



# Cambridge Pre-U

---

**PSYCHOLOGY**

**9773/03**

Paper 3 Key Applications

**For examination from 2020**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 120

---

**Specimen**

This specimen paper has been updated for assessments from 2020. The specimen questions and mark schemes remain the same. The layout and wording of the front covers have been updated to reflect the new Cambridge International branding and to make instructions clearer for candidates.

The specimen paper is for general illustrative purposes. Please see the syllabus for the relevant year of the examination for details of the current topics and studies.

---

This syllabus is regulated for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document has **70** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**Psychology and Abnormality****Section A**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>From the study by Tice, Bratslavsky and Baumeister (2001) on affect regulation over impulse control:</b></p> <p><b>Experiment 3 concerns procrastination. Explain procrastination in this study.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>The explanation listed by Tice et al. focuses on the emotional consequences of working versus engaging in alternative pursuits. Working toward assigned goals can be tedious or aversive, and when there are high expectations or pressures for good performance, working on tasks may generate anxiety and other forms of distress. Instead of working, people may find it more appealing to engage in play or leisure activities, which are intrinsically enjoyable. Other appropriate explanations are also acceptable.</p> <p>3 marks: appropriate explanation with important features of procrastination and understanding evident; 2 marks: appropriate explanation with some important features of procrastination; 1 mark: limited understanding; attempted explanation with poor understanding.</p>	<b>3</b>
1(b)	<p><b>For experiment 3, describe two ways in which quantitative data was gathered.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>Quantitative data was gathered through observation: 'The experimenter left the room for 15 minutes and observed the participants' behaviour through a one-way mirror. The experimenter had a metronome device that sounded a faint tone every 30 seconds, and she recorded what the participants were doing when the beep sounded. Three categories of responses were recorded: practising maths, playing with the games or magazines, and "other" (e.g. brushing hair, opening desk drawers and going through the contents, biting nails). The experimenter made a mark next to the category that best represented what the participants were doing when the metronome sounded'. Quantitative data was gathered through rating scales: At the end of the observation the experimenter returned to the participants. She asked participants to rate their moods, told them that they would not have to complete either the intelligence test or the colour matching test, and then asked the participants to estimate how much time they practised for the test and how much time they spent doing other things during the practice session.</p> <p>3 marks: both methods of gathering data accurately described with some elaboration; 2 marks: both methods of gathering data accurately described; 1 mark: both methods identified OR one method accurately described.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p><b>Briefly contrast qualitative data with quantitative data.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Quantitative: easy to replicate. Qualitative may be difficult to replicate.            Quantitative: can identify cause and effect relationships. Qualitative not really appropriate for cause and effect.            Quantitative: involves numbers and statistics. Qualitative often has no numbers and statistics.            Qualitative: often subjective and open to socially desirable answers unlike quantitative data.</p> <p>3 marks: one contrast accurately described with elaboration, or two (or more) contrasts described accurately;            2 marks: one contrast accurately described with some elaboration, or two (or more) contrasts described briefly;            1 mark: one contrast described, or two (or more) contrasts identified.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>Outline one definition of the term ‘abnormality’.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>Several possibilities:            ‘Deviation from statistical norms’: following a normal distribution curve, anyone at the extreme end is by definition, abnormal.            ‘Deviation from ideal mental health’: if there are agreed characteristics and abilities that people who are normal should possess, those who do not have these features will be considered to be abnormal.            ‘Failure to function adequately’: every person should have a sense of well-being. If an individual fails to achieve this, then they could be said to fail to function adequately.            ‘Deviation from social norms’: in every society norms for appropriate behaviours exist. If an individual does not adhere to these norms then they could be classed as abnormal.</p> <p>3 marks: accurate and clearly explained definition with elaboration and understanding;            2 marks: accurate and clearly explained definition with some elaboration and understanding;            1 mark: definition partially explained.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>Outline one model of abnormality.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>There are 5 major models of abnormality: medical, psychodynamic, behavioural, cognitive and humanistic. Models derived from the above are to be credited.</p> <p>For a full answer candidates should refer to assumptions, explanation of abnormality and treatment following on from the assumptions.</p> <p>3 marks: accurate and clearly explained model with elaboration and understanding;</p> <p>2 marks: accurate and clearly explained model with some elaboration and understanding;</p> <p>1 mark: model partially explained.</p>	<b>3</b>
2(c)	<p><b>Suggest one weakness of the model of abnormality outlined in (b).</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Weaknesses of models can be based on:</p> <p>‘Internal’ weaknesses or contradictions within the model itself. For example, the psychodynamic model is based on the concept of id, ego, superego and subconscious mind, which may not actually exist.</p> <p>Consistency: whether theory applies in practice: does therapy match theory?</p> <p>Explanation: can the model adequately explain a wide range/all abnormalities?</p> <p>Contrasts with other approaches/models.</p> <p>3 marks: accurate and clearly explained weakness with elaboration (e.g. example) and understanding;</p> <p>2 marks: accurate and clearly explained weakness with some elaboration and understanding;</p> <p>1 mark: weakness partially explained.</p>	<b>3</b>

**Section B**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Describe case studies of dissociative disorders.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 12</p> <p>There are various forms of dissociative disorder: depersonalisation and dissociative identity disorder.</p> <p><b>Dissociative identity disorder</b> (formerly multiple personality disorder) is a mental condition whereby a single individual has two or more distinct identities or personalities, each with its own pattern of perceiving and interacting with the environment. The diagnosis requires that at least two personalities routinely take control of the individual's behaviour and that there is associated memory loss that goes beyond normal forgetfulness, often referred to as losing time or acute Dissociative Amnesia. <b>Depersonalisation</b> is an alteration in the perception or experience of the self so that one feels detached from, and as if one is an outside observer of, one's mental processes or body. It is the third most common psychological experience, after feelings of anxiety and feelings of depression, and often occurs after life threatening experiences, such as accidents, assault, or serious illness or injury.</p> <p>There are many case studies to choose from and a large number are listed in 'explore more' in addition to the 'famous' cases. Thigpen and Cleckley (1954) report who they call <b>Eve White, Eve Black and Jane</b>. Eventually Christine Sizemore announced that she had been 22 personalities altogether. The film <i>The Three Faces of Eve</i> documents the case. <b>David Fitzpatrick</b> – David Fitzpatrick, a 25-year-old British man, suffered Dissociative Amnesia on 4 December 2005 which wiped his entire memory clean, leaving him with no identity. The television documentary <i>Extraordinary People: The Man with No Past</i> documents his case.</p> <p>Simeon et al. (1997) in their article list three case histories: Mrs A, Mr B and Mr C.</p> <p>The study by Baker et al. (2003) lists 6 case studies.</p> <p>It is expected that candidates will refer to at least two case studies in their answers.</p>	<b>12</b>

Question	Answer	Marks		
3(a)	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</p> <p>The studies described are wide-ranging.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.</p> <p>The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout).</p> <p>Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1204 226 1337 293" style="text-align: center;"><b>marks</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1204 293 1337 689" style="text-align: center;">10–12</td> </tr> </table>	<b>marks</b>	10–12
	<b>marks</b>			
	10–12			
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.</p> <p>Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>The studies described cover a reasonable range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> <p>The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	7–9		
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.</p> <p>Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>The studies described cover a range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p> <p>The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	4–6		
<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief.</p> <p>Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak.</p> <p>The studies described focus on a narrow range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible.</p> <p>The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</p>	1–3			
<p>No or irrelevant answer.</p>	0			

Question	Answer	Marks						
3(b)	<p><b>Evaluate the methodology of case studies of dissociative disorders.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 16</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u> Strengths and weaknesses of case studies, sample, controls, procedure; Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative methods.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> Any relevant debate can be raised, such as objective versus subjective data (case studies are largely subjective), snapshot versus longitudinal studies (case studies usually longitudinal), extent of ecological validity (case studies often conducted as part of life itself), nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics (possible deception by the participant?), validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 927 1326 1877"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 927 1203 978"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 927 1326 978">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 978 1203 1447"> <p>Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.</p> <p>Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 978 1326 1447">13–16</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1447 1203 1877"> <p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1447 1326 1877">10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	<p>Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.</p> <p>Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.</p>	13–16	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.</p>	10–12	16
	marks							
<p>Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.</p> <p>Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.</p>	13–16							
<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.</p>	10–12							



Question	Answer	Marks		
3(b)	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are good. Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. Limited use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is good.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1206 226 1337 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1206 293 1337 723">7–9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	7–9
	marks			
	7–9			
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is adequate. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) show some competency. Selection and range of arguments are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Occasional use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation is brief and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is adequate.</p>	4–6		
<p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) is adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–3			
No or irrelevant answer.	0			

Question	Answer	Marks						
4(a)	<p><b>Describe the behavioural explanation of anxiety disorders.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 12</p> <p>Several aspects could be considered here. Even though it is not mentioned on the specification, 'Free-floating' anxiety is a generalised term for panic disorder and generalised anxiety disorder. In addition any specific disorder could be included, such as:</p> <p><b>Phobic disorders</b> are irrational fears or desperation to avoid a particular object or situation. DSM has three types: agoraphobia, social phobia and a specific phobia. There are many varieties of specific phobias, perhaps the most common being acrophobia.</p> <p><b>Explanations</b> for phobic disorders come from the behavioural approach where Watson was the first to classically condition a fear into a child, namely little Albert. The view is that all phobias are learned.</p> <p><b>Obsessive-compulsive disorder:</b> obsessions – recurring thoughts that interfere with normal behaviour; compulsions – recurring actions which the individual is forced to enact. Obsessive-compulsive – irresistible thoughts or actions that must be acted on. There can be obsessions and compulsions and more commonly a mixture of the two.</p> <p><b>Explanations:</b> Behavioural view is that hypercritical, demanding parents reward similar behaviour in children and therefore this is another instance of maladaptive learning.</p> <p>In addition, any other valid description should be credited.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 1171 1326 1977"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th data-bbox="1206 1171 1326 1223">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1223 1206 1619">           Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1223 1326 1619">10–12</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1619 1206 1977">           Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1619 1326 1977">7–9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.	10–12	Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	7–9	12
	marks							
Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.	10–12							
Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	7–9							

Question	Answer	Marks								
4(a)	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a limited range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p> </td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">4–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td> <p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak. The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</p> </td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">1–3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a limited range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	4–6	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak. The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</p>	1–3	No or irrelevant answer.	0	
	marks									
<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a limited range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	4–6									
<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak. The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</p>	1–3									
No or irrelevant answer.	0									
4(b)	<p><b>Discuss the behavioural model of anxiety disorders with reference to alternative explanations.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 16</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p><u>Evaluation of the behavioural model itself:</u> Internal strengths and weaknesses; Theoretical issues: reductionism, determinism, scientific nature of approach; Supporting/contradicting evidence.</p> <p><u>Comparisons and contrasts with alternative models:</u> Most likely psychodynamic approach and its explanations for anxiety disorders, such as anxiety being traced to anal stage; Applications from alternative models may be used e.g. Freud outlined the case study of little Hans who had a phobia of horses; Also biological model where it has been shown that obsessive-compulsives have increased activity in frontal lobe of left hemisphere.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> Any relevant debate can be raised, such as objective versus subjective data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p>	<b>16</b>								

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	<p>Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.</p> <p>Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches is extensive.</p>	<p><b>marks</b></p> <p>13–16</p>
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.</p>	10–12
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are good.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident.</p> <p>Limited use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are good.</p>	7–9
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is adequate.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) show some competency.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Occasional use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is brief and quality of written communication is good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are adequate.</p>	4–6

Question	Answer		Marks		
4(b)	<p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative.  Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate.  Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident.  Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question.  Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible.  Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1206 226 1342 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1206 293 1342 656">1–3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	1–3	
	marks				
1–3					
No or irrelevant answer.	0				

**Section C**

Question	Answer	Marks						
5(a)	<p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest the design of a questionnaire to test schizotypy.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 8</p> <p>Schizotypy is a psychological concept which describes a continuum of personality characteristics and experiences related in particular to schizophrenia.</p> <p>The dimensional approach, influenced by personality theory, argues that full-blown psychotic illness is just the most extreme end of the schizotypy spectrum and there is a natural continuum between people with low and high levels of schizotypy.</p> <p>This really does exist! Adrian Raine has devised a personality test called the SPQ, the Schizotypal Personality Questionnaire, the first three items of which appear below:</p> <p>Please answer each item by checking Y (Yes) or N (No). Answer all items even if unsure of your answer. When you have finished, check over each one to make sure you have answered them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do you sometimes feel that things you see on the TV or read in the newspaper have a special meaning for you ? Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>2. I sometimes avoid going to places where there will be many people because I will get anxious. Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>3. Have you had experiences with the supernatural ? Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ol> <p>Candidates have the freedom to devise any type of questionnaire (forced choice or Likert type) with an appropriate way of scoring it. The test items included will demonstrate the extent of their knowledge about schizophrenia.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 1305 1326 1805"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge.</p> <p>Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.</p> </td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td> <p>Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge.</p> <p>Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> </td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">5–6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	<p>Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge.</p> <p>Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.</p>	7–8	<p>Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge.</p> <p>Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p>	5–6	<b>8</b>
	marks							
<p>Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge.</p> <p>Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.</p>	7–8							
<p>Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge.</p> <p>Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p>	5–6							

Question	Answer		Marks
5(a)	<p>Suggestions are largely appropriate to the question and based largely on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p>	<b>marks</b>	
	<p>Suggestion is peripheral to the question and vaguely based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes has coherence and is brief. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient.</p>	3–4	
	No or irrelevant answer.	1–2	
		0	

Question	Answer	Marks										
5(b)	<p><b>Explain the types and characteristics of schizophrenia on which your questionnaire is based.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 6</p> <p>5 main types of schizophrenia with characteristics:</p> <p><b>Hebephrenic:</b> incoherence, disorganised behaviour, disorganised delusions and vivid hallucinations.  <b>Simple:</b> gradual withdrawal from reality.  <b>Catatonic:</b> impairment of motor activity, often holding same position for hours/days.  <b>Paranoid:</b> well-organised, delusional thoughts (and hallucinations), but high level of awareness.  <b>Undifferentiated/untypical:</b> for all the others who do not fit the above!</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 790 1326 1771"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th data-bbox="1206 790 1326 835">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 835 1206 1133">           Quality of explanation and depth of argument are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The issue is effectively explained in relation to the topic area.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 835 1326 1133">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1133 1206 1431">           Quality of explanation and depth of argument are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The issue is adequately explained in relation to the topic area.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1133 1326 1431">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1431 1206 1729">           Quality of explanation and depth of argument are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and is brief. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The relationship between the issue and topic area is identifiable.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1431 1326 1729">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1729 1206 1771">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1206 1729 1326 1771">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The issue is effectively explained in relation to the topic area.	5–6	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The issue is adequately explained in relation to the topic area.	3–4	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and is brief. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The relationship between the issue and topic area is identifiable.	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	6
	marks											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The issue is effectively explained in relation to the topic area.	5–6											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The issue is adequately explained in relation to the topic area.	3–4											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and is brief. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The relationship between the issue and topic area is identifiable.	1–2											
No or irrelevant answer.	0											



**Psychology and Crime****Section A**

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	<p><b>From the study by Rubin, Brewin, Greenberg, Simpson and Wessely on psychological and behavioural reactions to the London bombings of 2005:</b></p> <p><b>Outline three results from the study.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>Results: many to choose from:</p> <p>31% of Londoners reported substantial stress and 32% reported an intention to travel less            Having difficulty contacting friends or family by mobile phone            Having thought you could have been injured or killed            Being Muslim was associated with a greater presence of substantial stress            Being white and having previous experience of terrorism were associated with reduced stress            Only 12 participants (1%) felt that they needed professional help to deal with their emotional response to the attacks.</p> <p>3 marks: any three of the above described clearly 1 mark each;            2 marks: any two of the above described clearly 1 mark each;            1 mark: any one of the above described clearly 1 mark.</p>	<b>3</b>
6(b)	<p><b>Briefly describe the method used to gather data.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>The method is a telephone survey, and specifically:</p> <p>‘Market and Opinion Research International (MORI) conducted a telephone survey by using a random digit dialling method for all London telephone numbers. The survey used proportional quota sampling, a standard method for opinion polls that entails setting quotas for participants on a range of demographic factors and ensures that the sample interviewed is representative of the population of interest. In this survey, we set quotas with regard to sex, age, working status, residential location, housing tenure, and ethnicity to make our sample representative of the demographic distribution of London as shown in the most recent census data. We invited people aged 18 or over and who spoke English to participate in an interview about “issues facing Londoners”. The 20-minute interviews took place in the evenings from Monday 18 July to Wednesday 20 July 2005.’</p> <p>Clearly not all this detail is required, but the salient points.</p> <p>3 marks: detailed answer with accuracy in description of method;            2 marks: limited answer with some accuracy of method;            1 mark: poor answer with vague description of details of method.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
6(c)	<p><b>Suggest an implication of the findings.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Speculative suggestion required, so any appropriate answer to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is no evidence of widespread desire for professional counselling (as concluded by Rubin et al.);</li> <li>• differences between being Muslim and white suggest further research is required;</li> <li>• people experience substantial stress (31%) but only 1% feel the need for help – why is this? Lack of confidence in psychological services or sufficient confidence in own ability to cope with stress.</li> </ul> <p>3 marks: appropriate implication with elaboration and understanding; 2 marks: appropriate implication with some elaboration and/or some understanding; 1 mark: peripherally appropriate implication with little or no elaboration. Limited understanding.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	<p><b>Outline the rational choice theory of criminal behaviour.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>The <b>rational choice theory</b> was proposed by Cook (1980). He believes that potential criminals weigh the positive and negative consequences of their actions and commit a crime only if it is in their interest to do so. People respond differently to equivalent criminal opportunities because they differ in their willingness to take risks.</p> <p>More specifically: 1. offenders seek benefit through criminal behaviour; 2. criminal behaviour involves making decisions and choices, however basic; 3. the decision-making process is constrained by time so the rationality is limited; 4. there will be many individual differences at different stages in the decision-making process.</p> <p>3 marks: detailed answer with rational choice theory described clearly with understanding; 2 marks: limited answer with rational choice theory described with some understanding; 1 mark: poor answer with an attempt to describe rational choice theory.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
7(b)	<p><b>Compare rational choice theory with an alternative cognitive theory of criminal behaviour.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Most likely is: the 1976 'The Criminal Personality' by Samenow and Yochelson embracing the idea that a person has full control over the choices they make. Consequently, a person who fails to diagnose his choices correctly will be more likely to make a bad one. They list various thinking errors or cognitive distortions believing that crime is the result of illogical or distorted thinking.</p> <p>An alternative cognitive theory is that of Felson, who outlines routine activity theory. This says that crime is normal and depends on the opportunities available. If a target is not protected enough, and if the reward is worth it, crime will happen. Crime does not need hardened offenders, super-predators, convicted felons or wicked people. Crime just needs an opportunity.</p> <p>3 marks: appropriate comparison with elaboration and understanding; 2 marks: appropriate comparison with some elaboration and/or some understanding; 1 mark: comparison with little or no elaboration. Limited understanding.</p>	<b>3</b>
7(c)	<p><b>Contrast rational choice theory with a theory of criminal behaviour from a different approach.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Learning theory e.g. Sutherland (1939) is best known for defining <u>differential association</u> which is a general theory of crime and delinquency that explains how deviants come to learn the motivations and the technical knowledge for deviant or criminal activity. Akers and Burgess (1966) developed the Social Learning Theory to explain <u>deviancy</u> by combining variables which encouraged delinquency (e.g. the social pressure from delinquent peers) with variables that discouraged delinquency (e.g. the parental response to discovering delinquency in their children).</p> <p>Genetic/biological explanations e.g. Mednick (1987) argues for genetic factors in the etiology of criminal behaviour and Raine et al. (1997) look at cortical and subcortical activity in PET scans of murderers claiming to be not guilty.</p> <p>Candidates who have awareness of approaches can contrast the major assumptions of each – but must relate them to explanations of crime.</p> <p>3 marks: appropriate contrast with alternative approach with elaboration and understanding; 2 marks: appropriate contrast with alternative approach and/or some understanding; 1 mark: contrast with little or no elaboration. Limited or no understanding of alternative approach.</p>	<b>3</b>

**Section B**

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	<p><b>Using examples, describe psychological approaches to offender profiling.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 12</p> <p>Answers may look at definitions: Douglas et al. (1986) described offender profiling as ‘a technique for identifying the major personality and behavioural characteristics of an individual based upon an analysis of the crimes he or she has committed’. Rossmo (2000) claimed that the profiling process is based on the premise that the ‘interpretation of crime scene evidence can indicate the personality type of the individual(s) who committed the offence’.</p> <p>Alison et al. (2003) review profiling and argue that: (a) most current profiling methods rely on a naive and outdated understanding of personality and the trait approach; (b) global traits, or broad personality types, are unlikely to be useful in predicting criminal behaviour; (c) it is unlikely that the classification of offenders into broad personality types would enable the profiler to relate clusters of sociodemographic characteristics to different types; (d) a theoretical framework that emphasises the importance of Person-Situation interactions in generating behaviour may lead to a more productive research endeavour; and (e) profiling should be used with extreme caution in criminal investigations, and not at all as evidence in court, until research demonstrates its predictive validity.</p> <p>Pinizzotto and Finkel (1990) described the steps that lead to profiling inferences. Professional profilers: (a) assess the type of criminal act with reference to individuals who have committed similar acts previously, (b) thoroughly analyse the crime scene, (c) scrutinise the background of the victim as well as any possible suspects, and (d) establish the likely motivations of all parties involved. Finally, a description of the perpetrator is generated from the characteristics supposedly connected with such an individual’s ‘psychological make-up’.</p> <p>Another focus can be behavioural consistency, the repetition of particular aspects of behaviour if the same offender engages in the same type of offense again (Canter, 1995).</p> <p>Numerous studies have provided some support for the notion of offender consistency, e.g. Green et al. (1976) looked at the consistency of behaviours displayed by different burglars of residential properties.</p> <p>Many case studies exist of where profiling has been successful: In 1986, Canter was invited to compose British crime’s first offender profile. When John Duffy was later arrested, charged and convicted, it turned out 13 of Canter’s 17 proclamations about the perpetrator were accurate.</p> <p>It is also highly likely that candidates will compare the US approach (pioneered by the FBI) and the UK approach, preferred by Canter, Alison and Salfati.</p>	12

Question	Answer	Marks		
8(a)	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</p> <p>The theories/studies described are wide-ranging.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.</p> <p>The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout).</p> <p>Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1204 226 1337 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1204 293 1337 689">10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	10–12
	marks			
	10–12			
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.</p> <p>Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> <p>The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	7–9		
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.</p> <p>Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>The theories/studies described cover a limited range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p> <p>The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	4–6		
<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief.</p> <p>Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak.</p> <p>The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible.</p> <p>The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</p>	1–3			
No or irrelevant answer.	0			

Question	Answer	Marks				
8(b)	<p><b>Compare and contrast psychological approaches to offender profiling.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 16</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p><u>Comparison and contrast</u> between British and United States approaches, such as investigation procedure itself; Also possible is comparison between individual approaches such as that by Canter and the FBI; Further success rates of each approach may be compared.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of approach itself:</u> Internal strengths and weaknesses; Theoretical issues: reductionism, determinism, ethnocentrism; Supporting/contradicting evidence.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u> Strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure; Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative approaches.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> Any relevant debate can be raised, such as objective versus subjective data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 1238 1326 1756"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 1238 1203 1290"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 1238 1326 1290">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1290 1203 1756">           Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive.            Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive.            Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.            Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.            Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.            Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.            Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1290 1326 1756">13–16</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.	13–16	16
	marks					
Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.	13–16					

Question	Answer	Marks		
8(b)	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1206 226 1342 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1206 293 1342 723">10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	10–12
	marks			
	10–12			
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.</p>	10–12		
<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are good. Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. Limited use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are good.</p>	7–9			
<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is adequate. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) show some competency. Selection and range of arguments are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Occasional use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation is brief and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are adequate.</p>	4–6			



Question	Answer		Marks		
8(b)	<p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative.  Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate.  Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident.  Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question.  Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible.  Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1209 241 1337 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1209 293 1337 656">1–3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	1–3	
	marks				
1–3					
No or irrelevant answer.	0				



Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	<p><b>Describe ‘treatments’ for offenders.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 12</p> <p>Candidates should focus on attempts to rehabilitate offenders, particularly anger management and behavioural treatments or specifically treatments for sex offenders.</p> <p>Candidates may describe meta-analyses e.g. Garrett (1985) looked at 111 studies published between 1960 and 1983 involving some 13000 offenders. She concluded that there was no significant difference made in reoffending rates between those on a programme and those not. However, most programmes were only short-term. Gottschalk et al. (1987) in a similar analysis concluded the same.</p> <p>Most programmes are behavioural. The ‘scared straight’ programme uses fear arousal tactics. This is not successful and Finkenaur (1982) found offenders were more likely to reoffend following this programme. Token economy programmes may also be included.</p> <p>Another area of focus may be anger management techniques. Most common here is that of Novaco (1978) which involves cognitive restructuring and coping skills training. Stage 1 involves cognitive preparation, stage 2 skill acquisition and stage 3 application practice.</p> <p>The treatment of sex offenders also appears on the specification, and the main treatment programmes here are SOTP (sex offender treatment programme) and evaluation of it STEP 3 and STEP 4 published by HM prison service. It involves Group-work, known to be an effective way of delivering treatment and by joining a group, a sex offender publicly acknowledges his need to change. Group-work also provides a context in which socially acceptable values are conveyed and ‘normal’ social interactions reinforced.</p> <p>The treatment approach used is ‘cognitive-behavioural’. The ‘cognitive’ aspect involves recognising the patterns of distorted thinking which allow the contemplation of illegal sexual acts and understanding the impact which sexually abusive behaviour has on its victims. The ‘behavioural’ component of treatment involves reducing sexual arousal to inappropriate fantasies of forced sexual activities with children and adults.</p>	<b>12</b>

Question	Answer	Marks		
9(a)	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</p> <p>The theories/studies described are wide-ranging.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.</p> <p>The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout).</p> <p>Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1204 226 1337 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1204 293 1337 689">10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	10–12
	marks			
	10–12			
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.</p> <p>Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> <p>The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	7–9		
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.</p> <p>Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>The theories/studies described cover a limited range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p> <p>The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	4–6		
<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief.</p> <p>Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak.</p> <p>The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible.</p> <p>The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</p>	1–3			
No or irrelevant answer.	0			

Question	Answer	Marks				
9(b)	<p><b>Discuss the extent to which treatments of offenders successfully reduce recidivism.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 16</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Candidates should define recidivism and address this throughout their answers.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of theory underlying research:</u> Internal strengths and weaknesses; Theoretical issues: reductionism, determinism; Supporting/contradicting evidence; Comparisons and contrasts with alternative theory.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u> Strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure; Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative approaches.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> Any relevant debate can be raised, such as objective versus subjective data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 1205 1326 1720"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 1205 1203 1256"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 1205 1326 1256">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1256 1203 1720"> <p>Discussion (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1256 1326 1720">13–16</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	<p>Discussion (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.</p>	13–16	16
	marks					
<p>Discussion (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.</p>	13–16					

Question	Answer	Marks		
9(b)	<p>Discussion (positive and negative points) is very good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1204 226 1337 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1204 293 1337 723">10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	10–12
	marks			
	10–12			
	<p>Discussion (positive and negative points) is good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are good. Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. Limited use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are good.</p>	7–9		
	<p>Discussion (positive and negative points) is adequate. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) show some competency. Selection and range of arguments are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Occasional use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation is brief and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are adequate.</p>	4–6		
<p>Discussion: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–3			
No or irrelevant answer.	0			

**Section C**

Question	Answer	Marks						
10(a)	<p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology suggest an appropriate interview technique that would give the best chance of detecting whether or not your suspect was telling lies.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 8</p> <p>There are three main interview styles used by the police:</p> <p>Accusatory, information-gathering and behaviour analysis, and reveal verbal cues to deceit.</p> <p>Specific to telling lies: Police manuals recommend several approaches to help investigators decide whether they are being told the truth. The main focus is on visual cues such as avoidance of eye contact and body movement (e.g. fidgeting), as well as stuttering, whilst the Baseline Method strategy sees investigators compare a suspect's verbal and non-verbal responses during 'small talk' at the beginning of interview with those in the interview proper. A third, the Behavioural Analysis Interview (BAI) strategy, comprises a list of questions to which it is suggested liars and those telling the truth will give different verbal and non-verbal responses.</p> <p>It is claimed in recent research that this approach is false.</p> <p>In fact, Vrij claims that practised liars often behave unnaturally calmly, making fewer gestures and giving a rehearsed and rigid impression to onlookers. They slow down to think about their answers, using fewer gestures and maintaining eye contact as they concentrate on putting together a plausible falsehood.</p> <p>For candidates dipping into 'explore more', the latest research by Vrij (2007) has found that interviewers paying attention to visual cues proved significantly worse at distinguishing liars from those telling the truth than those looking for speech-related cues. In another experiment, it was found that liars appeared less nervous and more helpful than those telling the truth – contrary to the advice of the BAI strategy. Other similar articles have appeared in 'The Psychologist' in 2007.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 1581 1326 2078"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th data-bbox="1206 1581 1326 1630">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1630 1206 1854">           Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge.            Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1630 1326 1854">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1854 1206 2078">           Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge.            Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1854 1326 2078">5–6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.	7–8	Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.	5–6	8
	marks							
Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.	7–8							
Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.	5–6							

Question	Answer	Marks		
10(a)	<p>Suggestions are largely appropriate to the question and based largely on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1206 226 1342 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1206 293 1342 517">3–4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	3–4
	marks			
	3–4			
<p>Suggestion is peripheral to the question and vaguely based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes has coherence and is brief. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient.</p>	1–2			
No or irrelevant answer.	0			

Question	Answer	Marks
10(b)	<p><b>Explain why your choice of technique might not be effective with every suspect.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 6</p> <p>Any appropriate explanation to receive credit. Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No technique will apply to every person as there are individual differences in non-verbal communication such as in use of eye contact.</li> <li>Those who are autistic for example avoid eye contact; it does not mean they tell lies.</li> <li>Any technique will be a generalisation – it will apply to most people most of the time, but not all the people all the time.</li> <li>There can be cultural differences in non-verbal communication: there are differences in preference for personal space for example and there are cultural specific gestures which may or may not be understood by all.</li> <li>To assume people from all cultures will behave the same is to be ethnocentric, and psychologists should be fully aware to avoid this.</li> <li>People vary in levels of intelligence and how skilled or not they are at (a) understanding how to tell a lie and (b) successfully carrying it off when being interviewed.</li> <li>Some people are high self monitors, being fully aware of how they behave in the presence of others, and some people are low self monitors.</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>
		<b>marks</b>
<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The issue is effectively explained in relation to the topic area.</p>		5–6
<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The issue is adequately explained in relation to the topic area.</p>		3–4
<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and is brief. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The relationship between the issue and topic area is identifiable.</p>		1–2
No or irrelevant answer.		0

**Psychology and Environment****Section A**

Question	Answer	Marks
11(a)	<p><b>From the study by North, Shilcock and Hargreaves on musical style and consumer spending:</b></p> <p><b>Identify the dependent variables and how they were measured.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>Specifically ‘The dependent variables investigated were spending on starters, main courses, desserts, coffee, bar drinks, wine, total amount spent on food, total amount spent on drinks, and total overall spend. Each party of diners contributed one data point for each of these variables with the values calculated by dividing spending for each party within each category by the number of people in that party. The restaurant’s billing system did not allow investigation of spending on a person-by-person basis. Measures were also taken of the amount of time elapsing between the party being seated and paying their bill, because this represents an obvious confound on customer spending.’</p> <p>3 marks: detailed answer with accuracy of nearly all of the above details; 2 marks: limited answer with some of the above features identified; 1 mark: one or two features of the above identified, or many but with inaccuracies.</p>	<b>3</b>



Question	Answer	Marks
11(b)	<p><b>Give one explanation for the findings and suggest a weakness of it.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>There are at least three possible explanations:</p> <p>(1) the classical music was synergistic with other aspects of the restaurant atmosphere and this synergy promoted spending. However, this cannot explain why North and Hargreaves (1998) found that classical music increased spending in a student cafeteria (in which, as they noted, classical music was not synergistic with other atmospheric variables such as décor).</p> <p>(2) classical music was simply preferred by the participants, and some form of transfer effect meant that liking for the music fed through into increased spending. Unfortunately, neither the present research nor that by Areni and Kim (1993) and North and Hargreaves provided data on customers' musical preferences, such that musical preference remains a possible explanation (although it seems implausible that student participants would have preferred classical over pop music).</p> <p>(3) classical music promotes an upmarket atmosphere, and this primes contextually appropriate, congruent behaviour – namely, increased purchase intentions. North and Hargreaves provided data directly showing that classical music led to their cafeteria being perceived as more upmarket than did other musical styles (including pop), such that this remains an appealing explanation of the present results. Indeed, the two courses that gave rise to significant differences between the conditions – namely, starters and coffee – are optional items at the beginning and end of the meal. It is tempting to speculate that the diners in the classical music condition decided to treat themselves by spending more on these parts of their meal. Indeed, informal comments made by customers to the experimenter in the restaurant indicated further that classical music promoted a more upmarket perception.</p> <p>3 marks: detailed answer with accuracy of both explanation and weakness; 2 marks: limited answer with either partial explanation and weakness or explanation only; 1 mark: explanation identified, but inaccurately described with partial attempt to explain weakness.</p>	<b>3</b>
11(c)	<p><b>Suggest an implication of the findings.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Speculative suggestion required, so any appropriate answer to receive credit. Most likely: commercial implications – type of music introduced to increase customer spending. Comment could also look at various settings where classical music would be inappropriate and other types of music advantageous.</p> <p>3 marks: appropriate implication with elaboration and understanding; 2 marks: appropriate implication with some elaboration and/or some understanding; 1 mark: peripherally appropriate implication with little or no elaboration. Limited understanding.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
12(a)	<p><b>Outline one real-life example of a type of crowd behaviour.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p><b>The acquisitive crowd:</b> This type of crowd seeks some economic gain, e.g. shoppers in sales. Anecdotal evidence from Mrs Vaught (1928) at the time of the Great Depression where banks closed and people panicked (people pushed then fought for places nearer to cashiers' windows) to withdraw their money. Although the bank had plenty of money, two cashiers withdrew all their money too. There are many real-life examples of this behaviour: Pushing and injuries at IKEA stores in Saudi Arabia and Edmonton, London.</p> <p><b>The apathetic crowd:</b> <i>Real-life</i> event of Kitty Genovese, where 38 people heard screams but no-one phoned for police. Behaviour explained by diffusion of responsibility and pluralistic ignorance.</p> <p><b>The peaceful crowd:</b> At <i>real-life</i> sporting event or at a pop concert there are positive forms of collective consciousness such as excitement. <b>Benewick &amp; Holton (1987)</b> interviewed people attending the visit of the Pope to Britain in 1982. 82000 people attended an open-air mass. For many it was an intensely personal and joyful experience but heightened by feelings of belonging and sharing and with so many others.</p> <p><b>The baiting crowd:</b> In 1964 there was the case of a man, standing on the ledge of a building ten storeys high. The crowd below of some 500 people shouted to him to jump off the ledge. When rescued, the crowd jeered. <b>Mann (1981)</b> has recorded ten instances of similar <i>real-life</i> events of taunting mob behaviour. If a person is more than 12 storeys high, baiting is less. The baiting crowd seems to be culture specific to US – no reports from Europe or the rest of the world.</p> <p><b>The escaping crowd:</b> Two <i>real-life</i> examples illustrate: In 1903 a fire in a Chicago theatre saw people panicking and stampeding in their desperation to escape. 602 lives were lost. A second example is the tragedy that occurred in a Chinese cinema in 1994. All the exits were blocked and panic developed as the children could not escape. 300 died.</p> <p><b>The aggressive crowd:</b> The aggressive crowd has anti-social intent, usually has a target and is often referred to as a mob. There are many examples particularly from football. In one case hundreds of Chinese football fans rioted in Xian after the referee awarded a late penalty to the visiting team.</p> <p>Any of the above types acceptable and any appropriate illustrative example. NB Example must be real-life, but it does not have to be one of those indicated above.</p> <p>3 marks: detailed answer with type identified and appropriate real-life illustration of it; 2 marks: limited answer with type identified and appropriate real-life illustration of it; 1 mark: poor answer with type identified but illustration is either missing, inappropriate or largely incorrect.</p>	3

Question	Answer	Marks
12(b)	<p><b>Comment on why this behaviour may not occur in all cultures.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>There is no correct answer for this; it is an invitation for speculation.</p> <p>3 marks: logical comment with elaboration and understanding; 2 marks: logical comment with some elaboration and/or some understanding; 1 mark: comment with little or no elaboration. Limited understanding.</p>	<b>3</b>
12(c)	<p><b>Contrast one type of crowd behaviour with another type of crowd behaviour.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Two types of crowd must be identified and at least one contrast must be made. Contrast must include both sides, i.e. x is this, but y is that. Most likely: Intention underlying behaviour; level of emotion or arousal involved; intent to harm or hurt others. Any appropriate contrast to receive credit.</p> <p>3 marks: two types identified with one detailed, appropriate contrast, or two appropriate contrasts with less detail; 2 marks: two types identified with limited, appropriate contrast, or two appropriate contrasts identified; 1 mark: two types identified with an attempt to contrast.</p>	<b>3</b>

**Section B**

Question	Answer	Marks								
13(a)	<p><b>Describe the key study by Aginsky, Harris, Rensink and Beusmans on learning a route in a driving simulator.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 12</p> <p>The study challenges the belief that there are three distinct types of spatial knowledge (landmark, route, and survey knowledge), that are acquired sequentially during spatial learning and development. Using a driving simulator, a Nissan 240sx convertible, participants follow a route which includes many features such as landmarks, cross-roads, etc. Participants then have to draw a sketch-map of the route adding as much detail as they can. Results show that participants follow either a visually dominated or a spatially dominated strategy.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 786 1326 1957"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 786 1203 837"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 786 1326 837">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 837 1203 1234">           Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 837 1326 1234">10–12</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1234 1203 1597">           Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1234 1326 1597">7–9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1597 1203 1957">           Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a limited range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1597 1326 1957">4–6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.	10–12	Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	7–9	Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a limited range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	4–6	12
	marks									
Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.	10–12									
Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	7–9									
Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a limited range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	4–6									

Question	Answer	Marks						
13(a)	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak. The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">1–3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak. The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.	1–3	No or irrelevant answer.	0	
	marks							
Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak. The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.	1–3							
No or irrelevant answer.	0							
13(b)	<p><b>Evaluate the key study by Aginsky, Harris, Rensink and Beusmans on learning a route in a driving simulator.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 16</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p><u>Evaluation of theory:</u> Internal strengths and weaknesses (e.g. insufficient evidence for the additional stage); Theoretical issues: relationship to similar research e.g. McGuire; Supporting/contradicting evidence; Comparisons and contrasts with alternative theory.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of methodology:</u> Strengths and weaknesses of methods (e.g. sketch map), sample, controls, procedure; Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative approaches.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> Any relevant debate can be raised, such as objective versus subjective data (sketch maps are subjective), snapshot versus longitudinal studies (study is snapshot), extent of ecological validity (driving simulator is not real life), nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p>	<b>16</b>						

Question	Answer	Marks
13(b)	<p>Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.</p> <p>Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.</p>	<p><b>marks</b></p> <p>13–16</p>
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.</p>	<p>10–12</p>
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are good.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident.</p> <p>Limited use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are good.</p>	<p>7–9</p>
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is adequate.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) show some competency.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Occasional use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is brief and quality of written communication is good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are adequate.</p>	<p>4–6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks						
13(b)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</td> <td>1–3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.	1–3	No or irrelevant answer.	0	
	marks							
Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.	1–3							
No or irrelevant answer.	0							

Question	Answer	Marks				
14(a)	<p><b>Describe what psychologists have learned about crowding and density in animals.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 12</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p><b>Animal studies</b> by Dubos (1965) on lemmings; Christian (1960) on deer and Calhoun (1962) on rats. <b>Dubos</b> claimed that lemmings would periodically jump off the edge of a cliff; biological pre-programming to reduce numbers and so avoid crowding. Much debate on this as many claim it is not true and based on false evidence created by the Disney film <i>White Wilderness</i>. <b>Christian</b> found that sika deer placed on James Island in 1911 lived happily until stress caused by crowding caused over half the herd to die. Both these studies are 'natural'. The study by <b>Calhoun</b> is laboratory based. Calhoun created a 'behavioural sink' a 'rat city' in which rats could live comfortably until breeding created crowding and the behaviour of the rats changed drastically.</p> <p>In addition to the above any other relevant animal study could be used.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.</td> <td>10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.	10–12	12
	marks					
Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.	10–12					



Question	Answer	Marks			
14(a)	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1206 226 1342 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1206 293 1342 651">7–9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	7–9	
	marks				
	7–9				
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a limited range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	4–6			
<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge is adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak. The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</p>	1–3				
No or irrelevant answer.	0				
14(b)	<p><b>Debate the use of animals in psychological research.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 16</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p><u>Evaluation of methodology used to study animals:</u> Laboratory versus natural studies; Capturing animals and problems when research has ended; Ethics of animal studies.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u> Usefulness of findings from research; Generalisations from animals to humans; Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative non-animal approaches.</p>	<b>16</b>			



Question	Answer	Marks
14(b)	<p><u>Evaluation of approaches:</u> Biological/instinctive nature of animal behaviour compared with behaviourist view; Ethology could also be included.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> Any relevant debate can be raised, such as objective versus subjective data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p>	
		<b>marks</b>
<p>Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.</p>		13–16
<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.</p>		10–12
<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are good. Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. Limited use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are good.</p>		7–9

Question	Answer	Marks		
14(b)	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is adequate. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) show some competency. Selection and range of arguments are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Occasional use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation is brief and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are adequate.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1203 226 1339 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1203 293 1339 723">4–6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	4–6
	marks			
	4–6			
<p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–3			
No or irrelevant answer.	0			

**Section C**

Question	Answer	Marks								
15(a)	<p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology suggest how a psychologist could trial ways to evacuate safely and efficiently large numbers of people from a 5-storey building that is on fire.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 8</p> <p>Several options available:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conduct a laboratory experiment along the lines of that by Mintz (1951) or follow-up studies.</li> <li>2. Give a questionnaire inviting people to suggest what they would do or how they would behave. Problem here is that there is no emergency situation and people can often not predict how they would actually behave. Both these approaches are ethical but lack ecological validity.</li> <li>3. A simulation is possible, conducted in a real-life building. Here the ecological validity is high, but participants must be informed. It is extremely unethical if participants assume the emergency is real.</li> </ol> <p>Trials can be based on evacuation messages, such as those suggested by Loftus (1979), which are designed to evacuate people safely and without any ambiguity in what is said. A sense of urgency needs to be created without any panic. Use of 'hot spot' rather than the word FIRE.</p> <p>Trials can be based on the scripts of 'normal' behaviour; or they can be based on the work of Kugihara (2001).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 1167 1326 1890"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th data-bbox="1206 1167 1326 1218">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1218 1206 1442">           Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge.            Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1218 1326 1442">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1442 1206 1666">           Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge.            Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1442 1326 1666">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1666 1206 1890">           Suggestions are largely appropriate to the question and based largely on psychological knowledge.            Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1666 1326 1890">3–4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.	7–8	Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.	5–6	Suggestions are largely appropriate to the question and based largely on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.	3–4	8
	marks									
Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.	7–8									
Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.	5–6									
Suggestions are largely appropriate to the question and based largely on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.	3–4									

Question	Answer	Marks										
15(a)	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Suggestion is peripheral to the question and vaguely based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes has coherence and is brief. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient.</td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Suggestion is peripheral to the question and vaguely based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes has coherence and is brief. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient.	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0					
	marks											
Suggestion is peripheral to the question and vaguely based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes has coherence and is brief. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient.	1–2											
No or irrelevant answer.	0											
15(b)	<p><b>Explain the ethical issues that would be raised from your suggestions.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 6</p> <p>Research into emergency behaviour is complex. Recreating emergency situations is not possible because people may die (research into stampede and LeBon) and many real-life examples. Laboratory experiments can be done which would be ethical but lack ecological validity. Simulations are best but if participants give informed consent their behaviour may be artificial. Should they be deceived so they remain naïve? Clearly studies should not cause either psychological or physical harm. The issue of confidentiality may be mentioned also.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Quality of explanation and depth of argument are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The issue is effectively explained in relation to the topic area.</td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quality of explanation and depth of argument are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The issue is adequately explained in relation to the topic area.</td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quality of explanation and depth of argument are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent, and is brief. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The relationship between the issue and topic area is identifiable.</td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The issue is effectively explained in relation to the topic area.	5–6	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The issue is adequately explained in relation to the topic area.	3–4	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent, and is brief. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The relationship between the issue and topic area is identifiable.	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	<b>6</b>
	marks											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The issue is effectively explained in relation to the topic area.	5–6											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The issue is adequately explained in relation to the topic area.	3–4											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent, and is brief. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The relationship between the issue and topic area is identifiable.	1–2											
No or irrelevant answer.	0											

**Psychology and Health****Section A**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
16(a)	<p><b>From the study by McVey and Stapleton on anti-smoking:</b></p> <p><b>Explain the objective of the study.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>Precisely it is: 'To evaluate the effectiveness of the Health Education Authority for England's anti-smoking television advertising campaign in motivating smokers to give up and preventing relapse in those who had already given up.'</p> <p>3 marks: detailed answer with understanding; 2 marks: limited answer with some understanding of main objective; 1 mark: objective of study identified with no elaboration.</p>	<b>3</b>
16(b)	<p><b>Outline the experimental design and independent variable of the study.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>The design was independent groups as participants could not be in two regions at the same time. There were four conditions of the IV: One tv region received no intervention (controls), two tv regions received TV anti-smoking advertising (TV media), and one region received TV anti-smoking advertising plus locally organised anti-tobacco campaigning (TV media + LTCN).</p> <p>3 marks for correct identification of design and description of all four conditions of the IV; 2 marks for partially correct identification of both design and IV; 1 mark for partial identification of either design or IV.</p>	<b>3</b>
16(c)	<p><b>Suggest one advantage of how the effectiveness of this campaign was measured.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Effectiveness is 'how good' something is. If a measure is taken immediately after the event and people say they have given up smoking it is often concluded that the intervention is effective. But for how long does the effect last? To be effective there should be a measure after a period of time. In this study a follow-up was done after 18 months and it was found that 9.8% had stopped smoking.</p> <p>3 marks for accurate description and expansion of the measure of effectiveness (self report) and an advantage of this i.e. done 18 months later; 2 marks for partial description; 1 mark for basic identification.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
17(a)	<p><b>Outline one study that has measured stress using a questionnaire.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p><b>Holmes &amp; Rahe</b> (1967) suggest that life events cause people stress. Events, such as divorce, or death in the family cause stress; but Holmes and Rahe believe that more minor life events also cause stress, such as starting school. They also believe that positive events can be stressful, such as getting married, Christmas or going on holiday. They believe that people experiencing many life events (who achieve a high score on their Social Readjustment Rating Scale) are more susceptible to physical (e.g. sudden death and non-fatal heart attacks) and mental illnesses.</p> <p><b>Friedman &amp; Rosenman</b> (1974) suggest that those with a Type A personality are also more likely to suffer physical and mental illnesses. It is suggested that there are two different personality types: either a Type A personality or a Type B personality. Individuals who exhibit the Type A behaviour pattern react differently to stressors than do those with the Type B pattern. The Type A behaviour pattern consists of three characteristics: Competitive achievement orientation; Time urgency; Anger/hostility.</p> <p><b>Lazarus et al.</b> (1981) have argued that lesser events can also be stressful (e.g. bus being late, looking for lost keys). These are called daily hassles. Lazarus et al. devised the Hassles and Uplifts checklist to measure daily hassles.</p> <p>Any appropriate questionnaire to receive credit.</p> <p>3 marks: detailed answer, accurate description of questionnaire with understanding; 2 marks: limited answer mainly accurate description with some understanding; 1 mark: poor answer with some accuracy but with errors and limited understanding.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
17(b)	<p><b>Give three limitations of this study.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Any limitation is appropriate; 1 mark for each limitation.</p> <p>Possible answers for Holmes and Rahe:</p> <p>Questions are out of date e.g. mortgage under \$10 000  Questions heavily biased to 'middle-aged people'  Questions are based on US society \$/dollars</p> <p>There is no opportunity for individual differences: divorce scores 73 points for every person without exception.</p> <p>No account of variations e.g. mortgage over \$10 000 which could be of \$11 000 or \$200 000.</p> <p>Limitations could be of questionnaires: social desirability in answers; issues concerning reliability and validity. Applicability to real life.</p> <p>1 mark for each limitation.</p>	<b>3</b>
17(c)	<p><b>Comment on how the reliability of stress questionnaires can be tested.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Reliability concerns the consistency and the reliability of any questionnaire can be tested by test-re-test, split half, or alternate forms. Candidates can consider how stress questionnaires address these issues:</p> <p>3 marks: description of two (or more) tests of reliability related to stress questionnaires;  2 marks: partial description of two (or more) tests related to stress questionnaires OR one full description related to stress questionnaires;  1 mark: description of one test partially related to stress questionnaire.</p>	<b>3</b>

**Section B**

Question	Answer	Marks						
18(a)	<p><b>Describe ways in which adherence to medical requests has been measured.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 12</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Subjective [a] ask practitioner to estimate: Pitts et al. (1991) ‘it has been shown to be particularly pointless to use doctors’ estimates of compliance’. [b] ask patient to estimate (self report).</li> <li>2. Objective [a] quantity accounting (pill count) where number of pills remaining is measured. Norell (1979) studied glaucoma patients and developed an automatic eyedropper allowing continuous measurement of when and how many times the dropper was used. Cramer et al. (1989) devised microprocessor in pill cap. Records not only number of pills but time of day. Chung and Naya (2000) developed TrackCap for oral asthma medication. [b] Biochemical tests: it is possible to use blood tests or urine tests to measure how adherent a patient has been with their medication e.g. it is possible to estimate adherence with diet in renal patients by measuring the levels of potassium in their blood when they report for their next session of dialysis. A study by Roth (1987) is relevant here. [c] Better is recording number of repeat prescriptions from a pharmacy e.g. Sherman et al., (2000). [d] Best is recording number of appointments kept. This is 100% accurate. It is reliable and valid. It is not time-consuming and does not involve the patient in any direct assessment.</li> </ol>	<b>12</b>						
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 1167 1203 1211"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 1167 1326 1211">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1211 1203 1615">           Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.            Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.            The theories/studies described are wide-ranging.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.            The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout).            Quality of written communication is very good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1211 1326 1615">10–12</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1615 1203 1986">           Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.            Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.            The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.            The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1615 1326 1986">7–9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			marks	Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.	10–12	Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	7–9	
	marks							
Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.	10–12							
Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	7–9							



Question	Answer	Marks			
18(a)	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a limited range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1206 226 1342 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1206 293 1342 656">4–6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	4–6	
	marks				
	4–6				
<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak. The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</p>	1–3				
No or irrelevant answer.	0				
18(b)	<p><b>Compare and contrast methods used to measure adherence to medical requests.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 16</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p><u>Comparisons and contrasts:</u>            Subjective versus objective data;            Methods used to gather data e.g. self report and repeat prescription;            Supporting/contradicting evidence;            Effectiveness of method.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u>            Strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure;            Evaluation and comparisons and contrasts in relation to reliability, validity.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> Any relevant debate can be raised, such as objective versus subjective data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p>	16			

Question	Answer	Marks
18(b)	<p>Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.</p> <p>Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.</p>	<p><b>marks</b></p> <p>13–16</p>
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Good use of appropriate supporting examples and are related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.</p>	<p>10–12</p>
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are good.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident.</p> <p>Limited use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are good.</p>	<p>7–9</p>
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is adequate.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) show some competency.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Occasional use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is brief and quality of written communication is good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are adequate.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks						
18(b)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p> </td> <td>1–3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No or irrelevant answer</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	<p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–3	No or irrelevant answer	0	
	marks							
<p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–3							
No or irrelevant answer	0							

Question	Answer	Marks
19(a)	<p><b>Explain why doctor patient interactions are not always successful.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 12</p> <p>Most likely this area will be organised as follows:</p> <p>Confusion relating to non-verbal communication: Argyle outlines the functions of NVC and McKinstry and Wang's (1991) 'doctor dress study' supports this. They had ten photographs of the male doctor ranging in appearance from traditional (white coat, white shirt, tie and suit) to casual (no white coat, denim jeans, open-neck casual shirt). Patients preferred the traditional dress.</p> <p>Verbal communication: Many studies carried out by Ley (1988, 1989) focus on the importance of what is said by both doctor and patient. Aspects such as retention of information is also a factor. MacKinlay (1975) looked at jargon words used by practitioners on a labour ward: breech, mucus and purgative for example, and found that many patients did not know what they meant and did not ask either.</p> <p>Patient-practitioner style: Beckham and Frankel (1975) suggest that a doctor is either patient-centred or doctor-centred. Although most patients prefer a patient-centred style, Savage and Armstrong (1990) found that some patients preferred the doctor-centred approach.</p> <p>Doctor diagnosis could also be mentioned as could how a doctor informs patients of bad news. Marteau (1990) found that patients would rather hear that they have a 10% chance of survival rather than a 90% chance of failure.</p> <p>Disclosure of symptoms could also be included and the study by Robinson and West (1992) found that personal symptoms would be given to a 'computer doctor' but much less so to a real doctor.</p>	<b>12</b>

Question	Answer	Marks		
19(a)	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</p> <p>The theories/studies described are wide-ranging.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.</p> <p>The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout).</p> <p>Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1204 226 1337 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1204 293 1337 689">10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	10–12
	marks			
	10–12			
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.</p> <p>Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> <p>The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	7–9		
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.</p> <p>Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>The theories/studies described cover a limited range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p> <p>The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	4–6		
<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief.</p> <p>Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak.</p> <p>The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible.</p> <p>The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</p>	1–3			
No or irrelevant answer.	0			

Question	Answer	Marks						
19(b)	<p><b>Evaluate research which has investigated the doctor patient relationship.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 16</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u> Strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure; Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative approaches.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> Any relevant debate can be raised, such as objective versus subjective data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 891 1326 1850"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 891 1203 943"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 891 1326 943">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 943 1203 1413">           Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive.            Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive.            Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.            Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.            Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.            Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.            Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 943 1326 1413">13–16</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1413 1203 1850">           Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good.            Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed.            Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.            Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.            Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.            Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good.            Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are very good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1413 1326 1850">10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.	13–16	Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are very good.	10–12	16
	marks							
Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.	13–16							
Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are very good.	10–12							

Question	Answer	Marks		
19(b)	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are good. Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. Limited use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are good.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1203 226 1337 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1203 293 1337 723">7–9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	7–9
	marks			
	7–9			
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is adequate. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) show some competency. Selection and range of arguments are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Occasional use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is occasionally evident. Evaluation is brief and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are adequate.</p>	4–6		
	<p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are discernible.</p>	1–3		
No or irrelevant answer.	0			

**Section C**

Question	Answer	Marks												
20(a)	<p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology suggest a suitable technique to encourage the girl to wear the knee-extension splints.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 8</p> <p>Most likely technique: operant conditioning. If the girl is rewarded for wearing the splints she is less likely to cry; if the pain behaviour she exhibits is ignored, it is likely to extinguish. The problem is the nurse, who rewarded the pain behaviour by taking off the splints originally.</p> <p>Less likely is to give the girl pain-killers: medication in children should be avoided if at all possible.</p> <p>Less likely is counselling or psychodynamic therapy which would involve reasoning with the girl, but this is difficult with a three-year-old.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 855 1326 1854"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th data-bbox="1206 855 1326 904">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 904 1206 1128">Suggestion is appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.</td> <td data-bbox="1206 904 1326 1128">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1128 1206 1352">Suggestion is appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</td> <td data-bbox="1206 1128 1326 1352">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1352 1206 1576">Suggestion is largely appropriate to the question and based largely on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</td> <td data-bbox="1206 1352 1326 1576">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1576 1206 1800">Suggestion is peripheral to the question and vaguely based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes has coherence and is brief. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient.</td> <td data-bbox="1206 1576 1326 1800">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1800 1206 1854">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1206 1800 1326 1854">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Suggestion is appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.	7–8	Suggestion is appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.	5–6	Suggestion is largely appropriate to the question and based largely on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.	3–4	Suggestion is peripheral to the question and vaguely based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes has coherence and is brief. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient.	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	8
	marks													
Suggestion is appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.	7–8													
Suggestion is appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.	5–6													
Suggestion is largely appropriate to the question and based largely on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.	3–4													
Suggestion is peripheral to the question and vaguely based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, sometimes has coherence and is brief. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is sufficient.	1–2													
No or irrelevant answer.	0													



Question	Answer	Marks
20(b)	<p><b>Explain how your suggested technique is based on a psychological approach or perspective.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 6</p> <p>Operant conditioning is part of the behaviourist approach, originally outlined by Skinner. Additional aspects can be mentioned such as the law of effect: behaviours that are rewarded are likely to be repeated etc., and there is much terminology that can be explained in addition to a number of assumptions of this perspective.</p> <p>If drugs are administered then the medical/biological approach is applicable and this can be related in the way pain-killers work (i.e. peripherally acting rather than centrally acting analgesics).</p> <p>The psychodynamic approach and or humanistic approach could be mentioned, but candidates may well struggle to explain this for a three-year-old.</p>	<b>6</b>
		<b>marks</b>
<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The issue is effectively explained in relation to the topic area.</p>		5–6
<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The issue is adequately explained in relation to the topic area.</p>		3–4
<p>Quality of explanation and depth of argument are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and is brief. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The relationship between the issue and topic area is identifiable.</p>		1–2
No or irrelevant answer.		0



**Psychology and Sport****Section A**

Question	Answer	Marks
21(a)	<p><b>From the study by Moore, Shepherd, Eden and Sivarajasingam on spectator aggression:</b></p> <p><b>Outline the sample of participants that was used in this study.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>Specifically: ‘Two hundred and two male sports fans (mean age = 39.97 years, SD = 15.08) volunteered to participate, 115 before matches and 87 after matches. Potential participants were approached at random at the main entrance to the Millennium Stadium complex in Cardiff, Wales, the venue for many international rugby football matches, where all five matches were played.’</p> <p>3 marks: detailed answer with accuracy and elaboration; 2 marks: limited answer with some features of sample identified; 1 mark: one or two features identified with some accuracy, or many with inaccuracies.</p>	<b>3</b>
21(b)	<p><b>Give one weakness of the procedure used to gather data in this study.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Most likely (but any appropriate answer receives credit):</p> <p>Only those entering by main entrance were sampled (those drunk may use a back entrance);</p> <p>Only volunteers were included, the views of those who did not volunteer are not known and may change the outcome;</p> <p>The questionnaires were done in the presence of many other people and there could be too much noise;</p> <p>The questionnaires were done in the presence of friends and this may have led to socially desirable answers or to answers of bravado to give the appearance of ‘tough men’.</p> <p>3 marks: appropriate weakness identified, explained and related to this study; 2 marks: appropriate weakness identified, partial explanation and related to this study; 1 mark: peripherally appropriate weakness identified with no explanation; 1 mark for any answer that is not related to this study.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
21(c)	<p><b>Suggest why generalisation from this sample may be problematic.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Generalisation is whether something applies to most people most of the time.</p> <p>It may be a problem in this study because:            All participants were male;            All participants volunteered, the views of those who did not volunteer and are not known may change the outcome;            The chosen sport is rugby union and those spectating at other sports may behave differently;            The sample may all be Welsh; there is no detail about this in the study.            However, there could be a multinational sample, with participants from Wales, England, Scotland, Ireland and France.</p> <p>3 marks: appropriate suggestion identified, explained and related to this study;            2 marks: appropriate suggestion identified, partial explanation and related to this study;            1 mark: peripherally appropriate suggestion identified with no explanation;            1 mark for any answer that is not related to this study.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
22(a)	<p><b>Briefly outline Eysenck's theory of personality.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>Eysenck outlined a theory of personality not specific to sport. He believed there were two basic dimensions, with the opposites of extravert and introvert and stability and neurotism. He devised the EPQ/EPI which would place an individual somewhere along either dimension. Eysenck's theory is a trait theory where stable across a variety of situations.</p> <p>3 marks: detailed answer with accuracy and elaboration;            2 marks: limited answer with some features identified;            1 mark: one or two features identified with some accuracy, or a number with inaccuracies.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
22(b)	<p><b>Describe the personality traits of high-risk sports athletes.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 3</p> <p>According to Kajtna et al. (2004) high-risk sports athletes possess four stable personality characteristics compared to non-high-risk sports athletes. These are emotional stability (ability to control emotions; absence of negative emotional states), conscientiousness (reliability, orderliness, persistence), extraversion and they score highly on acceptability (e.g. understand the need to help others).</p> <p>3 marks: three (or more) traits identified with elaboration; 2 marks: two traits identified with elaboration; 1 mark: one trait with elaboration or several traits identified with no elaboration.</p>	<b>3</b>
22(c)	<p><b>Briefly discuss one strength of psychometric measures of personality.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 3</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Allow comparison of large numbers of individuals; test is standardised; valid and reliable; allows placement of individual on standard scale; test is reliable and is easily replicated. Can be applied to relatively large numbers quickly and easily.</p> <p>3 marks: strength discussed with elaboration (e.g. clarification, definition of terms, use of example); 2 marks: strength identified with some elaboration; 1 mark: strength identified with little or no elaboration.</p>	<b>3</b>

**Section B**

Question	Answer	Marks						
23(a)	<p><b>Outline applications to motivation in sport such as attributions, self confidence and learned helplessness.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 12</p> <p>Attributions are the perceived causes of events and behaviours. Weiner (1974) proposed that the difference between high and low sports achievers is a difference in attributional pattern. Weiner outlines four categories: ability, effort, task difficulty and attributions to the task itself. In addition Weiner (1979) also outlines locus of causality, stability and controllability as pertinent features of an attribution.</p> <p>Many authors have worked on self confidence. Bandura (1977) focuses on self efficacy; Harter (1978) outlines competence motivation theory and Vealey (1986) proposes a 'sport specific model of sport confidence'.</p> <p>Learned helplessness is the acquired belief that one has no control over negative events or that failure is inevitable. Dweck (1978) distinguishes between learned helpless individuals and mastery-oriented individuals.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 994 1326 1805"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 994 1203 1039"></th> <th data-bbox="1203 994 1326 1039">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1039 1203 1442">           Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.            Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.            The theories/studies described are wide-ranging.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.            The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout).            Quality of written communication is very good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1039 1326 1442">10–12</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1442 1203 1805">           Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.            Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.            The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.            The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1442 1326 1805">7–9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.	10–12	Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	7–9	12
	marks							
Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The theories/studies described are wide-ranging. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.	10–12							
Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.	7–9							

Question	Answer	Marks			
23(a)	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The theories/studies described cover a limited range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1206 226 1342 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1206 293 1342 656">4–6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	4–6	
	marks				
	4–6				
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief. Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak. The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</p>	1–3			
No or irrelevant answer.	0				
23(b)	<p><b>Evaluate the contribution of these applications to motivation and sport.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 16</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p><u>Evaluation of models/theory:</u> Internal strengths and weaknesses; Theoretical issues: reductionism, determinism, ethnocentrism; Supporting/contradicting evidence; Comparisons and contrasts with alternative theory.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research supporting models:</u> Strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure; Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative approaches.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> Any relevant debate can be raised, such as objective versus subjective data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p>	<b>16</b>			

Question	Answer	Marks
23(b)	<p>Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.</p> <p>Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.</p>	<p><b>marks</b></p> <p>13–16</p>
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.</p> <p>Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.</p>	<p>10–12</p>
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are good.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident.</p> <p>Limited use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident.</p> <p>Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are good.</p>	<p>7–9</p>
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is limited.</p> <p>Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are poor.</p> <p>Selection and range of arguments are often imbalanced with little or no organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident.</p> <p>Sparse use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question.</p> <p>Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sparse.</p> <p>Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good.</p> <p>Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are poor.</p>	<p>4–6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks						
23(b)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p> </td> <td>1–3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	<p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–3	No or irrelevant answer.	0	
	marks							
<p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–3							
No or irrelevant answer.	0							

Question	Answer	Marks
24(a)	<p><b>Describe theories of anxiety and sport performance.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 12</p> <p>Candidates may describe drive theory and inverted U theory, but hopefully they will progress to more up-to-date theories. Drive theory (Hull, 1951) states that as arousal increases, so does performance. If skill is well learned, arousal leads one to perform better; if skill is low then arousal leads one to perform worse. Inverted U theory (Martens &amp; Landers, 1970 (after Yerkes-Dodson)): arousal causes increase in performance up to a point when, as arousal continues to increase, performance deteriorates. These models are very general and do not apply specifically to sport.</p> <p>More specifically (and on the specification) are:</p> <p>Catastrophe theory (Fazey &amp; Hardy, 1988): performance does not always gradually deteriorate as arousal increases. Sometimes there is a rapid decline (a catastrophe). Key is levels of somatic and cognitive state anxiety. Linked is Hanin's (1980) zone of optimal functioning where level of anxiety is optimal. Finally Apter (1982) proposed the reversal theory whereby individuals switch back and forth between being telic (goal directed orientation) and paratelic ('fun-loving here-and-now').</p> <p>Candidates could focus on research:</p> <p>Most likely candidates will look either at studies which support the above theories or look at ways in which anxiety can be measured. Most common is Martens CSAI-2 (Martens et al., 1990) an updated version of the SCAT (Sport Competition Anxiety Test).</p>	<b>12</b>

Question	Answer	Marks		
24(a)	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.</p> <p>Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive.</p> <p>The theories/studies described are wide-ranging.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.</p> <p>The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout).</p> <p>Quality of written communication is very good.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1204 226 1337 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1204 293 1337 689">10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	10–12
	marks			
	10–12			
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are very good. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.</p> <p>Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent.</p> <p>The theories/studies described cover a reasonable range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.</p> <p>The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	7–9		
	<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.</p> <p>Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate.</p> <p>The theories/studies described cover a limited range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p> <p>The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is good.</p>	4–6		
<p>Quality of description and depth of knowledge are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is sometimes accurate, has some coherence and is brief.</p> <p>Use of terms and use of psychological terminology are weak.</p> <p>The theories/studies described focus on a narrow range.</p> <p>Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible.</p> <p>The answer has some structure and/or organisation. Quality of written communication is sufficient.</p>	1–3			
No or irrelevant answer.	0			



Question	Answer	Marks						
24(b)	<p><b>Evaluate theories of anxiety and sport performance.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 16</p> <p>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p><u>Evaluation of theory:</u> Internal strengths and weaknesses; Theoretical issues: reductionism, determinism, ethnocentrism; Supporting/contradicting evidence; Comparisons and contrasts with alternative theory.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of research:</u> Strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure; Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative approaches.</p> <p><u>Evaluation of issues and debates:</u> Any relevant debate can be raised, such as objective versus subjective data, snapshot versus longitudinal studies, extent of ecological validity, nature versus nurture; freedom versus determinism; reductionism versus holism. Issues can be raised such as ethics, validity, ethnocentrism, effectiveness, application to real life.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 1099 1326 2047"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1151 1203 1615">           Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive.            Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive.            Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.            Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question.            Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout.            Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good.            Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1151 1326 1615">13–16</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1615 1203 2047">           Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good.            Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed.            Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches.            Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question.            Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident.            Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good.            Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.         </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1615 1326 2047">10–12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.	13–16	Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.	10–12	16
	marks							
Evaluation (balance of positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are impressive. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Effective use of appropriate supporting examples which are explicitly related to the question. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident throughout. Evaluation is detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are extensive.	13–16							
Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are clear and well developed. Selection and range of arguments are balanced and logically organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Good use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and quality of written communication is very good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are competent.	10–12							

Question	Answer	Marks		
24(b)	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are good. Selection and range of arguments may be imbalanced with some organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. Limited use of appropriate supporting examples which are related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are good.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1206 226 1342 293">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1206 293 1342 723">7–9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	marks	7–9
	marks			
	7–9			
	<p>Evaluation (positive and negative points) is limited. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are poor. Selection and range of arguments are often imbalanced with little or no organisation into issues/debates, methods or approaches evident. Sparse use of appropriate supporting examples which are often peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sparse. Evaluation is lacking in detail and quality of written communication is good. Understanding and usage of psychological concepts, issues and approaches are poor.</p>	4–6		
<p>Evaluation: some points are evident and may be either positive or negative. Quality and depth of argument (or comment) are adequate. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and psychological knowledge is occasionally evident. Rare use of appropriate supporting examples which are peripherally related to the question. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is discernible. Evaluation is very brief and quality of written communication is adequate.</p>	1–3			
No or irrelevant answer.	0			

## Section C

Question	Answer	Marks						
25(a)	<p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology suggest what the Wigan coach can do to ensure they win away from home.</b></p> <p>AO2 = 8</p> <p>Research attempting to identify the factors that contribute to the home advantage has largely focused on four areas: crowd factors, travel factors, familiarity factors and rule factors.</p> <p>The <b>crowd</b> factor has been examined based on the assumption that conditions associated with the audience, including its size, density, intensity, supportiveness and proximity, motivate the home team and lead to enhanced performance. Some studies have found evidence to support the crowd factor e.g. Agnew &amp; Carron (1994). The coach could therefore encourage large numbers of supporters to travel to the 'away' ground. He could encourage them to make a lot of noise, etc.</p> <p>The <b>travel factor</b> is based on the assumption that travel is not only fatiguing but also disrupts familiar routines and habits. Although the coach could not counter this totally, the team could book a hotel close to the away ground for a few days prior to the match.</p> <p>Studies have looked at <b>familiarity factors</b> such as size and nature of the playing surface (Pollard, 1986) and familiarity with the venue (Moore &amp; Brylinsky, 1993). The coach could ask for his team to train on the match pitch to familiarise the players.</p> <p>Research has also observed rules that may favour the home team (Courneya &amp; Carson, 1992) and that referee bias might contribute to the home advantage. Studies have highlighted that officials make more subjective decisions against visiting teams – or in favour of home teams (e.g. Glamser, 1990). Not a lot the coach could do about this, but awareness that rugby league has a 'video referee' ensures fairness and removes possible bias.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 1473 1326 1977"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th data-bbox="1206 1473 1326 1529">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1529 1206 1753">           Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge.            Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1529 1326 1753">7–8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1753 1206 1977">           Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge.            Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.            Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1753 1326 1977">5–6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.	7–8	Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.	5–6	8
	marks							
Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based explicitly on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good.	7–8							
Suggestions are appropriate to the question and based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good.	5–6							

Question	Answer		Marks
25(a)	<p>Suggestions are largely appropriate to the question and based largely on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is reasonable.</p>	<b>marks</b>	
	<p>Suggestions are mainly inappropriate to the question and vaguely based on psychological knowledge. Description of applied knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is poor.</p>		
	No or irrelevant answer.		

Question	Answer	Marks										
25(b)	<p><b>Explain your suggestions in relation to theory on ‘home advantage’.</b></p> <p>AO1 = 6</p> <p>The suggestions above need to be explained in relation to theory.</p> <p>One possible option is to focus on explanations specific to ‘home advantage’, the four main factors of which were outlined above: crowd, travel, familiarity and referee bias.</p> <p>Another option is to focus on effects of an audience: the crowd leading to social facilitation or social inhibition.</p> <p>Also relevant would be coaching strategies to focus the attention of the players and use other coaching/motivating strategies to maintain an optimal level of arousal.</p> <p>Raised in the study by Waters and Lovell (2002) is the idea that there is more pressure from home supporters when playing at home and this raises performance.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 965 1326 2022"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th data-bbox="1206 965 1326 1016">marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1016 1206 1308">           Quality of explanation and depth of argument are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The issue is effectively explained in relation to the topic area.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1016 1326 1308">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1308 1206 1632">           Quality of explanation and depth of argument are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The issue is adequately explained in relation to the topic area.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1308 1326 1632">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1632 1206 1957">           Quality of explanation and depth of argument are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and is brief. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The relationship between the issue and topic area is identifiable.         </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1632 1326 1957">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1957 1206 2022">No or irrelevant answer.</td> <td data-bbox="1206 1957 1326 2022">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		marks	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The issue is effectively explained in relation to the topic area.	5–6	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The issue is adequately explained in relation to the topic area.	3–4	Quality of explanation and depth of argument are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and is brief. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The relationship between the issue and topic area is identifiable.	1–2	No or irrelevant answer.	0	6
	marks											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are impressive. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Use of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is very good. The issue is effectively explained in relation to the topic area.	5–6											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are competent. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Use of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is good. The issue is adequately explained in relation to the topic area.	3–4											
Quality of explanation and depth of argument are adequate. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent and is brief. Use of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. Understanding (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is discernible. The relationship between the issue and topic area is identifiable.	1–2											
No or irrelevant answer.	0											

**BLANK PAGE**