



Mark Scheme (Results)

June 2014

GCE Psychology (6PS03/01)
Unit 3: Applications of Psychology

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2014

Publications Code UA039799

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

General Guidance on Marking – GCE Psychology

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

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

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

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>Mark according to levels for A1c and A3.</p> | |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| A1(a) | Outline the term ‘modelling’ as it is used to understand anti-social behaviour. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Max 1 mark if no reference to anti-social/(criminal/aggressive) behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People may copy anti-social behaviour of others through mimicking the behaviour known as modelling/an individual may copy stealing by mimicking the stealing which is known as modelling/eq; • Anti-social behaviour that is reinforced in some way is seen as more likely to be modelled by the observer/stealing may be reinforced somehow is seen as more likely to be modelled by the person watching the stealing happen/eq; • Vicarious reinforcement encourages modelling of anti-social behaviour/eq; • An observer may identify with the role model because they share similar characteristics/look up to them and want to be like them so model their anti-social behaviour/eq; • Modelling involves the process of attention, retention, reproduction and motivation/eq; <p>Look for other marking points.</p> | (3 A01) |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| A1(b) | Evaluate one explanation of anti-social behaviour, other than Social Learning Theory. Do not refer to Social Learning Theory in your answer. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore description. Ignore social learning theory. The theory need not be identified in the appropriate place/may be incorrectly labelled, but full marks should still be given if the theory is clearly identifiable from the answer written.</p> <p>Suitable examples include: Self fulfilling prophecy, personality theory (Eysenck). Biological theories should refer to personality in at least one way, e.g. the warrior gene (MAO/MAO-L) should account for the influence of genes on personality/aggression.</p> <p>Eg Self-fulfilling prophecy (non-criminal research e.g. Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968)), should only be credited if reference to criminality/being able to extrapolate the findings to criminality is made clear.</p> <p>Credit can be given to methodological strengths/weaknesses of a study used to evaluate the theory IF the methodological point is directly linked to theory.</p> <p>Self fulfilling Prophecy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance of a label can be affected by the self esteem of the individual, if low they are more likely to accept the label ascribed/eq; • Rebellion against a label is very possible/eq; • Jahoda (1954)found that children born on a Wednesday and given a name meaning that they are considered to be aggressive are more likely to have a criminal record later in life than those born on Monday/considered mild and meek/eq; • Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968) found that children randomly labelled bloomers were recorded to have a higher IQ than those labelled non-bloomers due to perceived teacher expectation/attention, this gives indirect evidence for expectation that can be assumed to affect criminality similarly/eq; • Madon (2004) found that children predicted to be alcohol users by their parents were more likely to use alcohol, fulfilling the prophecy of their parents, this finding can be extrapolated to criminal behaviour/eq; • Studies such as Madon (2004) and Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968) are correlational so there may be other reasons, such as genes, why someone may show anti-social behaviour/eq; • We cannot experimentally test the effect of SFP as it would be against ethical guidelines to label someone criminal, to find out if it works/eq; • There are other reasons for anti-social behaviour, such as the way we are raised by parents/genetic reasons/cortical under arousal, that may account for anti-social behaviour | (5 A02) |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>other than SFP/eq;</p> <p>Personality theory (Eysenck)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hare (2001) found an over representation of psychotic individuals have a tendency to be violent suggesting a link between the personality dimension psychosis and offending/eq; • Grann (1999) found that individuals scored higher on the PCL-R if they had anti-social behaviour prior convictions, suggesting that psychosis is linked to offending/eq; • Grann (1999) also found that 48% of ex-offenders rated as psychotic were likely to reoffend compared to those rated as not highly psychotic/eq; • Center and Kemp (2003) found that there was a relationship between anti-social behaviour and psychoticism in a sample of 11 delinquents/eq; • Raine and Venables (1981) found no relationship between conditioning (as measured by skin conductivity) and socialisation (teacher rated) not supporting Eysenck/eq; • Alternative explanations for anti-social behaviour take a wider social explanation such as social construction of criminality/social learning theory suggests that behaviour is a result of a learning experience/eq; • Eysenck found serious criminals scored highly on P E and N/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

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

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| A1(c) | Make one comparison (similarity or difference) between the explanation you have written about in A1 (b) and Social Learning Theory as explanations of anti-social/criminal behaviour. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>Mark according to the levels below.</p> <p>No credit for non-comparative descriptions.</p> <p>If they compare a different theory than the one written in A1b then no marks.</p> <p>If more than one comparison made mark all and credit the best.</p> <p>0 marks No clear comparison made, largely descriptive with no similarity or difference clearly made.</p> <p>One mark for an appropriate brief and basic comparison, may be a one sided difference. e.g. Both SFP and SLT focus on environmental factors in determining anti-social behaviour.</p> | (2 A02) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Two marks for clear, appropriate and well explained comparison. e.g. SLT suggests we observe and model the behaviour of role models whereas SFP believes it is the pressure of expectation exerted upon us that determines criminality.</p> <p>Indicative content: SLT and biological</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SLT focuses on environmental factors whereas Eysenck suggested anti-social behaviour is caused by internal and external factors (1 mark)/eq;• Eysenck suggests that criminality may be predisposed and therefore inherent in our nervous system whereas SLT understands that anti-social behaviour is a result of environmental conditions such as modelling a role model (2 marks)/eq;• Eysenck does acknowledge the role of the environment, but as an individual response to it in the way we can be conditioned according to our nervous system, whereas SLT does not take into account any nature/nurture interaction (2 marks)/eq; <p>SLT and SFP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Both SLT and SFP suggest that anti-social behaviour results from environmental factors (1 mark)/eq;• SLT suggests we observe and model the behaviour of role models whereas SFP believes it is the pressure of expectation exerted upon us that determines criminality (2 marks)/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable comments.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|--|----------------|
| A2(a) | <p>Hasnain conducted a field experiment to test the effectiveness of eyewitness testimony. He staged an incident in the local park. He then approached males and females individually, and once they had agreed to take part, he asked them what they remembered about the incident.</p> <p>After collecting his results, Hasnain became worried that the findings of his field experiment may not be reliable.</p> <p>Explain why Hasnain's findings may lack reliability.</p> | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore ethical issues. Ignore issues of validity and generalisability, unless elaboration of the reliability point made and linked.</p> <p>The answer must be contextualised to the scenario or 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • His findings may lack reliability because he has no control over situational variables that may occur in the park, such as distractions/eq; • Hasnain will not be able to replicate his study under exactly the same conditions again, as it is in the natural environment, so he cannot check for consistency of findings/eq; • The way that Hasnain approached and interviewed the witnesses to the incident is not standardised and can lead to unreliable findings/eq; • Hasnain has only conducted one field experiment so he cannot measure consistency and the reliability of his findings cannot be checked/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (3 A03) |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| A2(b) | Hasnain was also concerned about the ethics of his field experiment. Outline ethical issues associated with using the field experiment as a research method to test witness effectiveness in psychology. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore issues of reliability, generalisability and validity. The answer need not refer to the stimulus material. A list of brief ethical issues with no elaboration gains no marks Categorical statements (eg. 'field experiments have no RTW') – gain no marks Max 2 if only one ethical issue considered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If participants are unaware of the incident in the study, they may be affected/distressed by it/eq; • If the participants are unaware of the research being conducted initially so have not given their consent/eq; • Without consent, the participants (in the park) have no right to withdraw/eq; • If the participants have been deceived into believing that a real incident may have taken place when in fact it was staged, this is deception leaving participants embarrassed or annoyed (2 marks)/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (3 A03) |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|--|----------------|
| A2(c) | Suggest one way that Hasnain might improve either the reliability or the ethics of his field experiment. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore improvements to issues such as validity or generalisability. Mark only one of ethics or reliability improvements. If both commented on, mark all and credit the best. Consider 'one way' with reference to the fact that issues of reliability and ethics can involve more than one issue (eg. Controlled + standardised / consent + deception). Go with the intention of the candidate.</p> <p>Reliability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting the experiment in more controlled conditions, such as a laboratory, will ensure better control and standardisation to permit replication compared to those conducted in the field/eq; (2 marks) • Using a standardised approach and questionnaire, for example, would ensure that the consistency of his findings could be checked/eq; • Conduct the research in a controlled environment so that situational variables often present in the field do not affect the reliability of his research/eq; <p>Ethics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants could have been approached before the | (2 A03) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>incident and consent could be obtained/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If the participants are informed prior to the investigation then they could exert a right to withdraw/eq;• The incident could be made mundane rather than dramatic so no harm is caused to participants witnessing the event/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------|
| *A3 | Describe and evaluate two treatments/therapies that could be used for prisoners serving a sentence. | |
| | Indicative content | Mark |
| | <p>Mark according to the levels below.</p> <p>Marking points can be about the rationale behind the treatment and/or the treatment process itself.</p> <p>Description (AO1) Eg Anger management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offenders can be helped to identify the triggers that cause anger. • Thought patterns associated with the anger are challenged. • Alternative thinking and behaviour is considered. • Therapists help offenders understand the consequences of their anger on others. • Relaxation/coping mechanisms are taught to deal with physiological response to triggers. • Offenders are taught assertiveness to help talk through their problems rather than respond angrily. • Role play is used to practise new skills to deal with anger. <p>Eg Token economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tokens are given for appropriate behaviour as a form of secondary reinforcement. • Tokens can be exchanged for leisure time/phone cards/extra visits/primary reinforcers. • Token economy programmes are based on operant conditioning principles. • Positive reinforcers encourage appropriate behaviours to be repeated. • Tokens are used to manage behaviour not rehabilitate/eq; • Tokens control behaviour in the short term making prison life more harmonious. <p>Evaluation points (AO2) Eg Anger management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychologists question the assumption that anger causes aggression. • Loza and Loza-Fanous (1999) found no relationship between anger and violent and non-violent offenders. • Dowden (1999) showed reduced recidivism after anger management in high risk offenders. • Ireland found significant behavioural improvements in violent offenders using the programme/lower anger scores. • It can only be used on offenders self motivated and willing to change their behaviour. • There is a real change in behaviour due to cognition change so underlying issues are addressed. • Anger management may help offenders control their emotions to commit more calculated and controlled acts | <p>(12 AO1/2)</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The treatment is time consuming and/or expensive compared to token economy as it is done in small groups and needs trained professionals <p>Eg Token economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TE is only used to control behaviour in prison and has little application in real life as token are not given outside of prison. Staff and inmate interaction becomes more positive which might account for the improved behaviour, not the tokens per se. Tokens may be abused by prison staff who may use their authority to manipulate a criminal's behaviour They can be used as a form of contraband within prisons. Other forms of reinforcement in prison might override the value of tokens. Reinforcement in life outside prison is more subtle than tokens, so the long term effectiveness is limited. It could be the increased positive social interaction between staff and prisoners that creates good behaviour rather than the tokens themselves. TEP's are cost effective as professionals are not needed to implement them. Hobbs and Holt (1976) reported improvements in the behaviour of young male offenders in exchange for cigarettes, drinks and sweets. Pearson et al (2002) compared CBT and TEPs and found little success of tokens within prisons. <p>Look for additional material</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|----------------|------|---|
| | | AO1: Knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works. AO2: Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works. If description and evaluation are not at the same level then the lowest level must be awarded |
| | 0 | No rewardable material |
| Level 1 | 1-3 | Candidates will produce brief answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple statements concerning two treatments or partial answer (one treatment described). Little or no attempts at the evaluative demands of the question. <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 | Description OR evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR one is in less detail than the other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited description of both treatments OR one is described well and another is limited. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited evaluation of both therapies <p>OR</p> |

| | | |
|----------------|-------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good evaluation of one therapy <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate 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 and organisation in the response.</p> |
| Level 3 | 7-9 | <p>Good and accurate description and evaluation/comparison.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good description of both treatments with breadth and or depth of elements to the treatments. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good evaluation of both treatments in at least one way using a well detailed/explained strength and/or weakness. There is a trade off between breadth or depth of evaluation. • Or Very good evaluation of one therapy (with breadth and depth of explanation) more than one evaluative point very well explained, and limited evaluation of the other therapy. <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 | <p>Candidate has attempted and answered <i>all injunctions</i> in the question very well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good description of both treatments using breadth and depth of the elements of both treatments – one may be a bit better described than the other but they are both clear and appropriate given the time constraints of the exam. • Very good evaluation (breadth and depth with regards to both treatments) using strengths and/or weaknesses in more than one way. <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 | |
|--|--|--|
| | <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>Refer to levels for B3</p> | |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| B1(ai) | Briefly outline one research study that found negative effects of daycare. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.</p> <p>Ignore research showing the positive effects of daycare, but be mindful that research can suggest BOTH positive and negative effects under certain circumstances. If in doubt about whether the study looks at negative effects ask team leader.</p> <p>If more than one study described, mark all and credit the best. If study name is missing or does not match description but an appropriate study is outlined then eligible for full marks. No ID mark.</p> <p>Belsky and Rovine (1988)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aimed to investigate the effect of daycare on attachments with mothers and fathers/eq; • Used the findings of two American longitudinal studies to assess effects of daycare/eq; • Children had experienced daycare within the first year of life and attachments to the mother and father were examined/eq; • The strange situation procedure was used to classify attachment types/eq; • They found that early onset and intensive hours in daycare has a negative impact on attachments (more than 20 hours per week before the age of two years)/eq; <p>Melhuish et al (1990a/b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aimed to investigate the social and intellectual development of children in maternal care and those using different daycare practices (childminder, relative, nursery)/eq; • Using two-parent families of 250 first born children from birth to age 3 years they were assessed by the strange situation and intellectual and language development/eq; • Children in nurseries showed more aggression and less vocalisation than in other forms of daycare/eq; • Daycare was characterised by lower social and emotional responsiveness to the children compared to other forms of daycare/eq; | (3 A01) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On most measures, children did less well in nurseries than other forms of daycare/eq; <p>NICHD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aimed to examine the effects of different types of childcare on children’s social, emotional, intellectual and language development/eq; Longitudinal study following children from birth through childhood/eq; 1,200 children were observed, surveys were conducted on teachers and parents until they started school/eq; Early onset and extended hours in daycare was linked to behavioural problems at school/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| B1(aii) | Evaluate the research study you have outlined in (ai). | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore description.</p> <p>TE: If B1ai is blank but B1aii evaluates an identifiable appropriate day care study that shows the negative effects from child psychology, then full marks can be given. If B1ai is incorrect (eg positive effects) and B1aii evaluates that study, max 2 marks can be given for appropriate evaluation of the study described in B1ai as long as the study is about daycare. If B1ai does not match B1aii no marks can be given.</p> <p>Belsky and Rovine (1988)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The strange situation may not be an appropriate tool for measuring attachment in daycare children who are used to separation/eq; Children may not be avoidant, but used to stranger care/eq; Daycare can also have positive effects upon children’s intellectual and social development as found by Andersson (1996)/eq; Factors other than daycare may account for the findings, such as resilience of the child/eq; The procedure was highly controlled/standardised and reliability was established/eq; DiLalla (1998) found that children who spent no time in daycare were more prosocial than children who attended daycare/eq; The EPPE project (2004) suggests that children who attend daycare can have positive benefits – which goes against Belsky’s findings/eq; <p>Melhuish et al (1990a/b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melhuish et al investigated the factors associated with good and bad daycare practices so we able to control for many factors that impact upon the development of | (4 A02) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>children/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study did not examine the reasons for parents returning to work, and this has been linked to whether a child responds positively or negatively to daycare/eq; • Aggression can often be mistaken for assertiveness, so surveys of carers may not have been an appropriate measure of this characteristic/eq; • The strange situation has been criticised as an inappropriate tool to measure children in daycare as they are already accustomed to separation and care by strangers/eq; <p>NICHD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study was carried out in the USA and so the results are not generalisable to other cultures (such as African or Asian)/eq; • There may have been other factors, such as a child's temperament, that may actually be responsible for the findings rather than the childcare/eq; • The same children were followed throughout the NICHD study so there were no participant variables/individual differences that could have occurred if a cross-sectional study had been carried out/eq; • A variety of methods, such as observation, interview and survey were used and therefore the findings can be checked for validity / reliability/eq; • Children were observed in their natural environment so would have shown normal behaviour and ecological validity was high/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| B1(b) | <p>Psychologists have studied ways of improving care for children to avoid deprivation.</p> <p>Outline two suggestions that psychologists might make, which may reduce the negative effects of deprivation.</p> | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Max 3 marks for each way outlined (so can be 1+3 or 2+2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a continuous substitute figure/eq; • Daycare provides a single carer for a child to allow attachments to be formed/eq; • Reduce the time spent away from the attachment figure/eq; • The less time spent in daycare, according to Belsky, the lessened the effects of deprivation on attachment/eq; • If the deprivation is due to divorce, minimising conflict, according to Rutter reducing adverse effects of separation. | (4 AO2) |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also maintaining regular contact with estranged partners will reduce separation effects/maintains attachment/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| B2(a) | <p>This case study of Genie (Curtiss 1977) can be used to discuss whether the negative effects of privation may or may not be reversible.</p> <p>Using the case study of Genie, explain whether the negative effects of privation are reversible</p> | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Ignore reference to other privation cases unless used to understand the case of Genie, for example, unlike the Czech twin who had each other Genie was truly privated, so reversibility is not fully possible as it was with the Czech twins (largely).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> She began to form attachments to staff members and learn words showing some signs of reversibility in social and cognitive areas initially as she made good progress/eq; However, her grammar never achieved beyond that of a toddler, suggesting that there was a critical stage for grammar and this was not reversible/eq; She regressed when moved into different foster care, suggesting lack of reversibility, although it could be due to the change of attachments/eq; She was said to be retarded by her doctor from birth, so her lack of progress may be accounted for by this and not that the effects of privation are not reversible/eq; The sleep spindle research suggested mental retardation from birth, so the issue of reversibility is unclear/eq; Compared to the Czech twins (Koluchova, 1972) Genie showed a poorer outcome despite good quality care possibly due to lack of sibling to attach to, suggesting true privation is not reversible/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (3 A02) |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|--|----------------|
| B2(b) | <p>Evaluate the case study as a research method used to investigate children's development.</p> <p>You must refer to children's development in your answer.</p> | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Max 2 marks if no reference to child development in the answer at least once.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case studies of children are unique cases and not likely to | (4 A03) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>be repeatable under the same circumstances/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unique case results cannot be cross checked for reliability, so examples such as Genie are not reliable/eq; • Case studies are typically naturally occurring circumstances where child development can be affected by many uncontrolled variables that may affect reliability/eq; • Case studies are useful in studying rare cases, such as privation, where the situation cannot be tested experimentally/eq; • Case studies are often intensive and detailed, so can impact upon the daily lives of the child and their family and be intrusive/eq; • Not all factors can be controlled or accounted for in a case study, so cause and effect cannot be established for the developmental trait/eq; • The case study is often conducted under naturalistic conditions in the life and development of the child so real life can be examined/eq; • Case studies often use a variety of research methods to study the child so triangulation can establish validity of findings/eq; • Observations, psychological tests, interviews of the child can be used to ensure findings from one method are validated by findings from other methods/eq; • Often more than one researcher is involved with the child to maintain objective findings unaffected by researcher bias/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|--|-------------------|
| B3 | <p>Mary Ainsworth used a structured observation method called the Strange Situation as a way of investigating parent-child attachment.</p> <p>Describe the procedure used in the Strange Situation and evaluate the Strange Situation as a structured observation research method.</p> <p>In your evaluation you must compare the structured observation method with the naturalistic observation method at least once.</p> | |
| | Indicative content | Mark |
| | <p>Credit according to the levels below. (6 AO1 and 6 AO3)</p> <p>Procedure of the strange situation – NB no credit for results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A laboratory/controlled situation is set up with chairs for adults and toys for the child. • Tinted glass is used so the researchers can observe the child whilst not being seen by the child/parent. • Mother and child are together in the room playing together with toys. • A stranger comes into the room, talks to the mother and attempts engagement with the child in the mothers presence. • Mother leaves the room leaving the child and stranger together, the stranger tries to engage and console the child, stranger anxiety is measured. | (12 AO1/3) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mother returns according to the distress shown by the child, if the distress is high the mother returns quickly, and the stranger leaves the room. The mother consoles the child. • The mother then leaves the child alone in the room, separation anxiety is measured.. • The stranger enters the room with the child alone and attempts to play with the child. • The mother returns and reunion behaviour is measured. <p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The behaviour being measured is controlled in a laboratory setting, so extraneous variables that might alter the behaviour of the child are controlled or eliminated/eq; • Unlike a naturalistic observation, where the observer would have to wait for an arising behaviour/situation, a structured observation prompts behaviour so saves time and resources/eq; • The situation is staged so natural behaviour is not measured in a realistic way, this limits the generalisability of the research method to real life situations/eq; • The procedure has been criticised for causing unnecessary distress to the child (and the parent)/eq; • However, the parent is empowered to curtail any period and/or abandon the procedure if the child's distress is untenable/eq; • Many observers are used to judge the behaviour of the child during the episodes of the procedure, so inter-rater reliability can be established/eq; • The procedure is particularly stressful in some cultures (Japan) where separation between child and parent is infrequent, so the procedure causes high levels of stress for the child/eq; • The whole method does not account for the individual differences of children, particularly the strange situation may be a measure of temperament rather than attachment/eq; • The strange situation may not be an appropriate tool for measuring the behaviour of children already used to separation (through daycare)/eq; • The strange situation has identified that child rearing practices affect the child's behaviour, and inappropriate judgements about culture have been made/eq; <p>Comparison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structured observations are more artificial than naturalistic observations as they are staged and typically conducted in a laboratory situation. This may affect the spontaneity and natural behaviour of the children and parents/eq; • Structured observations are more convenient and cost/time effective than naturalistic observations as the situation is contrived to force a behaviour rather than waiting for a behaviour to occur spontaneously in a natural situation/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|----------------|------|--|
| | | AO1: Knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works. AO3: knowledge and understanding of research methods. |
| | 0 | No rewardable material |
| Level 1 | 1-3 | <p>Candidates will produce brief answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief and basic description of the procedure, simplistic statements made. • Little or no attempt at the evaluative demands of the question. <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 | <p>Description OR evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR one is in less detail than the other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic description of the strange situation, but most elements of the procedure are covered (staging of the mother, child and stranger). • Limited evaluation of the strange situation as a structured observation, may attempt to evaluate the strange situation without focus on the research method. • There may be some attempt to compare with naturalistic observation. <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate 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> |
| Level 3 | 7-9 | <p>Good and accurate description and evaluation/comparison.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good description of the strange situation, some detail and most elements covered (staging of the mother, child and stranger with some detail and accuracy concerning the episodes of the procedure). <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good evaluation in more than one way of the strange situation as a structured observation. The evaluation is focused on the research method although may be interspersed with irrelevant evaluation. • There is a clear, accurate attempt to compare the structured observation with naturalistic observation. <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 | 10- | Candidate has attempted and answered all injunctions in |

| | | |
|---|----|--|
| 4 | 12 | <p>the question very well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very good, detailed and full description of the strange situation. Accurate and detailed episodes showing a very good understanding of the events with detailed descriptions of the staging of each episode.• Very good evaluation, more than one evaluation point made very well. Evaluation is focused on the strange situation as a structured observation.• Comparison with naturalistic observation is made at least once, done very well in terms of being an accurate and direct comparison between naturalistic and structured observation. <p>The skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are in place. Very few syntactical and /or spelling errors may be found. Very good organisation and planning. Given time constraints and limited number of marks, full marks must be given when the answer is reasonably detailed even if not all the indicative content is present.</p> |
|---|----|--|

Section C – Health Psychology

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

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| C1(a) | Using one explanation from the learning approach, explain why people misuse drugs. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.</p> <p>If more than one learning theory (CC, OC or SLT positive reinforcement or negative reinforcement can be considered as separate theories) mark all and credit the best one described.</p> <p>MAX 1 if no reference to misuse of drugs.</p> <p>Operant conditioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drugs that produce a pleasant effects can reinforce the drug taking behaviour/explain how it starts to become addictive/eq; • Maintaining pleasurable effects can explain drug maintenance through positive reinforcement/eq; • Drugs are pleasurable only in the short term, so a user needs to take more to return to the reward state/eq; • Drugs are often taken socially and reinforced by the approval of friends/peers/eq; • Withdrawal of use can have unpleasant side effects so is avoided which can be explained by negative reinforcement/eq; • Stopping name calling from peers may act as a negative reinforcement and encourage substance misuse/eq; <p>SLT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An individual may observe a drug user and model their behaviour through attention, retention, reproduction and motivation/eq; • A role model who takes drugs can encourage drug misuse if they have status and power is looked up to or respected/eq; • Drug use can be glamorised and rewarded which can be a form of vicarious reinforcement for an observer/eq; • The observer may identify with the drug user and wish to adopt the same drug taking values and beliefs as a role model/eq | (3 A01) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Classical conditioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a drug user may associate a drug with pleasurable/relaxation effects/eq; • the conditioned stimulus of a drug becomes paired with a conditioned stimulus that already results in pleasure/relaxation/eq; • with pairing of the UCS/Drug and CS the drug eventually becomes a CR/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| Question Number | | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| C1(b) | <p>When trying to understand drug misuse, it can be useful to compare different explanations in terms of their similarities and differences.</p> <p>Compare the Learning Approach with the Biological Approach as explanations of substance misuse.</p> | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per comparison made/elaboration. MAX 1 for an implicit comparison. Must refer to substance misuse/drugs or 0 marks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culturally, different drugs are used/misused in different cultures, supporting social learning theory as an explanation of drug taking which the biological approach cannot explain/eq; • At a neurological level, drugs that are commonly used are those which produce euphoric or relaxing effects so are strongly reinforcing the drug taking behaviour. So operant conditioning and the biological approach are complementary/eq; • Both approaches explain how drug use persists in families, genetics for the biological approach and role models for the learning approach/eq; • The biological approach can be tested experimentally but it is more difficult to establish cause and effect as the brain is more difficult to investigate than behavioural research in a controlled environment/eq; • The biological approach is on the nature side with the explanation of misuse determined by physiology, whereas the learning approach is on the nurture side, misuse being caused by environmental factors/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (3 A02) |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| C2(a) | Describe issues that researchers need to consider when using animals in laboratory experiments to test the effects of drugs. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration</p> <p>Issues can include ethical issues, methodological issues and practical issues (there may be others).</p> <p>MAX 2 if no reference to drug research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers should consider the certain species are more appropriate and ethical to use under certain circumstances, so endangered species should not be used in drug research/eq; • Small animals should be given smaller quantities of drug compared to larger animals/eq; • Some drugs are lethal for some animal species, so knowledge of each animal is very important in drug research/eq; • Housing arrangements should be suitable for the size and natural routines of an animal/eq; • Animals should not be isolated if their species is social by nature/eq; • Generalisability from animals to humans may be limited as humans respond differently to drugs than animals/eq; • Animals cannot articulate their experience, so physiological measures of the effects of drugs should be taken/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (4 A03) |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|--|----------------|
| C2(b) | Assess the usefulness of animal research in understanding drug misuse in humans. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration.</p> <p>Ignore ethics unless used in a practical way.</p> <p>MAX 2 if no reference to drug research.</p> <p>Responses likely to focus on generalisability, validity, practical issues. Others are possible. Contact TL if unsure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animals, such as rats, have a shorter lifespan than humans so the long term effects of drugs can be determined much faster than with humans/eq; • The results may not be generalisable to humans so usefulness of the findings is limited/eq; humans take drugs in a social context that affects drug misuse, that cannot be studied in animals/eq; (second mark) • Rats (other animal) have different behavioural patterns to humans, and their response to drugs may be markedly different, so the findings are not usable/eq; • Human drug use is more complex/social/emotional than animals so isolating animals in the laboratory for study may not accurately | (4 A03) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>reflect human drug taking/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, the basic processes involved in drug use can be studied at a basic level as some laboratory animals have simpler nervous systems that mean the findings can be scaled up and applied to humans/eq; • Animal research is costly, requiring licences and governed by laws, so even if useful it may not be financially viable/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points concerning usefulness of animal research.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|--|----------------|
| C2(c) | <p>During your course you will have learned about one study that uses human participants to investigate drugs. Evaluate this study in terms of ethics and practical applications.</p> | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Max 3 for either ethics or practical applications (2+2 or 3+1).</p> <p>Stacy et al (1991)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were recruited from a drug misuse project to be studied longitudinally, so may have felt pressure to take part leaving some doubt over consent given/eq; • The participants were given money to complete a questionnaire, which is seen as incentivising participation/eq; • The names and details of respondents were kept confidential and participants given a certificate of confidentiality to that effect/eq; • Asking participants about parental alcoholism and violence may have been distressing to relive for some participants/eq; • The study informs us of the likelihood of sensation seekers being more prone to alcoholism so may be used as an indicator for vulnerability to excessive drinking/eq; • Linking personality and drinking behaviour displaces the usefulness of government policies to protect people from alcohol using social strategies, an important practical application that may be ignored/eq; <p>Eg Ennett et al (1994)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigating friendship groups may cause distress to those who have issues with friendship or did not want parents/teachers to find out/eq; • Non-smoking friendship cliques show us that peer pressure can be very important in discouraging smoking. Peer mentors can be used to prevent smoking in schools/eq; • Non-smoking role models should be used on ad campaigns to discourage smoking/eq; • Smokers were often isolated individuals which suggests that asking them about smoking behaviour could be a result of lack of social skills and developing friendship groups, which could be seen as distressing for those smokers/eq; | (4 A02) |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>Eg Blattler (2002)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Participants of the study were fully informed about the nature and extent of the research, so it was ethical in that sense/eq;• An independent ethics committee gave approval for the research to be conducted/eq;• A few of the participants did withdraw from the study, showing that the right to withdraw was enforced/eq;• The applications of this study are far reaching in terms of economic and individual cost of drug use/eq;• Removing the user from the drug scene, which was found to have a significant impact on rehabilitation, ensures that costs are saved by the police and social service agencies with such maintenance programmes/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|-------------------|
| C3 | <p>Describe and evaluate one health campaign that has been used to encourage people not to use recreational drugs.</p> <p>In your answer explain two ideas you might suggest that would improve the health campaign you have described.</p> | |
| | Indicative content | Mark |
| | <p>Refer to levels for marking.</p> <p>Description (AO1) E.g. 'Scared' (2008)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the concept of children being scared of a parent dying • Targeted at parental conscience • Smoking parents are encouraged to identify with the parent being portrayed on the advertisement (TV) • Exploits parental protectiveness of children to discourage smoking • Provides information about death rates of smoking related illness as fear factor <p>E.g 'Talk to Frank'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses openness as a strategy for children and parents to seek advice • Parents are encouraged to look for signs of drug use • Younger people are exposed to drug user images that are negative • Shows peer group pressure and how this can influence drug use • Uses both sides of the argument to encourage choice and consideration <p>Evaluation (AO2)</p> <p>e.g. Talk to Frank</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talk to Frank is based on the Yale Model of Persuasion which has experimental support for the effectiveness of presenting both sides of the argument/eq; • By 2008, 89% of 11-21 year olds recognised the FRANK adverts and 82% knew about the website (Mitchell, 2008)/eq; • Frank campaign receives approximately 1,350 calls per day which shows people are using the phone service/eq; • In 2005-2006 the Frank website had 5.7 million hits from over 2 million visitors which shows its popularity/eq; • Campaigns such as Frank can be costly but they are cheap in comparison to curative strategies/eq; • Quantitative measures of drug related behaviour (death rate, consumption, helpline activity) can be statistically verified/eq; • Frank informs people about drug use using a balanced approach which can be effective when communicating to an undecided audience (McGuire, 1964)/eq; <p>e.g. Smoking campaigns (such as Scared or British Heart Foundation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • British Heart Foundation used various media to give information, meaning that it reached lots of people in different ways so should be more effective/eq; | (12 AO1/2) |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hafsted et al (1997) found anti-smoking campaigns to have a positive emotional influence on smokers (particularly women) so this campaign should have been effective in reducing smoking/eq; • Mechanic et al (2005) assessed smoking campaigns to be generally effective in reducing smoking, so this finding should apply to the BHF campaign/eq; • Campaigns, such as the BHF are cost effective compared to the treatment of diseases associated with smoking/eq; • Some smokers may not have seen or heard about the campaign or not have known how to seek help/eq; • Other factors at the time, such as the smoking ban/advertising ban, may have reduced smoking rather than the campaign itself/eq; • It is impossible to measure the effectiveness of this campaign in particular as other variables could reduce smoking/accurate smoker statistics are not readily available (or could be compared to the campaign)/eq; • Hafsted (2009) found that those who responded emotionally to anti-smoking campaigns were more likely to quit, so emotionally provoking campaigns seem to work/eq; <p>General evaluative points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fear tactics as used by the campaign may not be effective (Janis and Feshback, 1953) as although they generate an emotional response they may be ignored or minimised/eq; • Difficult to measure effectiveness as many factors may cause increase in health/eq; • Health programmes often go hand in hand with a change in public opinion, which may account for reduction in unhealthiness rather than programme itself/eq; • Health campaigns only work if people do not have barriers to health related behaviour and can access help/eq; • They are preventative rather than curative so stops issues before they cause health/lifestyle/family issues/eq; <p>Improving the health campaign</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redesign the campaign to incorporate a moderate level of fear as this is effective in attitude change as illustrated by Janis and Feshback/eq; • Use an expert in the ad campaign as they can be more persuasive than non-experts (Baron & Byrne)/eq; • Present both sides of the argument as this is known to be effective in producing resistant attitudes (innoculation)/eq; • Use a quantitative measure of effectiveness, such as carbon monoxide tests at the doctors to monitor cessation of smoking/eq; • Use celebrities to endorse the campaign as individuals may identify with the role model and be more likely to model good behaviour (SLT)/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|-------|------|--|
| | | AO1: Knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works. AO2: Application/evaluation of knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works. |

| | | |
|----------------|-------|---|
| | | |
| | 0 | No rewardable material |
| Level 1 | 1-3 | <p>Candidates will produce brief answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief and basic description of one health campaign. May be difficult to identify or muddled. • Little or no attempt at the evaluative demands of the question. • Little or no attempt at improving the campaign. <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 | <p>Description and Evaluation OR Description and Improvement OR Evaluation and Improvement (any two of the three elements)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited but clear description of one identifiable health campaign. Details are likely to include the target audience, type of drug and some limited ideas on how the campaign was initiated. • Limited evaluation, which may not include effectiveness and appropriateness of the campaign but still has evaluative component. • May or may not have relevant reference to improving the campaign. <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate 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 and organisation in the response.</p> |
| Level 3 | 7-9 | <p>Candidate has attempted and answered at least two of the injunctions (description, evaluation, improvement) in the question well and one is limited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good description of one identifiable health campaign. Some detail of the campaign in terms of audience, type of target drug, procedures used in the campaign. • Good evaluation of one health campaign, will include a reference to effectiveness of appropriateness. There should be some breadth or depth of evaluation (more than one evaluation point should be made clearly with explanation). • Some relevant reference to improving the campaign in at least one way. <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 | <p>Candidate has attempted and answered at least two of the injunctions (description, evaluation, improvement) in the question very well and one done well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good description of one health campaign that is identifiable and detailed. Detail should cover a |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>range of elements of the campaign in terms of audience, procedures used, target drug and resources used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very good evaluation including effectiveness and appropriateness. There will be detail of more than one evaluation point and both effectiveness and appropriateness comments should be clear and explained fully.• Good reference to improving the campaign in at least one way, or two ways referred to briefly without explanation. <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 D – Sport Psychology

| | Guidance | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Marking points are indicative, not comprehensive and other points should be credited. In each case consider OWTTE (or words to that effect).</p> <p>Each bullet point is a marking point, unless otherwise stated, and each point made by the candidate must be identifiable and comprehensible.</p> <p>One mark is to be awarded for each marking point covered. For elaboration of a marking point also award one mark UNLESS otherwise stated.</p> <p>Refer to level for D2a and D3</p> | |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| D1(a) | Outline the Inverted U hypothesis as theory as it is used in sports psychology. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. Max 2 if no reference to sport psychology/the concept of sporting performance/performance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inverted U hypothesis is a biological theory that explains sporting performance relating to arousal and anxiety rather than a focus on psychological processes/eq; • Arousal is important in sport as it can improve performance/eq; • An optimum point is reached where peak performance is achieved/eq; • Too much arousal results in a loss of physical performance/eq; • According to the Yerkes-Dodson law, moderate arousal results in optimum performance, but it really depends upon the type of sporting activity and experience level of the individual/eq; • Fine motor control sports are better performed in a low state of arousal/eq; • Complex sports are best performed in a state of low arousal/eq; • High strength/power sports are best performed in high state of arousal/eq; • Simple tasks are better performed in high arousal state/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (3 AO1) |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|--|----------------|
| D1 (b) | Evaluate the Inverted U hypothesis as an explanation used within sports psychology. Do not use comparison as part of your answer. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. No marks for description. No marks for comparison.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experienced sportspeople can perform well with high arousal as there is less need to focus on a well practised task, this can have a practical application in terms of coaching/eq; Coaches may use this theory to suggest that novices practise tasks using low arousal as concentration is needed in learning a new skill/eq; The inverted U hypothesis can be usefully applied to help 'psych up' or relax a sportsperson to achieve the optimal level of arousal needed for the type of sport and individual/eq; Experimental research to test the inverted U hypothesis has used techniques to relax or psych out an individual (threat or incentive) which may cause anxiety/ego rather than arousal/eq; More recent multidimensional theories have tried to bridge the gap between physical arousal and cognitive factors associated with sporting performance/eq; If skilled sportspeople need higher levels of arousal to perform, this might explain why records are broken more frequently at large important events where pressure is very high/eq; Lowe's (1974) Little League study found that baseball performance was better in moderate conditions rather than critical or non-critical conditions during a game, supporting optimal performance/eq; A field study by Klavora (1978) followed a basketball team during a competition and found that coaches assessments of performance related to standing in the tournament (high or low standing led to worse performances)/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (5 A02) |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| D1 (c) | Compare the inverted U hypothesis with one other theory of arousal, anxiety and/or the effect of the audience that you have learned about. Comparison can include similarities and/or differences. | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per comparison/elaboration. Ignore pure description with no comparative element. Theories include; drive theory, attentional narrowing, evaluation apprehension, catastrophe theory.</p> <p>Inverted U and catastrophe theory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inverted U does not explain the sudden drop in performance that catastrophe theory does/eq; Performance is unlikely to slowly dip, but more likely to drop | (3 A02) |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>off sharply as catastrophe theory suggests/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Both theories propose that there is an optimum level of arousal which will lead to the best performance/eq;• Both theories suggest that too much arousal will cause a deterioration in performance/eq;• Neither the inverted U or catastrophe theory takes into account the cognitive and affective aspects of performance/eq; <p>Inverted U and evaluation apprehension</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The theory is biological and ignores the psychological factors involved in performance, such as evaluation apprehension where there is a greater emphasis on psychological processes/eq;• Evaluation apprehension theory takes into account the nature of the task and expertise of the sports person in arousal level which the basic inverted U hypothesis does not take into account/eq;• Therefore both theories explain why the audience may have a deleterious effect on performance/eq;• Evaluation apprehension understands performance being affected by childhood experiences whereas the inverted U is purely nature/biological/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| D2 (a) | <p>Sarah is a sports teacher at a school who wants to see if the lap times of her running team improved as they become happier with their performance. This will require using a correlation study.</p> <p>Describe how Sarah might go about conducting a study to assess whether there is a relationship between performance satisfaction correlates with running times.</p> | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>Refer to level for marking and also see indicative content.</p> <p>Elements include sample, procedure, apparatus, location, design, controls, data collection, data analysis, ethics.</p> <p>Watch for tautology.</p> <p>Levels</p> <p>0 mark No rewardable material</p> <p>1 mark Basic and brief information about how a correlation might be conducted. Includes an attempt at one or more of the above elements.</p> <p>2 marks Basic detail about how a correlation might take place with reference to more than one basic idea. Includes at least one well explained element from above. Partial replication possible.</p> <p>3 marks Good detail about how a correlation might take place. Includes at least two well explained elements from above. Replication possible (but take into account time constraints and number of marks available)</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarah could collect lap time data for each team member and see if they were related to satisfaction with their performance /eq; • Sarah could conduct a questionnaire on satisfaction, asking team members to rate their happiness with performance/eq; • Sarah could use a stop watch to measure lap times a/eq; • A rating scale, such as Likert from 1-10 could be used to measure happiness in performance/eq; • Sarah could use the same questionnaire and running track for all participants in her study/eq; • Sarah could use an opportunity sample and ask those runners available at the time if they want to participate/eq; • She would need to get consent from her team and let them know the nature of her investigation so it was informed consent/eq; • Anonymous questionnaires would help prevent social | (3 A03) |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>desirability/eq;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarah would plot lap times with happiness scores on a scattergraph/eq; • Sarah could conduct a Spearmans rho test to get a correlation coefficient/eq; • The closer the coefficient to +/-1, the higher level of relatedness between happiness and lap times/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|
| D2 (b) | <p>There are techniques that Sarah could use to improve the performance of her sports students'.</p> <p>Evaluate one technique that could be used to improve sporting performance.</p> | |
| | Answer | Mark |
| | <p>One mark per point/elaboration. If more than one technique mark all credit the best, however, techniques can inform one another.</p> <p>e.g. Imagery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feltz and Landers (1983) found that overall studies found imagery to be better than no mental imagery at all/eq; • Imagery is not a substitute for physical practice/eq; • Isaac (1992) found that high imagery trampolinists performed better the low and no imagery groups/eq; • Research into imagery has been experimental, so the technique lacks field trials to achieve validity/eq; • Imagery is quite specific and may lead to greater physical practice of the skill, which would account for the improvement rather than the imagery itself/eq; <p>e.g. Goal setting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mellalieu (2005) found that SMART targets set for rugby players showed considerable sporting improvement in those skills compared to the skills that were not targeted/eq; • Because self generated targets are most effective, this itself may be intrinsically motivational/eq; • Targets that are unrealistic may not be achieved and act as a demotivator/eq; • Goal setting, unlike imagery, is more likely to involve physical practice which will improve performance/eq; <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (4 A02) |

| Question Number | Question | |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------|
| D3 | Describe the study of Boyd and Monroe (2003) and then evaluate the use of quantitative data as it is used to gather information on sporting performance. | |
| | Indicative content | Mark |
| | <p>6 AO1 and 6AO3. Refer to levels for marking.</p> <p>Description points (AO1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aimed to see if there was a difference in the use of imagery between beginner and advanced climbers • Aimed to investigate the difference in imagery use between climbers and track athletes • Hypothesised that climbers would be higher on CG and use MG-A more than track athletes • Hypothesised that climbers would score low on MS than track athletes because they tend not to focus on extrinsic motivation • Hypothesised that beginner climbers would use imagery strategies to reduce anxiety (MG-A) than experienced climbers • 38 track athletes and 48 climbers, of which 18 were beginners and 30 experienced climbers, participated in this study • The track athletes completed the SIQ and the climbers completed a modified version called the CIQ • Track athletes scored higher on average on MS than climbers overall • 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 • There was no significant difference found in the five imagery sub-scales between beginner and advanced climbers • Climbers use intrinsic motivation more than extrinsic motivation because there is very little 'winning' in climbing compared to track and field sports (audience) • Climbers scored low on confidence, which is more necessary in team sports than having outward confidence in an isolated sport <p>Evaluation points (AO3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is easy to analyse as it is numbers rather than narrative. • It can be easily subject to a statistical test to determine significance. • It is not open to interpretation like qualitative data. • It is objective and therefore more scientific/eq; • It does not permit the gathering of more rich and detailed information about sporting performance. • It does not allow researchers to understand reasons behind choices/performance. • It does not allow sports people to respond freely without constraints of closed ended questions. • It does not allow researchers to explore topics in greater depth. • Subtle information about sporting performance cannot be achieved that can be achieved with open questions. <p>Look for other reasonable marking points.</p> | (12 AO1/3) |

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|----------------|-------|---|
| | | AO1: Knowledge and understanding of psychology and how psychology works. AO3: Knowledge and understanding of research methods. |
| | 0 | No rewardable material |
| Level 1 | 1-3 | <p>Candidates will produce brief answers, making simple statements showing some relevance to the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief and basic outline of the study. • Little or no attempt at the evaluative demands of the question. <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 | <p>Description OR evaluation only OR limited attempt at each OR one is in less detail than the other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited outline of the study, including two of aims/procedure/results/conclusions. • Limited evaluation of quantitative data. Basic understanding that it is restricted, superficial, easy to analyse. Undeveloped comments such as these. <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate 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> |
| Level 3 | 7-9 | <p>Good and accurate description and evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good description of the study – including more than two study elements. • Good evaluation of quantitative data. There should be some attempt to judge both strengths and weaknesses, or partially done very well. <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 | <p>Candidate has attempted and answered both injunctions in the question very well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good description of the majority of elements of the study with some depth of detail. • Very good evaluation of quantitative data, including both strengths and weaknesses. Both strengths and weaknesses are clearly explained and full. <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> |

