after a big race. She collected quantitative and qualitative data.  Explain what is meant by quantitative data.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Examples can gain credit. 0 marks for qualitative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gathered through closed ended questions/eq;</li> <li>• Likert scales can be used to gain judgement/eq;</li> <li>• Number rather than narrative /eq;</li> <li>• Superficial information is gathered about beliefs and opinions/eq;</li> <li>• Often subject to statistical analysis/eq;</li> <li>• A sports person can be asked about their favourite sport and rate it/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(2 AO3)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>D2 (b)</b>	Explain what is meant by qualitative data.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Examples can gain credit. 0 marks for quantitative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gathered through open questions/interviews/eq;</li> <li>• Narrative rather than number/eq;</li> <li>• In depth beliefs, attitudes, understanding and knowledge gathered/eq;</li> <li>• Often subject to thematic analysis/eq;</li> <li>• A sports person can be asked about their favourite sport and why they like it/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(2 AO3)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>D2 (c)</b>	In terms of validity <b>and</b> reliability, evaluate questionnaires as a research method in sport psychology.	
	Answer	Mark
	<p>One mark per point/elaboration. Examples can gain credit. Max three marks for reliability and three marks for validity. Ignore ethical issues, application and generalisability issues.</p> <p>Max 1 for reverse arguments referring to open and closed questions e.g. open=unrestricted, closed=restricted.</p> <p>Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaires can have test-retest reliability and scores can be checked over time/participants/eq;</li> <li>• If questions are open ended, this may be subjectively interpreted by researchers/eq;</li> <li>• Pilot studies are typically conducted to ensure the reliability of specific questions</li> <li>• Some participants may answer in a way they think they ought to answer so results can be unreliable/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Validity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a respondent guesses the aim of the study they may answer in a way that reflects the demands of the questionnaire rather than honesty/eq;</li> <li>• Answers may reflect social desirability rather than reality so findings are invalid/eq;</li> <li>• Respondents may lie if they feel they are being judged on their answer/eq;</li> <li>• Open questions can gather rich qualitative information/eq;</li> <li>• There are many ways of asking the same question, which can check for construct validity/eq;</li> <li>• Asking athletes as opposed to inferring from experiments can be seen as more valid/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p>	<b>(4 AO2)</b>

Question Number	Question	
<b>D3*</b>	<p>Describe Boyd and Munroe's (2003) study of the use of imagery in climbing and evaluate it in terms of both generalisability <b>and</b> practical applications.</p> <p>You must include the aim(s), procedure, results and conclusions in your description.</p>	
	Indicative content	Mark
	<p>Refer to the levels at the end of the indicative content.</p> <p>Appropriate answers may include the following indicative content, but the list is not exhaustive so look for other reasonable points.</p> <p><b>Description points (AO1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aimed to see if there was a difference in the use of imagery between beginner and advanced climbers</li> <li>• Aimed to investigate the difference in imagery use between climbers and track athletes</li> <li>• Hypothesised that climbers would be higher on CG and use MG-A more than track athletes</li> <li>• Hypothesised that climbers would score low on MS than track athletes because they tend not to focus on extrinsic motivation</li> <li>• Hypothesised that beginner climbers would use imagery strategies to reduce anxiety (MG-A) than experienced climbers</li> <li>• 38 track athletes and 48 climbers, of which 18 were beginners and 30 experienced climbers, participated in this study</li> <li>• The track athletes completed the SIQ and the climbers completed a modified version called the CIQ</li> <li>• Track athletes scored higher on average on MS than climbers overall</li> <li>• Track athletes scored a higher mean average for MG-M so felt more confident and controlled than climbers, whereas climbers scored lower on MG-A so were able to control anxiety levels</li> <li>• There was no significant difference found in the five imagery sub-scales between beginner and advanced climbers</li> <li>• Climbers use intrinsic motivation more than extrinsic motivation because there is very little 'winning' in climbing compared to track and field sports (audience)</li> <li>• Climbers scored low on confidence, which is more necessary in team sports than having outward confidence in an isolated sport</li> </ul>	<p>AO1 AO2</p>

**Evaluation points (AO2)**

Generalisability

- The sample sizes of each group were small and limited to one university track team and one indoor climbing group
- which makes generalisability difficult and may account for the small difference in trends between the data sets
- The questionnaire (SIQ) has been used before and found to be reliable in testing the subscales of imagery use with sportspersons so the findings should be generalisable to other sports people

Practical applications

- Climbers should use Cognitive General as an imagery technique to practice their climbing skill as a strategy for an outside climb with no clear route marked for them
- Track athletes should use Motivational Specific as an imagery strategy to increase motivation for winning
- Track athletes should use Motivational general Mastery to increase confidence and belief in their ability to win, whereas climbers already have self confidence so don't need this technique specifically
- Imagery is a useful technique that all athletes could use but it does not substitute physical practice

**Look for other reasonable marking points.**

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		<p>AO1: Knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works.</p> <p>AO2: Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works. Evaluation should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengths and/or weaknesses of the study in terms of generalisability.</li> <li>• Practical applications of the study.</li> </ul>
	0	No rewardable material
<b>Level 1</b>	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce <b>brief</b> answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempted description of <b>the study</b>.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt at the evaluation/application demands of the question.</li> </ul> <p>Lack of relevant evidence. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. The writing may have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but lack both clarity and organisation. High incidence of syntactical and /or spelling errors.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	4-6	<p>Description <b>OR</b> evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR either description or evaluation is in less detail than the other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited description of the study (may focus on two aspect of the study).</li> <li>• Evaluation of the study includes some appropriate strength(s) / weakness(es) in terms of generalisability <b>OR</b> include a brief/basic application.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of <b>mostly accurate</b> and relevant factual material. There are likely to be passages which lack clarity and proper organisation. Frequent syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present. Limited clarity organisation in the response.</p>
<b>Level 3</b>	7-9	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b>both injunctions</b> in the question <b>well</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description must include a detailed description of the study (including three or more elements of AMRC).</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses in terms of generalisability <b>AND</b> application of the study.</li> </ul> <p>The candidate will demonstrate most of the skills needed to produce effective extended writing but there will be lapses in organisation. Some syntactical and /or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
<b>Level 4</b>	10-12	<p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b>both injunctions</b> in the question <b>very well</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With a clear, accurate and detailed description of the study (all aspects of APRC explained well)</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriate strengths and weaknesses of generalisability <b>and</b> application that are fully explained.</li> </ul>

		<p>The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning.</p> <p>Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the indicative content is present.</p>
--	--	---





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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

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

Order Code UA028579 June 2011

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

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

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

