

# Mark Scheme (Results)

## Summer 2010

GCE

GCE Psychology (6PS03/01)

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, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

Summer 2010

Publications Code UA024572

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## 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: even if it is not what is expected it 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.

- 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 ecf/TE/cq (error carried forward) 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 will 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  |  |
|----|---|--|
| A1 | <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> |  |

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| A1(a)           | <p>Loftus and Palmer (1974) investigated the effect of leading questions on eyewitness testimony.</p> <p>Outline the findings (results and/or conclusions) of Loftus and Palmer's experiment.</p>   |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration of the findings (results and/or conclusions), <b>ignore</b> aim and procedure.</p> <p>Give some leeway regarding actual results but not more than +/- 2 mph. Actual speeds are 40.8 ('smashed'), 39.3 ('collided'), 38.1 ('bumped'), 34 ('hit'), 31.8 ('contacted')</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants asked the question with the verb 'smashed' estimated the vehicle to be travelling at 40.8mph/eq;</li> <li>• Participants asked the question with the verb 'contacted' estimated the vehicle to be travelling at 31.8mph /eq;</li> <li>• There was a 9mph difference in speed estimates between contacted and smashed verbs used in the question/eq;</li> <li>• The highest speed was for 'smashed', then 'collided', then 'bumped', then 'hit', and the lowest being 'contacted'/eq;</li> <li>• Participants who were exposed to the word smashed in a question were more likely to recall broken glass/eq;</li> <li>• 32% recalled broken glass in the smashed condition compared to 14% in the hit condition/eq;</li> <li>• Leading questions did affect the participants judgement/estimate/recall of car speed/eq;</li> <li>• Post event information in the form of a leading question can influence eyewitness testimony/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO1=3) |

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| A1(b)           | Evaluate Loftus and Palmer's (1974) experiment in terms of validity.  |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. <b>Ignore</b> responses about reliability or ethical issues. One comment can gain two marks. A psychological term on its own cannot gain credit (e.g. lacks ecological validity).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study was conducted in a lab which is an artificial environment so lacks ecological validity/eq;</li> <li>• It lacks ecological validity so does not measure natural behaviour of a real witness/eq;</li> <li>• Real witnesses experience an event in natural surroundings with uncontrolled variables/eq;</li> <li>• The behaviour of participants may not be as life like when they are aware of taking part in a study/eq;</li> <li>• Participants may have responded in a way that they thought was expected of them/eq;</li> <li>• Participants could have answered because of the wording of the question and not because of a real change in recall/ eq;</li> <li>• Real witnesses may not give the same attention to the incident in real life/eq;</li> <li>• Real witnesses would be questioned by the police and not given a questionnaire to complete/eq;</li> <li>• Participants were aware of participation in the study and could have displayed demand characteristics so reacted to the wording of the question rather than a valid change in actual recall/eq; (2 marks)</li> <li>• The study was conducted in a lab which is an artificial environment for EWT recall/with regard to car accidents, this lack of ecological validity is not a true measure of natural behaviour of a witness/eq; (2 marks)</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p> | (AO2=2) |

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| A1(c)           | Evaluate Loftus and Palmer's (1974) experiment in terms of reliability.   |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. <b>Ignore</b> responses about validity or ethical issues. One comment can gain two marks. A psychological term on its own cannot gain credit (e.g. Increased reliability/replicability/demand characteristics) without reason or explanation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was a Laboratory experiment with control over what participants watched and answered so the procedure is standardised/eq; (control + standardisation)</li> <li>• The standardised procedure made the study replicable as it can be repeated accurately/eq; (standardisation + replicability)</li> <li>• Extraneous variables were controlled to ensure the findings were reliable/consistent/eq; (control + reliable)</li> <li>• Similar studies have found that verbs do affect recall so the study findings are consistent/eq; (consistent + study detail)</li> <li>• The experiment was controlled and standardised, such as the fact that all participants watched the clips in the same environment and all but the critical question was the same/eq; (2 marks) (control + standardisation + study detail)</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO2=2) |

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| A1(d)           | Explain how the findings (results and/or conclusions) of research could be used by police to improve the effectiveness of eyewitness memory.  |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.<br/>           Max 2 marks if no reference to how it could be used by police (including by implication - i.e. may not actually mention 'police', see point two).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cognitive interview was developed to ensure a narrative style interview by police/eq;</li> <li>• Context/state cued recall can be aided by recreating scene or mood/eq;</li> <li>• Police should be aware that weapons can hinder recall accuracy as a narrowing of focus/eq;</li> <li>• Yuille and Cutshall showed that the police can be more confident in ewt even after some time has passed/eq;</li> <li>• Police should not use verbs that imply a direction for a response/eq;</li> <li>• Open ended questions should be used to prevent misleading the witness/eq;</li> <li>• Police should be aware that the wording they use in a question can act as post event information that is incorporated into the original memory and produces an inaccurate response/eq;</li> <li>• Certain words may trigger a schemata that reconstructs the original memory/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO2=3) |

|    | Guidance   |  |
|----|--|--|
| A2 | Use the levels below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information.<br>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.<br>Please read the whole response before crediting |  |

| Question Number | Question   |         |
|-----------------|--|---------|
| A2(a)           | What was the aim/purpose of your practical investigation?  |         |
|                 | Answer   | Mark    |
|                 | <p>Please read the whole response before crediting A2a to ensure clarity of aim. If more than one aim mark all and credit the best. Check to see if aim is 'ambitious' and claims a very general and hard to test aim using articles/content analysis - in which case this is likely to be level 1 at best.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b><br/>No mention of an aim/purpose or unfocused or not criminological psychology<br/>e.g. looked at whether articles contained the word 'aggression'<br/>e.g. to summarise two articles</p> <p><b>1 mark</b><br/>A simple aim/account of purpose so that the examiner can just about identify what was being researched.<br/>e.g. to find out if criminals are born or made<br/>e.g. are eyewitnesses reliable</p> <p><b>2 marks</b><br/>A clear aim / account of purpose so that the examiner can identify and understand what was done.<br/>e.g. to see whether people's perceptions of whether criminals are born or made are represented in the media<br/>e.g. to see whether criminals are born or made by looking at the evidence for each viewpoint/eq;<br/>e.g. to investigate peoples opinions on whether they feel eyewitnesses are reliable or not.<br/>e.g. to see if offender profiling is effective in reported accounts of it being used.</p> | (AO3=2) |

| Question Number | Question   |         |
|-----------------|--|---------|
| A2(b)           | Describe how you went about gathering and/or analysing the data for your practical investigation.  |         |
|                 | Answer   | Mark    |
|                 | <p>Mark according to the levels given below.</p> <p>The practical investigation may be a content analysis or summary of two article sources.<br/> Gathering data involves the planning and sourcing of material to conduct a practical and analysing data - one/all can gain credit equally.<br/> It also covers the procedure, sampling, apparatus, controls, coding/theme decisions made in order to gather the data.<br/> Analysing can involve qualitative and/or quantitative measures and drawing conclusions.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b><br/> No rewardable material</p> <p><b>1 mark</b><br/> Basic/brief comments about gathering and/or analysing data - the reader can work out what was done to gather/analyse in a brief/basic way.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b><br/> Good comments about gathering and/or analysing data - the reader has a good understanding of the practical in either respect with breadth and/or depth.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b><br/> Very good and detailed comments that show a depth and breadth understanding of how data was gathered and/or analysed - the reader has a very good understanding of how the data was gathered/analysed with breadth and depth (detail and range of procedures).</p> | (AO3=3) |

| Question Number | Question   |         |
|-----------------|--|---------|
| A2(c)           | Outline the findings (results and/or conclusions) you have drawn from your practical investigation.  |         |
|                 | Answer   | Mark    |
|                 | <p>Mark according to the levels given below.</p> <p>The practical investigation may be a content analysis or summary of two sources.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b><br/>no rewardable material</p> <p><b>1 mark</b><br/>basic/brief comment(s) about results and/or conclusions</p> <p><b>2 marks</b><br/>clear comments about results and/or conclusions</p> <p><b>3 marks</b><br/>clear and detailed comments about results and/or conclusions.</p> | (AO3=3) |

| Question Number | Question   |      |
|-----------------|--|------|
| *A3             | <p>There has been a recent increase in anti-social behaviour amongst girls which has led to more ASBOs (Anti-Social Behaviour Orders) being served.</p> <p>Describe how <b>one</b> psychological theory <b>other than</b> Social Learning Theory explains anti-social behaviour, <b>and</b> evaluate this explanation.</p>   |      |
|                 | Indicative content   | Mark |
|                 | <p>Refer to levels at the end of indicative content.</p> <p>Answer do NOT have to link to girls or ASBOs. Points made linking to girls or ASBOs may gain credit if appropriate or should be ignored if not relevant.</p> <p>If more than one theory - mark all and credit best.</p> <p><b>Ignore</b> social learning theory.</p> <p>Biological theory/theories can be treated as one theory or separately.</p> <p><b>Ignore</b> media as a theory of aggression unless it explicitly uses operant conditioning or links to biological changes being caused by violent media (video games).</p> <p><b>Ignore</b> girls having greater levels of testosterone than boys.</p> <p>Antisocial behaviour is any behaviour where the police or authorities could be involved.</p> <p>Appropriate answers might include the following knowledge, but this list is not exhaustive.</p> <p>e.g. Self fulfilling prophecy (must include labelling/expectation and behaviour/treatment)</p> <p>Description (AO1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A person commits an act perceived as antisocial</li> <li>• The person is labelled as an antisocial person</li> <li>• The person is <b>treated</b> according to the label given</li> <li>• People are suspicious and give little opportunity to change or disprove the label</li> <li>• The label can become internalised</li> <li>• The person begins to see no other route than to act in accordance with the label</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation (AO2)</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</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</li> <li>• Madon (2004) found that parents were able to predict the drinking behaviour of their children a year before being retested</li> <li>• Extreme expectation that goes against an internal belief system are often ignored</li> <li>• A SFP will only occur if the label is not too different from the actual truth/outcome or held by a majority/VIP, so not all will fulfil their prophecy/eq; (needs more than 'not everyone will fulfil' eg - plus one reason</li> </ul> |      |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We cannot experimentally test for the effects of self fulfilling prophecy because of ethical reasons</li> <li>• There other reasons for antisocial behaviour, such as the way we are raised by parents, that could account for antisocial behaviour other than SFP</li> <li>• In contrast to SFP, social learning theory states that we observe and model antisocial behaviour</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)</li> <li>• Snyder found that beliefs about the level of attractiveness of a woman during a telephone conversation affected the male callers behaviour towards her - labelling affects behaviour</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Personality theory (Eysenck)</p> <p>Description (AO1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Antisocial behaviour is caused by an interaction between genetic factors associated with personality and environmental influences</li> <li>• A particular nervous system causes a predisposition to criminality that can be passed on through genetics</li> <li>• The personality type responds to environmental stimuli differently/eq;</li> <li>• An extrovert seeks arousal from risk taking/antisocial behaviour to stimulate</li> <li>• An extrovert has a dampened RAS so seek external stimulation to redress the balance</li> <li>• Neurotic individuals are unstable and find it difficult to inhibit their behaviour</li> <li>• Neuroticism is linked to ANS, as sympathetic division is quick to turn on and parasympathetic is slow to turn off - criminality is linked to impulsivity and violent response (fight)</li> <li>• High neurotic and extrovert personalities are more likely to seek out antisocial activity and resist social conditioning/eq;</li> <li>• Psychotic individuals lack empathy so can harm or distress others without guilt or remorse</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation (AO2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hare (2001) found an over-representation of psychotic individuals have a tendency to be violent</li> <li>• Personality theories have been regarded as outdated as an explanation of antisocial behaviour because findings of studies have been inconsistent</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</li> <li>• Gabrys et al (1988) found that children referred for conduct disorders scored highly for psychoticism and extroversion</li> <li>• Fonseca and Yule (1995) compared delinquent and non-delinquent boys and found no difference in extroversion, psychoticism and neuroticism scores as measured by the EPI</li> <li>• Center and Kemp (2002) found a relationship between antisocial behaviour and psychoticism in a sample of 11 delinquents</li> <li>• Learning theory is an alternative explanation of antisocial behaviour using reinforcement to explain repeated antisocial behaviour</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>e.g. Biological theory (hormonal/genetic/neurological)</p> <p>Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presence of the extra Y chromosome (male XYY) has been associated with violent offenders</li> <li>• It has been hypothesised that it causes greater amounts of testosterone that can cause greater aggression in males</li> <li>• XYY causes lower IQ, language development problems and this often is implicated in educational and employment failure which may result in a criminal career</li> <li>• Slower and underdeveloped language may result in individuals using physical means of expression rather than verbal ones</li> <li>• Aggressive parents may pass on an aggressive gene to their children, who also become aggressive</li> <li>• Testosterone in males is much higher than in females, and males are more likely to be aggressive than females</li> <li>• Castrated male animals often show passivity, linking a lack of testosterone to reduced of aggression</li> <li>• Castrated animals injected with testosterone have their aggression levels restored</li> <li>• The amygdala is associated with aggressive/emotional interpretation and response</li> <li>• Low levels of serotonin are linked to aggression as it modulates and inhibits emotional responses</li> <li>• The premenstrual phase of a menstrual cycle is characterised by high irritability and aggression</li> <li>• The pre-frontal cortex involves planning and consequences, any abnormality of functioning could result in violent behaviour</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There have been claims that the general prison population/serial murderers (eg John Wayne Gacy) had XYY</li> <li>• However, with small and biased samples this is very difficult to establish compared to the general population</li> <li>• Theilgaard found no significant link between criminality, aggression and the XYY in her study</li> <li>• Virkkunen study of a Dutch family with lower levels of serotonin - transmitted same gene throughout family, who displayed higher levels of aggression and impulsivity</li> <li>• One family in a study is not enough to generalise to the whole population</li> <li>• Lagerspetz bred angry mice and fostered their offspring to docile mice - they still displayed aggression</li> <li>• Animal studies that deliberately breed aggression may not be generalisable to human behaviour</li> <li>• Raine et al found a significant difference in the PET analysis of brain functioning between murderers pleading insanity and 'normals', the right side (emotional) being more active than the left</li> <li>• The biological approach ignores social influences on criminality, such as being labelled a criminal or learning from role models</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable points</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

| Level   | Mark        | Descriptor  |
|---------|-------------|---|
|         |             | <p><b>A01:</b> Knowledge and understanding of psychology<br/> <b>A02:</b> Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of psychology.<br/>           Evaluation could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengths and/or weaknesses of a theory that explains antisocial behaviour</li> <li>• Research evidence drawn from <u>psychology</u></li> </ul>  |
|         | 0           | No rewardable material (e.g. social learning theory or not antisocial behaviour)  |
| Level 1 | 1-3 marks   | <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>• Includes brief description of one theory of antisocial behaviour.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt at the analytical/evaluation 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>   |
| Level 2 | 4-6 marks   | <p>Description <b>OR</b> evaluation only <b>OR</b> limited attempt at each <b>OR</b> either description or evaluation is in less detail than the other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic description of one theory of antisocial behaviour.</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses.</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.</p>  |
| Level 3 | 7-9 marks   | <p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b>both injunctions</b> in the question <b>well</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good description of an appropriate theory of antisocial behaviour.</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses and/or psychological research/evidence.</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>  |
| Level 4 | 10-12 marks | <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>• Clear, detailed description of theory, well explained.</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriately explained strengths / weaknesses <b>and</b> evidence drawn from psychological research. Evidence must link to anti social behaviour at least once (e.g. Rosenthal and Jacobson needs linking, Jahoda is already linked).</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 information is present.</p> |

## Section B: Child Psychology

|           | Guidance  |  |
|-----------|---|--|
| B1 and B2 | <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> |  |

| Question Number | Question   |         |
|-----------------|--|---------|
| B1(a)(i)        | <p>During your course you will have studied one developmental issue from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severe learning difficulties (including e.g Downs syndrome, Fragile X, FAS, there are others).</li> <li>• Autism</li> <li>• ADHD</li> </ul> <p>Outline characteristics of the developmental issue you have studied. Make it clear which developmental issue you are referring to.</p>   |         |
|                 | Answer   | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. No ID mark.<br/>Max one mark for lists of one word comments (if more than one word comments please mark according to markscheme below).<br/>Can be features such as course, prevalence as well as symptoms.</p> <p>e.g. Autism (autistic spectrum disorder):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delayed speech and language development/eq;</li> <li>• Autism is on a spectrum which varies in degree of severity/eq;</li> <li>• Inability to understand others emotions/cognition/eq;</li> <li>• Lack of eye contact/eq;</li> <li>• Difficulty in forming relationships and engaging in social situations/interaction/eq;</li> <li>• Unresponsiveness/inappropriate response to environmental stimuli/eq;</li> <li>• Intellectual variation ranging from mental retardation to acute abilities in particular skills/eq;</li> <li>• Repetitive behaviour/ritualistic behaviour/eq;</li> <li>• Can display savant intelligence/behaviour/eq;</li> <li>• Affects more boys than girls/eq;</li> <li>• Is often diagnosed in early childhood around 2-3 years/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. ADHD (attention deficit hyperactivity disorder - <b>check tautology when listing symptoms</b>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulty maintain attention resulting in fidgeting, talking excessively and being overactive/eq;</li> <li>• Impulsive behaviour that interrupts or interferes with</li> </ul> | (AO1=3) |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>others/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reckless actions that may cause harm to themselves or others/eq;</li> <li>• Distractibility from a task or listening to others/eq;</li> <li>• Difficulty following instructions for a sustained period of time/eq;</li> <li>• Lack of organisational skills and time management/eq;</li> <li>• Affects more boys than girls/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Severe learning difficulties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mental retardation/IQ classified as below 50/eq;</li> <li>• Physical disabilities that hinder mobility and motor control/eq;</li> <li>• Limited communication skills/eq;</li> <li>• Incapacity to look after themselves physically/eq;</li> <li>• Emotional under development/difficulties/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p> |  |
|--|---|--|

| Question Number  | Question  |                |
|------------------|---|----------------|
| <b>B1(a)(ii)</b> | <p>Issues such as severe learning difficulties, autism and ADHD tend to affect a child's development.</p> <p>Compare <b>two</b> explanations of the developmental issue that you have outlined in (a)(i).</p>   |                |
|                  | <b>Answer</b>   | <b>Mark</b>    |
|                  | <p>One mark per comparison point.<br/>If lengthy descriptions of each theory without direct comparison - comparison can be implicit and you can credit - one mark is available.</p> <p>e.g. Autism: Theory of mind and extreme male brain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both theories explain autism by examining the lack of social skills/eq;</li> <li>• However EMB looks at how the brain develops prenatally whereas the ToFM explains a lack of decentring ability/eq;</li> <li>• Increased testosterone is responsible for EMB, whereas theory of mind concerns developmental deficit/eq;</li> <li>• Both theories are supported by experimental research using experiments to assess social skills and perceptual/cognitive ability/eq;</li> </ul> <p>ADHD: biological and social theories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social construct theories suggest that it is not a real problem whereas biological explanations say it is a real problem/eq;</li> <li>• The biological approach offers a natural explanation whereas the social theories suggest a man made definition of abnormality/eq;</li> <li>• The social explanation suggest redefining behaviour so ADHD is normalised whereas the biological explanation would offer drugs/eq;</li> </ul> | <b>(AO2=4)</b> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The social explanation suggests that the classification is the cause is difficult to prove, whereas the biological explanation is scientific and clinically provable/eq;</li> <li>• A label that is assigned to difficult behaviour that does not conform to normal behaviour versus a biological issue that is clinically classified/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Severe learning difficulties: e.g. Downs Syndrome and Fragile X (as alternative explanations for severe learning difficulties)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both disorders are caused by a genetic marker/eq;</li> <li>• The disorders are inherited from the genes of one or both parent carriers/eq;</li> <li>• Both disorders are innate and not learnt/nature and not nurture/eq;</li> <li>• Because of the genetic basis for both disorders, none are curable by medical or other therapies/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Severe learning difficulties: e.g. Downs syndrome and FAS:<br/>Biological and environmental causes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Downs is a chromosome abnormality whereas FAS the child is genetically healthy/eq;</li> <li>• FAS is caused by the environmental issue of alcoholism during the first trimester of pregnancy, whereas Downs is determined at conception/eq;</li> <li>• Both alcohol and genetic makeup affect physical and mental development of the child prenatally/eq;</li> <li>• Nature versus nurture/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| B1(b)           | Many children attend daycare. Explain the possible <b>positive</b> effects of daycare for children.   |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.<br/> <b>Ignore</b> negative effects. Marks are awarded for explaining not just stating the positive effects - though saying more about a positive effect can be accepted as explaining.<br/> Daycare research gains credit if the results/conclusions is/are described.<br/> Check whitespace below answer lines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daycare can aid intellectual development due to stimulating environments/eq;</li> <li>• Day care encourages self confidence because they mix with other children away from their parents/eq;</li> <li>• Play is structured and staff and highly qualified to aid cognitive development/eq;</li> <li>• The EPPE project found a long term positive influence on SAT scores/eq;</li> <li>• Social development is encouraged through contact with peers/eq;</li> <li>• Children are encouraged to become assertive and independent/eq;</li> <li>• The opportunity to form multiple attachments to other caregivers/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO2=3) |

| Question Number | Question   |         |
|-----------------|--|---------|
| B2(a)           | Describe the case study as a research method used to study child development.  |         |
|                 | Answer   | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point or elaboration.</p> <p>Must relate to child psychology in at least one way or Max 3</p> <p>Only credit a description of a case study as a research method used in child/developmental psychology.<br/>           Descriptions of Genie (or other case studies) can be used <b>IF</b> the description <u>adds</u> to the detail of a case study as a research method - Max 1.<br/>           Do not credit any general descriptions of Genie or any case study that do not relate to the case study as a research method.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case studies are in depth investigations conducted on one or a small group of individuals/children/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies are often longitudinal as they focus on development of a child over time/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(ren)/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies often look at rare or unique cases of privation for example/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies are used where it is unethical to conduct experimental research e.g. privation/eq;</li> <li>• Genie is an example of case study as one person is studied using a range of research methods to find in depth information/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO3=4) |

| Question Number | Question   |         |
|-----------------|--|---------|
| B2(b)           | <p>Evaluate the case study as a research method used to study child development.</p> <p>You may wish to evaluate in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reliability</li> <li>• validity</li> <li>• ethical issues.</li> </ul>   |         |
|                 | Answer   | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.</p> <p>Must relate to child psychology at least once or Max 3</p> <p>Psychological terms without explanation gain no credit e.g. are ecologically valid, cannot generalise, are not reliable - need qualification. No credit for an evaluation of a specific case study (eg Genie) unless the comment would apply to the research method as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Case studies of children, gather rich and detailed information about a single case so the resulting findings allow a more complete picture/eq;</li> <li>• Different research methods can be used to validate concepts under investigation/eq;</li> <li>• The researcher may become too close to the individual in the study especially when studying children/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies can have ethical issues of confidentiality with high profile cases like Genie/eq;</li> <li>• Pseudonyms (like Dibs) are good to ensure protection of confidentiality/eq;</li> <li>• Case studies are often conducted in a range of natural play settings, thus making findings ecologically valid [can argue both for and against ecological validity as they can get evidence from a structured environment]/eq;</li> <li>• The use of different research methods can be used as triangulation to improve the validity of the findings/eq;</li> <li>• Generalisability is limited to the case as it is unique and a one-off as is the case with Genie/eq;</li> <li>• You will not find the same case again exactly so the reliability of findings cannot be verified/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 that would be very different from any other/eq; (2 marks)</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> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO3=4) |

| Question Number | Question  |      |
|-----------------|---|------|
| *B3             | Describe and evaluate one of the following research studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bowlby (1946)</li> <li>• Belsky and Rovine (1988)</li> <li>• Rutter and the ERA team (1998).</li> </ul>   |      |
|                 | Indicative content  | Mark |
|                 | <p>Refer to levels at the end of indicative content.<br/>           Ignore description of Bowlby's theory of attachment.<br/>           However, if an evaluation point clearly applies to the study (even if as well as to the theory and probably not intentional) then some credit can be given, probably just one or two marks.<br/>           Appropriate answers might include the following knowledge, but this list is not exhaustive.<br/>           e.g. Bowlby (1946)</p> <p>Description (AO1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bowlby investigated whether maternal deprivation effected emotional adjustment of children</li> <li>• He used a sample of 88 children attending a clinic for behavioural problems</li> <li>• 44 were identified as thieves and 44 had emotional issues/eq;</li> <li>• The children were interviewed and a case history was built up of all the children</li> <li>• 14 thieves were identified as having affectionless psychopathy [be sympathetic with regard to exact figures]</li> <li>• 12 out of 14 of the affectionless psychopaths had experienced maternal deprivation [be sympathetic with regard to exact figures]</li> <li>• Only 2 of the non-affectionless psychopaths had suffered similar maternal deprivation [be sympathetic with regard to exact figures]</li> <li>• Bowlby concluded that maternal deprivation affected emotional adjustment</li> <li>• Separation from a mother led to a lack of guilt and remorse</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation (AO2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study was non-experimental so no causal relationship between maternal deprivation and emotional adjustment can be concluded</li> <li>• Bowlby conducted the interviews himself so can be criticised for researcher bias</li> <li>• Other reasons could be responsible for the affectionless psychopathy in the families where deprivation occurred</li> <li>• The reason for the maternal deprivation may have been the cause of emotional problems rather than the separation itself</li> <li>• The study used retrospective data which may be unreliable</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Belsky and Rovine (1988)</p> <p>Description (AO1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aimed to examine the effects of daycare on emotional adjustment of children</li> <li>• Used the findings of two American longitudinal studies to assess effects of daycare</li> <li>• Children had experienced daycare within the first year of life and</li> </ul> |      |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>attachments to the mother and father were examined</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strange situation procedure was used to classify attachment types</li> <li>• They found 43% had avoidant attachment types to their mother if they had experienced intensive (more than 20 hours) of daycare a week</li> <li>• Boys whose mothers worked fulltime (more than 35 hours) had insecure attachments with their fathers</li> <li>• Boys were more insecure than girls</li> <li>• 50% of the boys were insecure if in daycare</li> <li>• Intensive and early daycare has negative effects on children's emotional development</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation (AO2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strange situation may not be an appropriate tool for measuring attachment in daycare children who are used to separation</li> <li>• Children may not be avoidant, but used to stranger care</li> <li>• Daycare can also have positive effects upon children's intellectual and social development</li> <li>• Factors other than daycare may account for the findings, such as resilience of the child</li> <li>• The procedure was highly controlled/standardised and reliability was established</li> <li>• DiLalla found that children who spent no time in daycare were more prosocial than children who attended daycare</li> <li>• The EPPE project suggests that children who attend daycare can have positive benefits - which goes against Belsky's findings</li> <li>• The use of the strange situation is said to be unethical as it causes some distress to the child during the procedure</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Rutter and the ERA team (1998)</p> <p>Description (AO1)<br/>[when marking, be sympathetic with regard to exact figures]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aimed to look at the long term effects of privation of Romanian orphans adopted by English families</li> <li>• A longitudinal study of 111 Romanian orphans who were institutionalised within a few weeks of life</li> <li>• The children were either adopted before 6 months old or after six months and before two years</li> <li>• Compared to a control group of 52 English adoptees</li> <li>• Adoptees under six months had caught up developmentally by the age of four years</li> <li>• Children adopted after six months showed signs of developmental delays</li> <li>• Recovery from institutional care was delayed after a longer period in care before being adopted</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation (AO2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A longitudinal study enabled the long term effects of care to be studied</li> <li>• The adoptees were matched with a group of English children so fair comparison could be made</li> <li>• We can never fully match a control group and experimental group so comparisons may not be valid</li> <li>• Research cannot establish cause and effect between the care and resulting behaviour, there may be other influences involved/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p> |  |
|--|--|--|

| Level   | Mark        | Descriptor  |
|---------|-------------|---|
|         |             | A01: Knowledge and understanding of one study<br>A02: Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of one study  |
|         | 0           | No rewardable material  |
| Level 1 | 1-3 marks   | <p>Candidates will produce brief answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question. Little or no attempt at the analytical/evaluation demands of the question. Lack of relevant evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description includes the basic elements of procedure and/or results.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt at the analytical/evaluation demands of the question.</li> </ul> <p>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>  |
| Level 2 | 4-6 marks   | <p>Description OR 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>• Basic description of the study (e.g. includes some procedure/results of the study).</li> <li>• Evaluation includes limited appropriate strengths / weaknesses.</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.</p>  |
| Level 3 | 7-9 marks   | <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 breadth and/or depth of study description (e.g. aim, procedure and results and/or conclusion <b>and/or</b> detail).</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses including at least one methodological issue</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>  |
| Level 4 | 10-12 marks | <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>• Description must include good accurate breadth <b>and</b> depth of knowledge of the study (e.g. aims, procedure, results, conclusion(s) <b>and</b> specific detail).</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses clearly and accurately explained including some methodological issues</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 information is present.</p> |

## Section C: Health Psychology

|   | Guidance   |  |
|---|--|--|
| For all except C1b and C3 (which are levels marked) | Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).<br>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible. |  |

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| C1(a)           | Describe the mode of action of <b>one</b> drug you have studied. Make it clear which drug you are referring to.   |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.<br/>Max one for the effect on behaviour as a result of the drug (elaborates mode of action of it).<br/>Accept drugs other than those in the spec list, if health psychology - e.g. antidepressants</p> <p>e.g. Heroin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases the level of dopamine in the brain/eq;</li> <li>Acts upon the opioid receptors sites/eq;</li> <li>Trigger release of neurotransmitter at receptor sites at synapse/eq;</li> <li>Mimics endorphins to stimulate dopamine reward system/eq;</li> <li>Morphine produced by taking heroin is a depressant and painkiller/eq;</li> <li>GABA activity is inhibited/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Cocaine</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is an agonist</li> <li>Acts upon dopamine, noradrenaline and serotonin/eq;</li> <li>Blocks reuptake of these neurotransmitters/eq;</li> <li>Causing higher levels of particularly dopamine in the synaptic cleft causing increased action potential in the post synaptic neuron/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Nicotine</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acts upon nicotinic receptors in the CNS and NS/eq;</li> <li>Acetylcholine is stimulated and then its receptors are disabled/eq;</li> <li>Increases levels of nor-epinephrine/eq;</li> <li>Increased endorphin level leads to anxiety/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Alcohol</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acts upon GABA system/eq;</li> <li>Increased GABA suppresses inhibitory behaviour/eq;</li> <li>Affects ANS by suppressing sympathetic division/eq;</li> <li>Results in slower reaction time/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO1=3) |

|          | Guidance   |  |
|----------|--|--|
| C1b only | Use the levels below to allocate marks according to how detailed the answer is and how thorough the information.<br>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  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| C1(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 or summary of two sources. Findings refer to results and/or conclusions drawn from the content analysis or summary.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b><br/>No rewardable material.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b><br/>A brief summary of the results and/or conclusions of the practical investigation with NO/very limited attempt at linking the findings to concepts drawn from health psychology.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b><br/>A summary of the results and/or conclusions of the content analysis or summary and/or some attempt to link to concepts, research and/or theories drawn from health psychology.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b><br/>A good clear attempt to link to concepts, research and/or theories drawn from health psychology in at least one way to the findings.</p> <p><b>4 marks</b><br/>Accurate and detailed links made between the findings and two or more concepts, theories and/or research drawn from health psychology.</p> | (AO2=4) |

|    | Guidance  |  |
|----|---|--|
| C2 | <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> |  |

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| C2(a)           | Outline <b>one</b> way of using animals in psychological research to investigate the effects of drugs.  |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.<br/>           Max 1 mark for giving a reason for using animals in health research (see marking point 6)<br/>           If more than one way, mark all and credit the best</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Animal laboratory experiments can be used to show a cause and effect relationship between the drug administered and the behaviour resulting/eq;</li> <li>• Mice can be used to comparatively study the effects of drugs on the brain or vital organs as they can be sacrificed to examine physiological damage/eq;</li> <li>• Monkeys, for example, can be studied to investigate the reinforcing effects of a drug on behaviour to understand what schedule of reinforcement/type of drug causes addictive behaviour/eq;</li> <li>• Meisch (2001) used monkeys research to show that they would be more likely to drink a drug solution than water, demonstrating its reinforcing effects/eq;</li> <li>• Animals can be used to test substitute biological drugs/replacement drugs for addicts/eq;</li> <li>• The findings of animal research are used to judge possible influences in human behaviour/physiology/eq;</li> <li>• Rat park was developed to understand whether drugs were biologically addictive or reinforced behaviour/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO3=2) |

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| C2(b)           | Explain the practical advantages and/or disadvantages of using animals in psychological research to investigate the effects of drugs.   |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.<br/>Ignore ethical issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Animals are more practical to use than humans as their behaviour can be monitored closely in confined situations over long periods of time/eq;</li> <li>• Animals are relatively cheap and can be used in large numbers/relatively small and easy to handle/easier to house and cage/eq;</li> <li>• Animal research as a whole is expensive as it involves specialist equipment/facilities/eq;</li> <li>• In drug trials animals are cheaper/more cost effective in terms of fee/cost and amount of drug - than humans/eq;</li> <li>• The knowledge gained from animals research can benefit humans, making it important in improving the quality of human life/eq;</li> <li>• Human behaviour is very different from animal behaviour, so the results of such study may not be generalisable to humans/eq;</li> <li>• The nervous system (neural transmission) is the same in animals as it is in humans, so the results of drug research on neural transmission should be generalisable to humans/eq;</li> <li>• Animals breed quickly, so the heritability of conditions caused by drug use can be studied conveniently/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO3=3) |

| Question Number | Question   |         |
|-----------------|--|---------|
| C2(c)           | Describe <b>one</b> research method as it is used when studying the effects of drugs on human participants.  |         |
|                 | Answer   | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. No ID mark.</p> <p>Many research methods can be described (eg interviews, scanning, questionnaires, family, twin and adoption studies, laboratory experiments, natural experiments/maintenance programmes)</p> <p>If more than one research method described, mark all and credit the best -<br/>but be sure that more than one research tool is not possible for the research method described. Some points may be relevant to more than one method e.g. urine analysis (marking points at end)</p> <p>Max 2 for generic description of a research method - must mention drugs or health at least once to gain access to full marks.</p> <p>Ignore reference to animal studies and evaluation.</p> <p>Examples of human studies can be credited if used to exemplify the research method described max 1 mark for each study example.</p> <p>Surveys may be described generically (rather than specific interview/questionnaire) and should gain credit as long as it is clear whether comments made are referring to structured, semi structured or unstructured types.</p> <p>e.g. interviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews can be used to generate quantitative and qualitative information about the effects of drug use and effectiveness of prevention/rehabilitation programmes/eq;</li> <li>• Interviews can gather essential information about the individuals experience of drug use, social conditions and rehab/relapse conditions/eq;</li> <li>• Qualitative information can be gathered about experiences of drug use/lifestyle/eq;</li> <li>• Quantitative information can be gathered about amount of substance abuse, age of commencement etc/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. questionnaires</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blättler et al (2002) used questionnaires to assess the effectiveness of prescription heroin/eq;</li> <li>• Questionnaires can be used to gather a lot of information about the prevalence, experience and causes of drug use/eq;</li> <li>• Questionnaires can gather qualitative and quantitative information based on the type of question asked (closed or open)/eq;</li> <li>• Ennett et al (1994) used questionnaires to gather information about smoking and peer group influence directly from the source</li> </ul> | (A03=3) |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>by asking/self report method/eq;</p> <p>e.g. PET scans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PET scans can be used on human participants to understand the effects of drug use on brain structure and functioning/eq;</li> <li>• Blood flow to a particular area of the brain can be detected/imaged to show the active parts of the brain during/following drug use/eq;</li> <li>• Scott (2004) found that smokers brains were less active in memory, emotion and pleasure regions after smoking cigarettes/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Laboratory experiments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laboratory experiments can be used to administer placebo drug use to investigate perception of experience or expectation/eq;</li> <li>• Participants may be told what to expect or have their own belief of how a drug will affect them, but do not receive a real drug/eq;</li> <li>• Their behaviour and perception of drug effects are recorded/eq;</li> <li>• Drug users, ex-users and non-users can be tested on a variety of measures, such as cognitive performance/eq;</li> <li>• Underperformance on a cognitive task might indicate how drugs affect information processing or cause brain damage/eq;</li> <li>• Wareing tested ecstasy users versus non-users on working memory span/eq;</li> <li>• Panlilio injected volunteer known cocaine users with cocaine and saline solutions as part of a second order conditioning experiment and compared the effects to animal models/eq;</li> <li>• Higgins offered the options of cocaine V placebo or cocaine V money and found that the first option cocaine acted as a reinforcer, but the latter option money became a greater incentive choice as it increased/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Generic points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urine analysis can be used to investigate maintenance/replacement drug programmes/eq;</li> <li>• Social behaviour and other lifestyle changes can be mapped over a period of time/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| C2(d)           | Evaluate <b>one</b> study you have learned about that has used human participants to investigate the effects of drugs. Identify the study you are evaluating.   |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.</p> <p>No marks for identification of the study evaluated.</p> <p>Studies include Blättler et al (2002), Ennett et al (1994) and others include Scott (2004) PET scan smokers, Wareing (2004/7) MDMA users and cognitive tasks. The spec lists some suggestions and there are many others.</p> <p>e.g. Blättler et al (2002)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They cross checked using biological and self report measures of drug use to ensure findings were valid/eq;</li> <li>• They followed up reasons for drop out from the programme to ensure that the findings were not biased by the remaining participants/eq;</li> <li>• The study was ethically correct and authorised by an ethics committee for offering of drugs/eq;</li> <li>• A full right to withdraw was offered and often taken up/eq;</li> <li>• As participants maintained their normal routines the findings of the study in terms of its effect on social behaviour should have good ecological validity/eq;</li> <li>• The study could be criticised for having a cohort effect, the findings could be due to conditions of the cohort and time/eq;</li> <li>• The sample size of drug users was high offering generalisable findings in the drug user population in Switzerland/eq;</li> <li>• Urine tests were used and cross-checked against drug use claims/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g. Ennett et al (1994)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sample of adolescents surveyed from the five schools was inclusive and large, so the results should be generalisable to this culture/eq;</li> <li>• The survey gathered in depth information about the friendship cliques using a variety of methods to ensure validity before examining smoking behaviour/eq;</li> <li>• 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/eq;</li> <li>• Connectedness and reciprocal friendship may have been mis-measured as one persons view of friendship may not be reciprocated by the other person/eq;</li> <li>• The self report data may have been affected by the lack of social desirability with regards to smoking/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO2=3) |

| Question Number | Question   |      |
|-----------------|--|------|
| *C3             | <p>Jagdeep works at a clinic which treats people who misuse drugs.</p> <p>Describe and evaluate <b>two</b> ways in which the clinic might treat drug misuse.</p>   |      |
|                 | Indicative content   | Mark |
|                 | <p>Refer to levels at the end of indicative content.<br/>Appropriate answers might include the following knowledge, but this list is not exhaustive.</p> <p>Token economy - description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Token economy programmes can be used to reward positive steps towards abstinence</li> <li>• Tokens can discourage drug use through negative reinforcement</li> <li>• Tokens are secondary reinforcers that can be exchanged for primary reinforcers</li> </ul> <p>Token economy - evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TEPs need close monitoring by staff and is difficult to regulate</li> <li>• TEPs is often successful alongside biological intervention</li> <li>• There are other sources of reinforcement (drug high) for behaviour that may supersede the tokens on offer</li> </ul> <p>Aversion therapy - description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aversion therapy can be used so that drug use is associated with an unpleasant consequence</li> <li>• Emetics can be given with a drug to force a negative consequence</li> <li>• Drugs will be avoided to prevent the conditioned effect</li> </ul> <p>Aversion therapy - evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aversion therapy is considered unethical as it forces adverse reaction</li> <li>• Participants must be fully informed of the process before undertaking the treatment</li> <li>• Abstinence is usually short term as conditioning can be reversed easily</li> <li>• Behavioural therapies do not successfully treat the causes of the addiction but help to break a habitual behaviour</li> </ul> <p>Drug treatments - description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biological substitute programmes, such as methadone for heroin addiction can reduce cravings and prevent heroin having its typical euphoric effect</li> <li>• Blood tests are done regularly to test for illegal drug use for the programme to be effective</li> <li>• Drug replacement for class A drugs also serve to reduce drug related behaviours and diseases (crime, prostitution and HIV)</li> <li>• The effects of methadone last a day for a daily dose is drunk</li> </ul> <p>Drug treatments - evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blättler et al (2002) found that those given prescribed methadone reduced their general use of cocaine and showed behavioural changes associated with abstinence</li> <li>• Replacement nicotine patches are a biological therapy intended</li> </ul> |      |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>to relieve the cravings associated with withdrawal from smoking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biological drug replacement therapy can be costly to the health service although this may not be as high as the cost to the individual and family if remains untreated</li> <li>• Drug replacement therapies often have withdrawal issues themselves</li> <li>• Non-compliance can result in abuse of the methadone programme</li> </ul> <p>Alcoholics anonymous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses group therapy to talk through their experiences of addiction and abstinence</li> <li>• In groups with other addicts to collectively deal with the same issue</li> <li>• Counselling is used to get clients to admit and overcome the psychological aspects of their addiction</li> <li>• Continuous psychological support can be used in conjunction with drug replacement or other treatments to prevent relapse</li> <li>• Can also help the families of addicts by offering practical help and social support network</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard to evaluate as effectiveness hard to measure</li> <li>• Can involve exploitation at a vulnerable time</li> <li>• Is useful in helping the family as well as the individual</li> <li>• It is not an invasive therapy, no side effects and so on, unlike drug therapy</li> <li>• Teaches coping strategies including recognition that relapse is a real danger so can be a long term solution</li> </ul> <p>Contingency programmes/token economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offer tokens/drug replacement and based on operant conditioning principles</li> <li>• Blood tests check for signs of drug use before token is given/set tasks or levels are negotiated for tokens to be achieved</li> <li>• Token rewards and goals are individually set to encourage healthy behaviour</li> </ul> <p>evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higgins achieved an 11.7 week abstinence from cocaine when using a voucher system</li> <li>• Petry found success using a prize contingency programme for cocaine addicts</li> <li>• Cheaper than drug replacement therapy</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable points.</b></p> |  |
|--|---|--|

| Level   | Mark        | Descriptor   |
|---------|-------------|--|
|         |             | A01: Knowledge and understanding of treatments<br>A02: Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of treatments   |
|         | 0           | No rewardable material   |
| Level 1 | 1-3 marks   | <p>Candidates will produce brief answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question. Lack of relevant evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description includes brief and basic description of one or more treatment for drug misuse.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt at the analytical/evaluation demands of the question.</li> </ul> <p>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>  |
| Level 2 | 4-6 marks   | <p>If the answer does not meet Level 3 requirements, but is more than brief (more than Level 1) e.g. missing sections, then use Level 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description includes basic description of both drug treatments <b>OR</b> one treatment described well.</li> <li>• Evaluation includes limited appropriate strengths / weaknesses of both drug treatments <b>OR</b> appropriate strengths / weaknesses including appropriateness and effectiveness of one of treatment.</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> all description missing but more than brief evaluation there</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> all evaluation missing but more than brief description there</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.</p>   |
| Level 3 | 7-9 marks   | <p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b>both injunctions</b> in the question well. The two treatments both have to be done <b>well</b> including both description and evaluation overall <b>but</b> there may be <b>two lapses</b> in either description or evaluation of the treatments (the lapse does not mean not there at all)<br/>'Well' must be taken in the context of having to describe and evaluate two treatments (e.g. compared with Bowlby's study)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description must include breadth of <b>both</b> drug treatments.</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses including appropriateness of treatment and/or effectiveness.</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>  |
| Level 4 | 10-12 marks | <p>Candidate has attempted and answered <b>both injunctions</b> in the question <b>very well</b>. The two treatments both have to be done <b>very well</b> including both description and evaluation overall <b>but</b> there may be <b>one lapse</b> in either description or evaluation of one of the treatments (the lapse does not mean not there at all).<br/>'Very well' must be taken in the context of having to describe and evaluate two treatments (e.g. compared with Bowlby's study)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description must include good breadth and depth of knowledge of two drug treatments (consider lapse).</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses clearly and accurately explained and with a good use of evidence (consider lapse).</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.<br/>Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the information is present.</p> |

## Section D: Sport Psychology

|                             | Guidance  |  |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| D1 and D2<br>(D3 is levels) | <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> |  |

| Question Number | Question   |         |
|-----------------|--|---------|
| D1(a)           | <p>Define the following terms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intrinsic motivation</li> <li>• Extrinsic motivation</li> </ul>   |         |
|                 | Answer   | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.<br/>Max 2 marks for each definition. Accept examples of each max 1 mark per example per definition.<br/>No credit if the answer gets these two the wrong way round without arrows etc to indicate error.</p> <p>Intrinsic motivation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An inner drive for behaviour/eq;</li> <li>• Motivation because of self satisfaction/drive to succeed/eq;</li> <li>• A sportsperson may derive pleasure from performance/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Extrinsic motivation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentive for behaviour that is outside an individual/eq;</li> <li>• Financial incentive can be an external motivation resulting in a change in behaviour/eq;</li> <li>• A sportsperson is motivated by a crowd's cheer/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO1=3) |

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| D1(b)           | <p>Ian is a trampolinist who came third in a recent competition and is feeling low. His coach needs to improve his motivation before the next competition.</p> <p>Explain how Ian's coach would use achievement motivation theory to improve Ian's motivation.</p>  |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.<br/>           No credit can be given for basic goal setting unless linked to Nach/Pow/Affill/fear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ian's coach would exploit his need for praise and offer him encouragement/eq;</li> <li>• Self satisfaction can be increased by offering small achievements/goals that can be met during practice/eq;</li> <li>• Ian's coach could assess his need for achievement and challenge him if his need was high/eq;</li> <li>• If Ian has high nAch he will not be phased by setbacks so his coach can set high risk challenges/eq;</li> <li>• With a high Nac, the coach could set him the challenge of winning the next event to motivate him/eq;</li> <li>• To satisfy a high NPow Ian's coach could set him the challenge of being captain if he wins/eq;</li> <li>• Train with a group of trampolinists to satisfy a high Naffill/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO2=3) |

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| D1(c)           | Evaluate achievement motivation theory.   |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.<br/>           Reject description of the theory. Accept comparisons with other theories (modifications to the theory e.g. Martens, Horner) if adds to comments in an evaluative way and is useful (not just the theory has been modified without explaining how and why).<br/>           There was no influence of arousal on Nach - ignore these comments.<br/>           Ignore reference to performance theories.</p> <ul 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>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO2=4) |

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| D2(a)           | Outline how qualitative data can be gathered using a questionnaire.   |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.<br/>Answer does not have to relate to sport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open ended questions are used/eq;</li> <li>• This gives space to answer freely about attitudes and beliefs/the questions do not force an answer/eq;</li> <li>• Sports professionals can be asked to describe their attitude/feelings/performance in their sport/eq;</li> <li>• The information gathered is detailed data about opinions, beliefs that can be used to assess a sport or individual/eq;</li> <li>• Themes from the responses are recorded/eq;</li> <li>• Often several coders are used to ensure themes are valid/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO3=2) |

| Question Number | Question   |       |
|-----------------|--|-------|
| D2(b)           | Explain why sports psychologists might choose to use qualitative data in their research.   | AO3=3 |
|                 | Answer   | Mark  |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.<br/>Must refer to sport in one way or max 2 marks overall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative data is in depth and detailed/eq;</li> <li>• Many raters/coders are used to ensure reliability of themes/findings/eq;</li> <li>• It allows the sportsperson to self report their detailed opinions/eq;</li> <li>• In sports psychology it allows an insight into an individuals perception of their performance/eq;</li> <li>• It has been useful when assessing an individuals motivation/eq;</li> <li>• Helps psychologists understand sporting performance/competence/attitudes/eq;</li> <li>• Allows researchers to develop new themes that would not be discovered with quantitative analysis/eq;</li> <li>• Allows coaches to understand the needs and beliefs of sports people so coaching skills can be developed/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> |       |

| Question Number | Question  |         |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| D2(c)           | Describe how the questionnaire as a research method was used in the Boyd and Monroe (2003) study.   |         |
|                 | Answer  | Mark    |
|                 | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.<br/>Take care with detail - climbers tested individually and athletes in groups (not other way round).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two questionnaires were given to expert and amateur climbers and field and track sportspeople/eq;</li> <li>• Both the SIQ (Sport imagery questionnaire) and CIQ (Climbing imagery questionnaire) were used to assess the function and frequency of imagery use/eq;</li> <li>• The questionnaires measured the cognitive (CS &amp; CG) and motivation functions (MG-M, MG-A &amp; MS) of imagery/eq;</li> <li>• The questionnaires were used to compare field and track with climbers in term of the used and function of imagery/eq;</li> <li>• The questionnaire was also used to compare expert and amateur climbers in terms of the use and function of imagery/eq;</li> <li>• Uses 7-point likert scale (rarely-often)/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (AO3=3) |

| Question Number | Question   |      |
|-----------------|--|------|
| *D3             | Describe and evaluate one of the following research studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cottrell et al (1968)</li> <li>• Koivula (1995)</li> <li>• Craft et al (2003)</li> </ul>   |      |
|                 | Indicative content   | Mark |
|                 | <p>Refer to levels at the end of indicative content.<br/>           Appropriate answers might include the following knowledge, but this list is not exhaustive.</p> <p>e.g. Koivula (1995)<br/>           Description (AO1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aimed to investigate gender based schematic information processing/eq;</li> <li>• She wanted to see if participants with a sex typed schema were more likely to stereotype sports as male and female compared to less sex-typed participants/eq;</li> <li>• She wanted to look at gender differences in ratings of male and female typed sports/eq;</li> <li>• Over 200 participants were used, many were university students and most Caucasian/eq;</li> <li>• She used the BSRI to measure the degree to which participants were sex typed/eq;</li> <li>• Participants were asked to rate different sports as male or female or neutral/eq;</li> <li>• Further questionnaires were given to measure age, ethnicity and other personality measures and attitudes/eq;</li> <li>• Most participants were sex typed from the BSRI score/eq;</li> <li>• Most participants were stereotypical when rating sports as male or female/eq;</li> <li>• Androgynous and undifferentiated participants from the BSRI were less likely to rate certain sports as male or female/eq;</li> <li>• Men were more likely to sex type a sport than females/eq;</li> <li>• The results support gender schematic information processing/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation (AO2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaires that ask a judgement of gender may encourage traditional views of gender, which may have confounded the results/eq;</li> <li>• Despite being instructed to ignore the number of males and females who play a sport, the participants may have used this knowledge and media coverage to make their judgements of male and female sports/eq;</li> <li>• The BSRI is a well established sex type inventory with a significant number of filler items to prevent demand characteristics/eq;</li> <li>• The sample was large but biased and the attitudes of Swedish, white undergraduates may not be generalised to the general population/eq;</li> <li>• Rating scales used by these questionnaires may reflect opinion on the day rather than an enduring attitude/eq;</li> </ul> |      |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>e.g Cottrell et al (1968)<br/>Description (AO1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aimed to test the effect of audience on performance/eq;</li> <li>• How audience affects performance on competition and non-competition tasks/eq;</li> <li>• 132 male undergraduates were given lists of paired associate words to learn/eq;</li> <li>• The non-competition list had strong associations between the paired associated words but not between the word pairs themselves/eq;</li> <li>• The competition list had weak associations between the paired associate words but strong associations between the word pairs themselves, making them more difficult to learn and a higher chance of error/eq;</li> <li>• Participants either had to produce two errorless list recalls or the whole set of 30 lists/eq;</li> <li>• Audience improved performance on non-competition tasks in terms of speed of learning/eq;</li> <li>• Error rate was highest with an audience on competition task/eq;</li> <li>• Slow learners produced a higher mean error rate on competition lists than fast learners with an audience, suggesting that audience hinders performance on less proficient individuals/tasks/eq;</li> <li>• In the second part of the study, mere-presence and audience was tested by using a blindfolded participant/eq;</li> <li>• Mere-presence had little effect on performance but with practice it showed that audience improved performance/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation (AO2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The type of performance is cognitive and unlikely to demonstrate real audience effects within sport/eq;</li> <li>• It was a laboratory situation which lacks ecological validity and does not represent real life/eq;</li> <li>• An audience during sport is more active and encouraging (or not) so affects an athlete more than the audience in this study/eq;</li> <li>• The sample of male undergraduates is biased and does not represent all individuals well, particularly as individual differences would have a great effect upon performance with or without an audience/eq;</li> </ul> <p>e.g Craft et al (2003)<br/>Description (AO1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aimed to see if there was a relationship between anxiety and sporting performance/eq;</li> <li>• Anxiety involved a series of subscales; cognitive, somatic and self confidence/eq;</li> <li>• They conducted a meta-analysis of 29 studies which used the CSAI-2 (IV) and sporting performance (DV)/eq;</li> <li>• A positive correlation was expected between self confidence and</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>performance, negative correlation between cognitive anxiety and performance and no relationship between somatic anxiety and performance/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They also explored the anxiety - performance relationship using a range of sporting variables such as individual and team sports/eq;</li> <li>• They found that only self confidence was a useful indicator of sporting performance and this was marginal/eq;</li> <li>• The subscales alone are not useful indicators of performance, but together show a useful interrelationship/eq;</li> <li>• They concluded that cognitive and somatic anxiety are interdependent/eq;</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation (AO2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self confidence measured by the CSAI-2 may be more a measure of global confidence rather than sports related activity confidence/eq;</li> <li>• The CSAI-2 may not be a useful psychometric measure of anxiety/eq;</li> <li>• Like an meta-analysis only comparable groups of athletes/samples/similarity of measures were used but matching for all properties is clearly not possible and variation may distort results/eq;</li> <li>• For example some studies administered the CSAI-2 some time before the event and some immediately before/some were administered in groups and some individuals/eq;</li> </ul> <p><b>Look for other reasonable marking points.</b></p> |  |
|--|---|--|

| Level   | Mark        | Descriptor   |
|---------|-------------|--|
|         |             | A01: Knowledge and understanding of one study<br>A02: Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of one study   |
|         | 0           | No rewardable material   |
| Level 1 | 1-3 marks   | <p>Candidates will produce brief answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question. Little or no attempt at the analytical/evaluation demands of the question. Lack of relevant evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description includes the basic and brief elements of procedure and/or results.</li> <li>• Little or no attempt at the analytical/evaluation demands of the question.</li> </ul> <p>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>   |
| Level 2 | 4-6 marks   | <p>(Good) Description <b>OR</b> (Good) evaluation only <b>OR</b> limited attempt at each <b>OR</b> either description or evaluation is in less detail than the other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description includes main procedure <b>and</b> results of the study.</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses.</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.</p>   |
| Level 3 | 7-9 marks   | <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 breadth and/or depth of study description (method and results and/or aim and/or conclusion).</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses that are clear.</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>  |
| Level 4 | 10-12 marks | <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>• Description must include good breadth and depth of knowledge of the study (all of APRC).</li> <li>• Evaluation includes appropriate strengths / weaknesses clearly and accurately explained on a range of issues with very good detail and explanation.</li> </ul> <p>The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning.</p> <p>Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the information 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 [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA024572 Summer 2010

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

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