



---

**PSYCHOLOGY**

**9773/03**

Paper 3 Key Applications

**May/June 2019**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 120

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

**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.

There are three types of question on this paper and for each applied option these are labelled Section A, Section B and Section C.

Section A includes short-answer questions and although each question is marked out of 3, each question has its own specific mark scheme.

Section B includes essay questions and although the indicative content varies for each question, the mark scheme for both question parts (a) and (b) is the same. It has to be to allow standardisation across the 5 options.

Section C is the application question and although the question will vary the mark scheme does not.

This means that the mark schemes for Section B questions (a) and (b) will appear once (immediately below) and not be repeated for each individual question as will the mark scheme for Section C question parts (a) and (b). Indicative content for each question appear after the mark schemes.

<b>SECTION B question part (a)</b>	
<b>This mark scheme applies to questions 3 and 4, 8 and 9, 13 and 14, 18 and 19, 23 and 24</b>	AO1 = 12
<p><b>Quality of description and depth of knowledge is impressive.</b> Description of <b>knowledge</b> (theories / studies) is <b>accurate, coherent and detailed</b>. Use of <b>terms</b> is <b>accurate</b> and use of psychological <b>terminology</b> is <b>comprehensive</b>. The <b>theories / studies</b> described are <b>wide-ranging</b>. <b>Understanding</b> (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good</b>. The answer is <b>competently structured and organised</b> (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of <b>written communication</b> is <b>very good</b>.</p>	10–12
<p><b>Quality of description and depth of knowledge is very good.</b> Description of <b>knowledge</b> (theories / studies) is <b>mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed</b>. Use of <b>terms</b> is <b>mainly accurate</b> and use of psychological <b>terminology</b> is <b>competent</b>. The <b>theories / studies</b> described cover a <b>reasonable range</b>. <b>Understanding</b> (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good</b>. The answer has <b>some structure</b> and organisation. Quality of <b>written communication</b> is <b>good</b>.</p>	7–9
<p><b>Quality of description and depth of knowledge is competent.</b> Description of <b>knowledge</b> (theories / studies) is <b>often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail</b>. Use of <b>terms</b> is <b>basic</b> and use of psychological <b>terminology</b> is <b>adequate</b>. The <b>theories / studies</b> described cover a <b>limited range</b>. <b>Understanding</b> (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>reasonable</b>. The answer is <b>lacking structure</b> or organisation. Quality of <b>written communication</b> is <b>adequate</b>.</p>	4–6
<p><b>Quality of description and depth of knowledge is poor.</b> Description of <b>knowledge</b> (theories / studies) is <b>mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail</b>. Use of <b>terms</b> and use of psychological <b>terminology</b> is <b>sparse or absent</b>. The <b>theories / studies</b> described cover a <b>very limited range</b>. <b>Understanding</b> (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>poor</b>. The answer is <b>unstructured</b> and lacks organisation. Quality of <b>written communication</b> is <b>poor</b>.</p>	1–3
No or irrelevant answer.	0

Note: Section B (a) questions can ask about 1. the general topic area; 2. the key study itself or 3. a selection of sub-topics from the topic area. Each answer will therefore be different.

1. A key study question should emphasise the aim, method(s), participants, procedure, results, conclusions, etc. It can also include a brief background to the key study and it can also include some explore more extending beyond the study.
2. A topic area question should cover a range of detail, including (from the syllabus) Theory, Research, Key study and Applications, but what specifically is included is the choice of the candidate.
3. A sub-topic question should only include detail from the specified sub-topics (combinations of Theory, Research, Key study and Applications). Each type of answer should be credited on its individual merits.

<b>SECTION B question part (b)</b>	
<b>This mark scheme applies to questions 3 and 4, 8 and 9, 13 and 14, 18 and 19, 23 and 24</b>	AO2 = 16
<p><b>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</b>            Most likely:  <u>Evaluation of theory:</u>            internal strengths and weaknesses;            theoretical issues: reductionism, determinism, ethnocentrism.            Supporting / contradicting evidence;            Comparisons and contrasts with alternative theory.  <u>Evaluation of research:</u>            strengths and weaknesses of methods, sample, controls, procedure.            Evaluation of and comparisons and/or contrasts with alternative approaches.  <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>	
<p><b>Evaluation</b> (balance of positive and negative points) is <b>comprehensive</b>.  <b>Quality and depth of argument</b> (or comment) is <b>impressive</b>.            Selection and range of <b>arguments</b> is <b>balanced</b> which are <b>competently organised</b> into issues / debates, methods or approaches.  <b>Effective use</b> of appropriate supporting <b>examples</b> which are <b>explicitly related</b> to the question.  <b>Analysis</b> (valid conclusions that effectively summarises issues and arguments) is <b>evident throughout</b>.  <b>Evaluation</b> is <b>detailed</b> and quality of <b>written communication</b> is <b>very good</b>.  <b>Understanding</b> and usage of psychological concepts, issues, and approaches is <b>extensive</b>.</p>	13–16
<p><b>Evaluation</b> (positive and negative points) is <b>very good</b>.  <b>Quality and depth of argument</b> (or comment) is clear and <b>well developed</b>.            Selection and range of <b>arguments</b> is <b>balanced</b> which are <b>logically organised</b> into issues / debates, methods or approaches.  <b>Good use</b> of appropriate supporting <b>examples</b> which are <b>related</b> to the question.  <b>Analysis</b> (key points and valid generalisations) is <b>often evident</b>.  <b>Evaluation</b> is <b>quite detailed</b> and quality of <b>written communication</b> is <b>very good</b>.  <b>Understanding</b> and usage of psychological concepts, issues, and approaches is <b>competent</b>.</p>	10–12
<p><b>Evaluation</b> (positive and negative points) is <b>good</b>.  <b>Quality and depth of argument</b> (or comment) is <b>limited</b>.            Selection and range of <b>arguments</b> may be <b>imbalanced</b> with <b>some organisation</b> into issues / debates, methods or approaches evident.  <b>Limited use</b> of appropriate supporting <b>examples</b> which are <b>related</b> to the question.  <b>Analysis</b> (key points and valid generalisations) is <b>sometimes evident</b>.  <b>Evaluation</b> is <b>lacking in detail</b> and quality of <b>written communication</b> is <b>good</b>.  <b>Understanding</b> and usage of psychological concepts, issues, and approaches is <b>adequate</b>.</p>	7–9

<p><b>Evaluation</b> (positive and negative points) is <b>limited</b>.  <b>Quality and depth of argument</b> (or comment) is <b>poor</b>.  Selection and range of <b>arguments</b> is often <b>imbalanced</b> with <b>little or no organisation</b> into issues / debates, methods or approaches evident.  <b>Sparse use</b> of appropriate supporting <b>examples</b> which are often <b>peripherally related</b> to the question.  <b>Analysis</b> (key points and valid generalisations) is <b>sparse</b>.  <b>Evaluation</b> is <b>lacking in detail</b> and quality of <b>written communication</b> is <b>good</b>.  <b>Understanding</b> and usage of psychological concepts, issues, and approaches is <b>poor</b>.</p>	4–6
<p><b>Evaluation</b> (positive and negative points) is <b>basic</b>.  <b>Quality and depth of argument</b> (or comment) is <b>weak</b>.  Selection and range of arguments is <b>imbalanced</b> with little or <b>no organisation</b> into issues / debates, methods or approaches evident.  <b>Sparse or no use</b> of appropriate supporting <b>examples</b> which are <b>peripherally related</b> to the question.  <b>Analysis</b> (key points and valid generalisations) is <b>barely discernible</b>.  <b>Evaluation</b> is <b>severely lacking in detail</b> and quality of <b>written communication</b> is <b>poor</b>.  <b>Understanding</b> and usage of psychological concepts, issues, and approaches is <b>weak</b>.</p>	1–3
No or irrelevant answer	0

<b>SECTION C question part (a)</b>	
<b>This mark scheme applies to questions 5, 10, 15, 20, 25</b>	AO2 = 8
In this question part candidates are either directed to design a study based on a named method or are free to suggest any way in which the assessment request could be investigated. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme.	
<b>Suggestion is appropriate</b> to the question and based <b>explicitly</b> on psychological knowledge. <b>Description</b> of applied knowledge is <b>accurate, coherent and detailed</b> . <b>Understanding</b> (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good</b> .	7–8
<b>Suggestion is appropriate</b> to the question and based on psychological knowledge. <b>Description</b> of applied knowledge is mainly <b>accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed</b> . <b>Understanding</b> (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good</b> .	5–6
<b>Suggestion is largely appropriate</b> to the question and based largely on psychological knowledge. <b>Description</b> of applied knowledge is <b>often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail</b> . <b>Understanding</b> (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>reasonable</b> .	3–4
<b>Suggestion is mainly inappropriate</b> to the question and vaguely based on psychological knowledge. <b>Description</b> of applied knowledge is mainly <b>inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail</b> . <b>Understanding</b> (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>poor</b> .	1–2
No or irrelevant answer.	0

<b>SECTION C question part (b)</b>	
<b>This mark scheme applies to questions 5, 10, 15, 20, 25</b>	AO1 = 6
<p>In this question part candidates are expected to justify his or her decisions or evidence presented regarding the design made in answer to question part (a). Two (or more) components may be presented here (full marks can be gained for just one):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of methodology,</li> <li>• Knowledge of appropriate topic area and/or key study.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is impressive.</b> <b>Description of knowledge is accurate, coherent and detailed.</b> Use of <b>terms</b> is <b>accurate</b> and use of <b>psychological terminology</b> is <b>comprehensive.</b> <b>Understanding</b> (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>very good.</b> The <b>issue</b> is <b>effectively explained</b> in relation to the topic area.</p>	5–6
<p><b>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is competent.</b> <b>Description of knowledge is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed.</b> Use of <b>terms</b> is <b>mainly accurate</b> and use of <b>psychological terminology</b> is <b>competent.</b> <b>Understanding</b> (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>good.</b> The <b>issue</b> is <b>adequately explained</b> in relation to the topic area.</p>	3–4
<p><b>Quality of explanation and depth of argument is poor.</b> <b>Description of knowledge is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail.</b> Use of <b>terms</b> is <b>basic</b> and use of <b>psychological terminology</b> is <b>adequate.</b> <b>Understanding</b> (such as elaboration, use of example, quality of description) is <b>poor.</b> The <b>issue</b> is <b>poorly explained</b> in relation to the topic area.</p>	1–2
No or irrelevant answer.	0

Question	Answer	Marks
<b>PSYCHOLOGY AND ABNORMALITY</b>		
1(a)	<p><b>From the key study by Ahn et al. on beliefs about essences:</b></p> <p><b>Describe the aim of the study.</b></p> <p>Quote from study:</p> <p>The current study examined whether and to what extent mental health practitioners and novices believe mental disorders, especially in comparison with medical disorders, are real and possess an essence, ‘an underlying reality or true nature, shared by members of a category’ (Gelman, 2003, p.8).</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> for accurate and detailed description with understanding of aim.  <b>2 marks</b> for accurate description.  <b>1 mark</b> for vague description.</p>	<b>3</b>
1(b)	<p><b>State <u>three</u> questions used to measure essentialism in the study.</b></p> <p>Quote from study:</p> <p>For the disorders, six questions were developed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Although people who have X might have similarities and differences, there is something that is shared by ALL people who have X – whether or not we currently know what this is.</li> <li>2. Out of all the things that are shared by all people who have X, there is something that ONLY people who have X share – whether or not we currently know what this is.</li> <li>3a. This thing that is shared by all and only people with X CAUSES or determines the symptoms these people display.</li> <li>3b. This thing that is shared by all people with X CAUSES or determines the symptoms these people display.</li> <li>4. The only way that someone could no longer have X is if we get rid of the thing that causes the symptoms of this disorder. Removing only the symptoms is not sufficient.</li> <li>5. If a person has X, s/he has X 100%, even if s/he has strange or unusual symptoms. People may be confused or have a hard time telling, but a person does not partially have X.</li> <li>6. Some categories are natural categories that exist in the real world and someone has to discover what they are. Other categories are invented by a culture and decided upon by experts. Rate these statements for X.</li> </ol> <p><b>1 mark</b> for correct description of each question</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p><b>Briefly discuss the usefulness of questionnaires to measure beliefs about mental disorders.</b></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Positives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are needed to measure ‘beliefs’</li> <li>• can provide both quantitative and qualitative data (and so various advantages)</li> <li>• can be replicated, given to wide sample</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>Negatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may elicit socially desirable answers</li> <li>• may include leading questions</li> <li>• using 4-point or 5-point scale may force participants to answer or allow ‘neutral’ answers.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark:</b> argument for.  <b>1 mark:</b> argument against.  <b>1 mark</b> for relating to study.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>Describe the learning theory explanation for anxiety disorders.</b></p> <p>JB Watson (1920) taught little Albert to be afraid of a white rat using classical conditioning (<b>expectancy learning</b>) where a previously neutral object (e.g. white rat) is associated with a potentially threatening negative event (e.g. loud noise) so that in the future the person is fearful because of the expectation of what will happen when coming into contact with the object (in Albert’s case, the white rat).</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> for accurate and detailed description with understanding of appropriate psychological knowledge / examples.  <b>2 marks</b> for accurate description with some understanding / examples.  <b>1 mark</b> for vague description with little understanding.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>From the study by Watson on little Albert:</b></p> <p><b>Suggest <u>one</u> way in which the study can be generalised and <u>one</u> way in which the study cannot be generalised.</b></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The processes of classical conditioning can be generalised from this study to explain how all fears and phobias develop for example ‘button boy’.</li> <li>• All behaviour is learned, including fears and phobias.</li> <li>• Classical conditioning is universal with no cultural differences.</li> <li>• Albert is like all other children (e.g. not afraid at start)</li> </ul> <p>Cannot:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Albert was one child and what is the case for him might not be the case for other children.</li> <li>• It is claimed that little Albert was not a normal child.</li> <li>• The way in which little Albert was conditioned is rare (hammer on bar behind his head)</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks:</b> accurate description of both aspects with good understanding, elaboration / examples.  <b>2 marks:</b> basic description of both aspects.  <b>1 mark:</b> description for one aspect only; however detailed.</p>	<b>3</b>
2(c)	<p><b>Contrast the learning theory explanation of anxiety disorders with the psychodynamic explanation of anxiety disorders.</b></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning theory is that fears and phobias can be learned;</li> <li>• Psychodynamic is conflict between id and ego</li> <li>• Learning theory is external and can be seen</li> <li>• Psychodynamic is internal (and may not even exist)</li> <li>• Learning theory is the <i>same</i> process i.e. learning</li> <li>• Psychodynamic is suggests treatment involves (some) <i>different</i> processes (e.g. catharsis, understanding unconscious processes)</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> for clear and concise contrast (both sides included) with detail and understanding.  <b>2 marks</b> basic contrast (both sides included).  <b>1 mark</b> for description of both with no explicit contrast.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Describe theory and research on schizophrenia</b></p> <p>Theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Characteristics of schizophrenia (DSM-5).</li> <li>• Explanations of schizophrenia including genetic and biochemical factors (e.g. twin and adoption studies and dopamine hypothesis), psychodynamic (e.g. schizophrenogenic mother) and psychological (e.g. the role of the family).</li> </ul> <p>Research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cortical abnormalities in schizophrenia (Goldstein et al., 1999). Influence of family life on the course of schizophrenic illness (Brown et al., 1962).</li> </ul> <p>Key Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brewer, W J, et al. (2003) Impairment of olfactory identification ability in individuals at ultra-high risk for psychosis who later develop schizophrenia. <i>American Journal of Psychiatry</i>, 160:1790–1794.</li> </ul> <p>Applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drug therapy. Cognitive Behavioural Therapy. ECT.</li> </ul> <p><i>Candidates should focus specifically on theory and research (as above) and this could include the Key Study. It should not include applications. Answers which focus exclusively on applications should receive no marks or ignored if part of a theory and research answer.</i></p>	12
3(b)	<p><b>Evaluate theory and research on schizophrenia.</b></p> <p><i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</i></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> <p><i>The question focuses on theory and research and so it is expected that candidates will show evaluation that can include the key study and/or the wider topic area.</i></p>	16

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	<p><b>Describe the key study by Simeon et al. on depersonalisation disorder.</b></p> <p>Abstract from study:</p> <p><b>Objective:</b> In contrast to the recent surge of interest in other dissociative disorders, DSMIII-R depersonalization disorder has not been thoroughly investigated and characterized. The authors systematically elucidated its phenomenology, comorbidity, traumatic antecedents, and treatment history.</p> <p><b>Method:</b> Thirty adult subjects (19 women and 11 men) were consecutively recruited and administered various structured and semi-structured interviews as well as the self-rated Dissociative Experiences Scale. An age- and sex-matched normal comparison group was also recruited.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> The mean age at onset of depersonalization disorder was 16.1 years (SD=5.2). The illness had a chronic course that was usually continuous but sometimes episodic. Severe distress and high levels of interpersonal impairment were characteristic. Unipolar mood and anxiety disorders were common, but none emerged as specifically related to the depersonalization. A wide variety of personality disorders was manifested; avoidant, borderline, and obsessive-compulsive were most common. Although not highly traumatized, the subjects with depersonalization disorder reported significantly more childhood trauma than the normal comparison subjects. Depersonalization had been typically treatment refractory; only serotonin reuptake inhibitors and, to a lesser extent, benzodiazepines had been of any therapeutic benefit.</p> <p><b>Conclusions:</b> This study supports the conceptualization of depersonalization disorder as a distinct disorder with a characteristic course that is independent of mood, anxiety, and personality symptoms. A subtle relationship may exist between childhood trauma and depersonalization disorder that merits further investigation. The disorder appears to be highly treatment refractory, and prospective treatment trials are warranted.</p> <p><i>The question is a specific 'key study' question and so it is expected that candidates will focus specifically on the key study. Contextualising the study at the beginning is creditworthy as is any 'explore more' that a candidate may include showing how the key study itself has been extended.</i></p>	12

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	<p><b>Evaluate the key study by Simeon et al. on depersonalisation disorder.</b></p> <p><i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</i></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> <p><i>The question is a specific ‘key study’ question and so it is expected that candidates will focus evaluation specifically on the key study. Credit can also be given for evaluation of contextualisation of the study and any ‘explore more’.</i></p>	16

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	<p><b>Online (internet) gambling is growing in popularity, but why this is so popular is not known.</b></p> <p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology, design a study using a questionnaire to investigate why online gambling is popular.</b></p> <p>In this question part candidates are either directed to design a study based on a named method or are free to suggest any way in which the assessment request could be investigated. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme.</p> <p><b>General features</b> that could be included: Sampling technique &amp; sample, type of data, ethics, reliability, validity, data analysis (descriptive and/or inferential).</p> <p><b>Specific features:</b> The question requires a questionnaire to be conducted. Specific features could include:</p> <p><b>Questionnaires / Interviews:</b> type, setting, example questions. Scoring / rating scale, analysis of responses.</p>	8
5(b)	<p><b>Explain the evidence on which your study is based.</b></p> <p>In this question part candidates are expected to justify his or her decisions or evidence presented regarding the design made in answer to question part (a).</p> <p><i>Evidence can include theory and research.</i></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of methodology, specifically that appropriate to the investigation in question.</li> <li>• Knowledge of syllabus study: Internet Gambling (Griffiths, 2002).</li> <li>• Knowledge of the topic area of impulse control disorders (e.g. pathological gambling).</li> </ul> <p><i>Any appropriate evidence to receive credit.</i></p>	6

Question	Answer	Marks
<b>PSYCHOLOGY AND CRIME</b>		
6(a)	<p><b>The key study by Farrington et al. looked at criminal careers.</b></p> <p><b>Outline <u>three</u> ways in which data was gathered directly from participants in this study.</b></p> <p>From study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Interviews</b> at 48 and 32 years collected information on accommodation; partner and family relationships; employment / unemployment, income; health, parenting, problems of children (lying, stealing, running away, truancy, disobedience, temper tantrums, bullying, destructiveness, restlessness, bed-wetting, sleep disturbance, fears, nervous habits), contact of children with social agencies; social activity, alcohol and drug use; drink driving, attitudes (questions as asked at age 18 and 32),</li> <li>2. <b>Self-reported offending;</b></li> <li>3. The General Health <b>Questionnaire</b> (GHQ), previously given at age 32, designed to detect non-psychotic psychiatric illness (anxiety / depression);</li> <li>4. <b>Psychometric tests:</b> the Eysenck Personality Inventory (previously given at age 16) and the Big Five Personality Inventory.</li> </ol> <p><b>1 mark</b> for brief description of each method.</p>	<b>3</b>
6(b)	<p><b>Suggest why data was also collected by searching criminal records.</b></p> <p>From study:</p> <p>The study results reported here were obtained from interviews at age 48 and from searches of criminal records.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objective evidence is gained from the criminal searches. If the interviewee has been convicted of a crime then it is fact.</li> <li>• In a self-report interview / questionnaire a participant may not be totally honest – for example if they had committed a crime they may not want to admit to it.</li> <li>• A self-report interview / questionnaire gathers subjective rather than objective data; there is way to know whether the interviewee is telling the truth or not. Objective evidence is needed.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks</b> for two different aspects with some detail / understanding / use of example.  <b>2 marks</b> for two different aspects, briefly stated; for one aspect with detail / understanding example.  <b>1 mark</b> for basic reason for criminal record search.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
6(c)	<p><b>Suggest <u>two</u> weaknesses of using ‘criminal convictions’ as a measure of crime in this study.</b></p> <p>From study:</p> <p>Convictions were only counted if they were for standard list offences, thereby excluding minor crimes such as traffic infractions and simple drunkenness. The most common offences included were thefts, burglaries and unauthorized takings of vehicles, followed by violence, vandalism, fraud and drug abuse. Official recorded cautions were also included from 1995 when they were routinely recorded on a national basis. All motoring offences were excluded.</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The person may not be convicted but has received a caution (cautions are counted);</li> <li>• The person may have committed a crime but not have been caught;</li> <li>• The person may have committed a ‘minor’ crime, excluded in this study, but it is still a criminal activity, just a ‘low-level’ crime;</li> <li>• Some excluded motoring offences are relatively more serious, so should be included.</li> </ul> <p><b>3 marks:</b> two weaknesses with some detail / understanding / use of example.  <b>2 marks:</b> two weaknesses briefly stated; for one aspect with detail / understanding example.  <b>1 mark:</b> for one weakness identified.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks																																						
7(a)	<p><b>From the key study by Cann on cognitive skills programmes in prisons:</b></p> <p><b>Describe the findings for the two-year reconviction rates.</b></p> <p><b>Key study:</b> Cann, J. (2006) Cognitive skills programmes: impact on reducing reconviction among a sample of female prisoners.</p> <p>Most likely: see table</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two year reconviction rates overall were higher in the programme participants than in the comparison group.</li> <li>Two year reconviction rates were higher in the programme group than the comparison group for all levels of risk.</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="373 723 911 1234"> <caption>Table 3 Two-year reconviction rates for programme participants (N=52) and comparison group (N=156) by risk of reconviction</caption> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="3">Risk level (OGRS)</th> <th colspan="2">Programme participants</th> <th colspan="2">Comparison group</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="4">Reconviction rates</th> </tr> <tr> <th>n</th> <th>%</th> <th>n</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Low</td> <td>2</td> <td>11.1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medium-low</td> <td>5</td> <td>26.3</td> <td>12</td> <td>21.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medium-high</td> <td>7</td> <td>77.8</td> <td>12</td> <td>44.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High</td> <td>5</td> <td>83.3</td> <td>12</td> <td>66.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall</td> <td>19</td> <td>36.5</td> <td>37</td> <td>23.7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>3 marks:</b> appropriate findings: comment of overall finding with <i>some</i> supporting correct numbers. Alternatively comment about overall finding and an additional detail such as comment on specific risk levels, or that the difference was not significant.</p> <p><b>2 marks:</b> appropriate findings: comment of overall finding with supporting numbers (allow tolerance). Alternatively, overall comment and comment about specific risk levels (see table)</p> <p><b>1 mark:</b> general comment of overall finding (i.e. comparison group reconviction rate higher than programme participants' reconviction rate).</p> <p><b>Note:</b> no credit for one year conviction rates.</p>	Risk level (OGRS)	Programme participants		Comparison group		Reconviction rates				n	%	n	%	Low	2	11.1	1	1.9	Medium-low	5	26.3	12	21.1	Medium-high	7	77.8	12	44.4	High	5	83.3	12	66.7	Overall	19	36.5	37	23.7	3
Risk level (OGRS)	Programme participants		Comparison group																																					
	Reconviction rates																																							
	n	%	n	%																																				
Low	2	11.1	1	1.9																																				
Medium-low	5	26.3	12	21.1																																				
Medium-high	7	77.8	12	44.4																																				
High	5	83.3	12	66.7																																				
Overall	19	36.5	37	23.7																																				

Question	Answer	Marks
7(b)	<p><b>Suggest <u>two</u> weaknesses of the quantitative method used to measure reconviction rates.</b></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Quote:</p> <p>The study measured reconviction which is a proxy measure for reoffending. It is also a yes / no outcome which does not allow for assessment of change in severity and frequency of offending.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The numbers take no account of how many times a person may have been reconvicted in the two-year period;</li> <li>• The numbers take no account of what crimes were committed; an offender may have been originally convicted for actual bodily harm and be reconvicted for shoplifting.</li> <li>• The sample size in some groups was very small (only 2 participants in one group with 7 the highest number in another) overall there were only 19 programme participants and 37 comparisons.</li> </ul> <p><i>Any appropriate weakness to receive credit.</i></p> <p><b>3 marks:</b> two weaknesses with some detail / understanding / use of example.  <b>2 marks:</b> two weaknesses briefly stated; for one aspect with detail / understanding example.  <b>1 mark:</b> for one weakness identified.</p>	<b>3</b>
7(c)	<p><b>Cann discusses several limitations of the programmes in her study.</b></p> <p><b>Describe <u>one</u> of these limitations.</b></p> <p>Quoting study (underline added):</p> <p>Implementation limitations: small-scale delivery.  The importance of integrity in programme delivery for successful outcomes is well documented (e.g. Andrews and Dowden, 2005). Evidence suggests that, at least in terms of short – term impact <u>tutors should deliver programmes regularly to maintain levels of integrity</u> (Blud et al., 2003). <u>However</u>, with the small-scale provision for female prisoners between 1996 and 2000, <u>it was not possible for tutors to consistently deliver programmes. This may have had an impact upon quality, which in turn may have had an impact on programme success.</u> In order to minimise any negative effect of insufficient delivery, HMPS now stipulates that cognitive skills tutors must deliver a minimum number of sessions each year.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tutors did not deliver programmes regularly; this affects quality; it affects consistency; which have an impact on success. Programmes must now deliver a minimum number of sessions.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> for each appropriate point from above.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	<p><b>Describe the key study by Rubin et al. on the London bombings.</b></p> <p>Abstract from study:</p> <p><b>Objectives:</b> To assess the impact of the bombings in London on 7 July on stress levels and travel intentions in London’s population.</p> <p><b>Design:</b> A cross sectional telephone survey using random digit dialling was conducted to contact a representative sample of adults. Respondents were asked to participate in an interview enquiring about current levels of stress and travel intentions.</p> <p><b>Setting Interviews</b> took place between 18 and 20 July.</p> <p><b>Participants:</b> 1010 participants (10% of the eligible people we contacted) completed the interviews.</p> <p><b>Main outcome measures:</b> Main outcomes were presence of substantial stress, measured by using an identical tool to that used to assess the emotional impact of 11 September 2001 in the US population, and intention to travel less on tubes, trains, and buses, or into central London, once the transport network had returned to normal.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> 31% of Londoners reported substantial stress and 32% reported an intention to travel less. Among other things, having difficulty contacting friends or family by mobile phone (odds ratio 1.7, 95% confidence interval 1.1 to 2.7), having thought you could have been injured or killed (3.8, 2.4 to 6.2), and being Muslim (4.0, 2.5 to 6.6) were associated with a greater presence of substantial stress, whereas being white (0.3, 0.2 to 0.4) and having previous experience of terrorism (0.6, 0.5 to 0.9) 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><b>Conclusions:</b> Although the psychological needs of those intimately caught up in the attacks will require further assessment, we found no evidence of a widespread desire for professional counselling. The attacks have inflicted disproportionately high levels of distress among non-white and Muslim Londoners.</p> <p><i>The question is a specific ‘key study’ question and so it is expected that candidates will focus specifically on the key study. Contextualising the study at the beginning is creditworthy as is any ‘explore more’ that a candidate may include showing how the key study itself has been extended.</i></p>	12

Question	Answer	Marks
8(b)	<p><b>Evaluate the key study by Rubin et al. on the London bombings.</b></p> <p><i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</i></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> <p><i>The question is a specific 'key study' question and so it is expected that candidates will focus evaluation specifically on the key study. Credit can also be given for evaluation of contextualisation of the study and any 'explore more'.</i></p>	16

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	<p><b>Describe theory and research on offender profiling.</b></p> <p><b>Theory:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approaches to or types of offender profiling: FBI approach (top down) and the British approach (bottom up). Effectiveness of offender profiling (e.g. Mokros et al. 2002; Kocsis et al. 2002).</li> </ul> <p><b>Research:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Categorising murderers and scenes: organised and disorganised (e.g. Douglas et al. 1992); expressive and instrumental (e.g. Salfati, 2000).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Study:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pinizzotto, A J and Finkel, N J (1990) Criminal personality profiling: an outcome and process study. <i>Law and Human Behaviour</i>, vol. 14, 3, 215–233</li> </ul> <p><b>Applications:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A case study of applied profiling (e.g. Canter's profile of John Duffy); profiling failures</li> </ul> <p><i>Candidates should focus specifically on theory and research (as above) and this can include the Key Study. It should not include applications. Answers which focus exclusively on applications should receive no marks or ignored if part of a theory and research answer.</i></p>	12
9(b)	<p><b>Evaluate theory and research on offender profiling.</b></p> <p><i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</i></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> <p><i>The question focuses on theory and research and so it is expected that candidates will show evaluation that can include the key study and/or the wider topic area.</i></p>	16

Question	Answer	Marks
10(a)	<p><b>It is argued that people who tell lies are better at detecting lying in others, than people who do not tell lies.</b></p> <p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology, design an experiment to investigate whether people who tell lies are better at detecting lies.</b></p> <p>In this question part candidates are either directed to design a study based on a named method or are free to suggest any way in which the assessment request could be investigated. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme.</p> <p><b>General features</b> that could be included: Sampling technique &amp; sample, type of data, ethics, reliability, validity, data analysis (descriptive and/or inferential).</p> <p><b>Specific features:</b> The question requires an experiment to be conducted. This could be natural, field or laboratory. Features could include:</p> <p><b>Experiments:</b> Type, IV, DV, controls, experimental design.</p>	8
10(b)	<p><b>Explain the evidence on which your study is based.</b></p> <p>In this question part candidates are expected to justify his or her decisions or evidence presented regarding the design made in answer to question part (a).</p> <p><i>Evidence can include theory and research.</i></p> <p>Most likely inclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of methodology, specifically that appropriate to the investigation in question.</li> <li>• Knowledge of 'Detecting lies and deceit' (e.g. Vrij, 2000).</li> <li>• Knowledge of key study (Mann et al.)</li> </ul> <p><i>Any appropriate evidence to receive credit.</i></p>	6

Question	Answer	Marks
<b>PSYCHOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT</b>		
11(a)	<p><b>From the key study by Drury et al. on behaviour in emergency situations:</b></p> <p><b>Outline the <u>three</u> ways in which interviewees were recruited.</b></p> <p><b>Key study:</b> Drury, J, Cocking, C and Reicher, S, Everyone for themselves? A comparative study of crowd solidarity among emergency survivors. British Journal of Social Psychology (2008), 00, 1–21.</p> <p>Quote from study:</p> <p>To recruit interviewees who had experienced such events,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We placed <b>advertisements in UK national newspapers</b> for people who had been involved in emergencies such as fires in public places, sinking ships, and bomb attacks. We then</li> <li>2. <b>Snowballed</b> the initial sample.</li> <li>3. We also <b>contacted people</b> who had been involved in well-known disasters, the Hillsborough football stadium crush and the Fatboy Slim beach party in Brighton.</li> </ol> <p><b>1 mark</b> for brief description of each aspect.</p>	<b>3</b>
11(b)	<p><b>Describe <u>one</u> of the events the interviewees had survived.</b></p> <p>List of the events. Additional detail available as appendices / in the original study</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sinking of the Jupiter, 1988</li> <li>2. Sinking of the Oceanos 1991</li> <li>3. Hillsborough (UK) football stadium disaster, 1989</li> <li>4. Ghana football stadium ‘stampede’, 2001</li> <li>5. Bradford (UK) football stadium fire, 1985</li> <li>6. Fire at Sonesta Hotel, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971</li> <li>7. Harrods bomb, 1983</li> <li>8. Fatboy Slim beach party, 2002</li> <li>9. Canary Wharf (UK) emergency evacuation,</li> <li>10. Frankfurt tower block emergency evacuation, 2002</li> <li>11. Grantham (UK) train accident, 2003</li> </ol> <p><b>3 marks</b> for accurate and detailed description with understanding.  <b>2 marks</b> for description with some understanding / examples.  <b>1 mark</b> for vague description.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
11(c)	<p><b>Contrast the face-to-face interview technique used in this study with <u>one</u> alternative way of conducting interviews.</b></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Telephone interview (e.g. key study in crime option);</p> <p><i>(other appropriate answers to receive credit):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews were face-to-face so <b><i>non-verbal communication</i></b> could be taken into account, unlike a telephone interview.</li> <li>• Interviews were conducted at the <b><i>survivor's home</i></b> (and so more relaxed), not in an office, at work, or on the street.</li> <li>• Interviews can <b>last longer</b> (between 45 and 90 minutes in this study) unlike a telephone interview which is usually 20 minutes maximum.</li> <li>• Interviews were about a story the survivor was telling, not answering 'tricky' questions at a job interview or on a rating scale.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> for face-to-face point.  <b>1 mark</b> for alternative point.  <b>1 mark</b> for relating to this study.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
12(a)	<p><b>The laboratory experiment by Zimbardo and the key study by Diener et al. both investigated deindividuation.</b></p> <p><b>Briefly describe the laboratory experiment by Zimbardo.</b></p> <p><b>Research:</b> Studies on individuation and deindividuation: laboratory (e.g. Zimbardo, 1969) and field studies (Diener et al., 1976). Johnson and Downing (1979) Social identity theory (Reicher 1984b St Pauls riots).</p> <p><b>Key study:</b> Diener, E, Fraser, S C, Beaman, A L and Kelem, R T (1976) Effects of deindividuation variables on stealing among Halloween trick-or-treaters. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Volume 33, Issue 2, February 1976, Pages 178–183.</p> <p>Female students were <b>individuated</b> emphasised by being welcomed by name, wearing a name badge and were in full view of the experimenter. A second group of female participants were <b>deindividuated</b>: They wore lab coats and hoods that masked their faces so they were not identifiable (Ku Klux Klan style); the experimenters did not know their names. The participants hear a tape recording of an interview in which the ‘victim’ was portrayed either as altruistic and likeable or as self-centred and obnoxious. Participants were then invited to ‘condition’ the ‘victim’ using electric shocks. (DV = length of time of a single shock). Result: those who were deindividuated delivered the shocks for <i>twice as long</i> as those who were identifiable.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> for accurate and detailed description with understanding of appropriate psychological knowledge / examples.  <b>2 marks</b> for accurate description with some understanding / examples.  <b>1 mark</b> for vague description with little understanding.</p>	3
12(b)	<p><b>Contrast the experiment by Zimbardo with the key study by Diener et al.</b></p> <p>Most likely: <i>(any appropriate point to receive credit)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zimbardo was a laboratory experiment, Diener et al. a field experiment;</li> <li>• Zimbardo used adults; Diener used children;</li> <li>• Zimbardo’s participants knew they were participating; Diener’s children did not.</li> <li>• Zimbardo’s participants gave (fake) electric shocks; Diener’s children played trick-or-treat;</li> <li>• Zimbardo’s participants knew they were participants; Diener’s children were unaware.</li> </ul> <p><i>Any appropriate contrast receives credit.</i></p> <p><b>1 mark:</b> one side.  <b>1 mark:</b> other side.  <b>1 mark</b> for elaboration / detail related to studies.</p>	3

Question	Answer	Marks
12(c)	<p><b>Briefly discuss the ethics of research on deindividuation.</b></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Zimbardo’s participants thought they were giving electric shocks to another participant.</li><li>• Diener’s research was on children and no consent was gained from anyone.</li><li>• Diener’s research encouraged children to steal candies / coins</li><li>• However, no one was harmed and Diener’s children were ‘trick-or-treating’.</li><li>• The ends justify the means, etc.</li></ul> <p><i>Any appropriate ethics argument receives credit</i></p> <p><b>1 mark:</b> argument for one side. <b>1 mark:</b> argument for other side. <b>1 mark</b> for relating to deindividuation.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
13(a)	<p><b>Describe what psychologists have learned about personal space.</b></p> <p>Theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definitions, types (alpha, beta, asymmetry), distances (Hall, 1963).</li> <li>• Measures: simulation, stop-distance, questionnaire (Duke and Nowecki, 1972).</li> <li>• Cultural differences (Little, 1968).</li> </ul> <p>Research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personal space invasions: Felipe and Sommer (1966); Middlemist et al., (1976); Smith and Knowles (1978).</li> </ul> <p>Key Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smith, R J and Knowles, E S (1978) Attributional Consequences of Personal Space Invasions. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i>, Vol. 4, No. 3, 429–433.</li> </ul> <p>Applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing crime at an ATM (cash machine) Home Office (2007).</li> </ul> <p><i>The question is a general, topic area question and so it is expected that candidates will show a wider knowledge of the topic area.</i></p>	12
13(b)	<p><b>Evaluate what psychologists have learned about personal space.</b></p> <p><i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</i></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> <p><i>The question is a general, topic area question and so it is expected that candidates will show evaluation of the wider topic area.</i></p>	16

Question	Answer	Marks
14(a)	<p><b>Describe theory and research on environmental cognition.</b></p> <p>Theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definitions, measures, sketch maps (Lynch, 1960).</li> <li>• Estimating distances (Moar, 1976).</li> <li>• Errors in cognitive maps.</li> </ul> <p>Research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Human sex differences in wayfinding (Malinowski, 2001), recalling routes (Maguire et al., 1997).</li> </ul> <p>Key Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aginsky, V, Harris, C, Rensink, R and Beusmans, J (1997) Two Strategies for Learning a Route in a Driving Simulator. <i>Journal of Environmental Psychology</i>, 17, 317–331.</li> </ul> <p>Applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designing better maps (Levine’s 1982 you are here maps).</li> <li>• Adult map acquisition (Aginsky et al., 1997).</li> </ul> <p><i>Candidates should focus specifically on theory and research (as above) and this could include the Key Study. It should not include applications. Answers which focus exclusively on applications should receive no marks or ignored if part of a theory and research answer.</i></p>	12
14(b)	<p><b>Evaluate theory and research on environmental cognition.</b></p> <p><i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</i></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> <p><i>The question focuses on theory and research and so it is expected that candidates will show evaluation that can include the key study and/or the wider topic area.</i></p>	16

Question	Answer	Marks
15(a)	<p><b>Research suggests that playing music by Mozart to children makes them more intelligent. Perhaps playing music by Mozart to babies before they are born will be even more effective.</b></p> <p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology, design a study to test the effectiveness of playing music by Mozart to babies before they are born.</b></p> <p>In this question part candidates are either directed to design a study based on a named method or are free to suggest any way in which the assessment request could be investigated. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme.</p> <p><b>General features</b> that could be included: Sampling technique &amp; sample, type of data, ethics, reliability, validity, data analysis (descriptive and/or inferential).</p> <p><b>Specific features:</b> The question does not name a method and the candidate is free to choose. The main features of the chosen method should be included. Specific features could include:</p> <p><b>Experiments:</b> Type, IV, DV, controls, experimental design.</p> <p><b>Observations:</b> Type, setting, response categories, sampling frame, number of observers.</p> <p><b>Questionnaires / Interviews:</b> Type, setting, example questions. Scoring / rating scale, analysis of responses.</p>	8
15(b)	<p><b>Explain the evidence on which your study is based.</b></p> <p>In this question part candidates are expected to justify his or her decisions or evidence presented regarding the design made in answer to question part (a).</p> <p><i>Evidence can include theory and research.</i></p> <p>Most likely inclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of methodology, specifically that appropriate to the investigation in question.</li> <li>• Knowledge of Applications: Positive benefits of music: on performance (the Mozart effect).</li> </ul> <p><i>Any appropriate evidence to receive credit.</i></p>	6

Question	Answer	Marks
<b>PSYCHOLOGY AND HEALTH</b>		
16(a)	<p><b>From the key study by Tapper et al. on the ‘Food Dudes’:</b></p> <p><b>Tapper et al. believed that the Food Dude programme would work in three main ways.</b></p> <p><b>Give these <u>three</u> ways.</b></p> <p><b>Key study:</b> Tapper, K, Horne, P J and Lowe, C F (2003) The Food Dudes to the Rescue. The Psychologist, January 2003, Vol. 16, No. 1.</p> <p>Quote from study:</p> <p>Why does it work? We believe the programme works in three main ways.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Firstly, children discover the intrinsically rewarding properties of fruit and vegetables and develop a liking for them.</li> <li>2. Secondly, the programme changes the culture within the school to one that strongly supports the eating of fruit and vegetables.</li> <li>3. Thirdly, children come to see themselves as ‘fruit and vegetable eaters’ and are guided by this self-concept.</li> </ol> <p><b>1 mark</b> for brief description of each aspect.</p>	<b>3</b>
16(b)	<p><b>Explain the perspective on which this study is based.</b></p> <p>Quote from study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modelling Research shows that certain factors make modelling (imitation and observational learning) more effective. (i) a child is more likely to imitate another person if that person is liked or admired by the child, (ii) is the same age or slightly older, (iii) has their behaviour rewarded.(iv) Observing multiple models has also been shown to be more effective than observing single models.</li> <li>• Positive reinforcement: children receiving letters from the Food Dudes means that the behaviour is likely to be repeated</li> <li>• ‘all behaviour is learned’ so children simply need to be taught the positive benefit of fruit and vegetables.</li> </ul> <p><i>Any appropriate behaviourist principle receives credit.</i></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> for accurate and detailed description with understanding of <i>behaviourist principles / examples.</i> <b>2 marks</b> for accurate description but basic understanding / examples. <b>1 mark</b> for vague description with little understanding.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
16(c)	<p><b>Briefly discuss the usefulness of this perspective to motivate children.</b></p> <p>Most likely: <i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit</i></p> <p>Italics as points are quoting from study.</p> <p><i>Usefulness:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>When used appropriately, rewards can be very effective at altering behaviour (The message here is clear: 'Well done! You should be proud of yourself.' The certificates and trophies are marks of achievement and hopefully the child will work just as hard next time).</i></li> <li>• <i>Rewards are most effective when they are highly desirable, achievable, their delivery is contingent upon performance, and when they convey the message that they are for behaviour that is both enjoyable and high status.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Less useful:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>It has been claimed that rewarding an individual for engaging in a particular task undermines his or her intrinsic motivation for that task.</i></li> <li>• <i>However, tell a child 'Eat all your vegetables and then you can have pudding', and the message is entirely different. You are telling the child that pudding is better than vegetables.</i></li> <li>• <i>In addition, the child is likely to feel that their behaviour is being controlled and may also conclude 'If I have to eat vegetables to get pudding, then vegetables must be really nasty!' Although the child may eat the vegetables on this occasion, it is unlikely that they will do so in the future in the absence of pudding.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark:</b> one side.  <b>1 mark:</b> other side.  <b>1 mark</b> for elaboration / detail related to studies.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
17(a)	<p><b>Briefly describe <u>one</u> piece of research which used a physiological measure of stress.</b></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Jamner / Goldstein: Ambulatory blood pressure and heart rate responses were obtained in 33 male paramedics during a 24-hour work shift to examine the effects of episodes of occupational stress on cardiovascular reactivity and subjective reports of stress. The aim of this study was to determine how individual differences in cynical hostility and defensiveness interacted with situational demands to affect cardiovascular responses in a natural setting. Defensiveness was found to interact significantly with cynical hostility in predicting subjects' heart rate responses in different work contexts. Specifically, in a hospital setting involving interpersonal conflict, subjects who were high in both defensiveness and hostility showed heart rate responses approximately 10 bpm higher than subjects who were high in hostility but low in defensiveness. The same pattern of relationships was obtained for diastolic blood pressure. High and low hostile subjects were also found to differ from each other in their daily mean levels of ambulatory blood pressure during awake and sleep periods. These findings obtained in a natural setting lend further support to the significance of cynical hostility for cardiovascular reactivity. The results for defensiveness suggest the need for further research on the role of conflicting attitudes in the pathophysiology of cardiovascular diseases.</p> <p>Also possible: Wang (year 1 key study) used fMRI to measure 'location' of stress in the brain. Also used physiological measures (heart rate and salivary cortisol) to check validity of stress tasks. Evans and Wener (year 2 Environment study) used salivary cortisol to measure stress levels.</p> <p><i>Any other appropriate study to receive credit (e.g. Geer and Maisel)</i></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> for accurate and detailed description with understanding of appropriate psychological knowledge / examples. <b>2 marks</b> for accurate description with some understanding / examples. <b>1 mark</b> for vague description with little understanding.</p>	3
17(b)	<p><b>Suggest <u>two</u> strengths of using physiological measures when studying stress.</b></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physiological measures are reliable.</li> <li>• Measures of physiological processes produce objective data (drug in blood means drug must have been taken).</li> <li>• Physiological processes are universal (excluding abnormalities) e.g. everyone has salivary cortisol.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> for each strength and <b>1 mark</b> for detail / elaboration / example.</p>	3

Question	Answer	Marks
17(c)	<p><b>Suggest <u>two</u> weaknesses of using physiological measures when studying stress.</b></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A physiological measure does not give the reason for a recording (many reasons for high blood pressure)</li><li>• There are minor individual differences in physiological recordings (e.g. higher or lower than average heart rate)</li><li>• A physiological measure may be invasive or uncomfortable (blood / urine sample; spitting into a salivette)</li></ul> <p><b>1 mark:</b> for each weakness and <b>1 mark</b> for detail / elaboration / example</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
18(a)	<p><b>Describe what psychologists have learned about the doctor-patient relationship.</b></p> <p>Theory: Doctor-patient interactions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-verbal communication (Mckinstry and Wang, 1991).</li> <li>• Verbal communication (Ley, 1989).</li> <li>• Communication styles (Savage and Armstrong, 1991).</li> </ul> <p>Research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doctor decision-making: Judgements of risk (Marteau, 1990),</li> <li>• Patient disclosure of symptoms (Robinson and West, 1992).</li> </ul> <p>Key study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• McKinstry, B and Wang, J X (1991) Putting on the style: what patients think of the way their doctor dresses. British Journal of General Practice, 1991 July, 41(348), 270, 275–8.</li> </ul> <p>Applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using-misusing health services: Munchausen syndrome (Aleem and Ajarim, 1995).</li> <li>• Hypochondriasis (Barlow and Durand, 1995).</li> </ul> <p><i>The question is a general, topic area question and so it is expected that candidates will show a wider knowledge of the topic area.</i></p>	12
18(b)	<p><b>Evaluate what psychologists have learned about the doctor-patient relationship.</b></p> <p><i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</i></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> <p><i>The question is a general, topic area question and so it is expected that candidates will show evaluation of the wider topic area.</i></p>	16

Question	Answer	Marks
19(a)	<p><b>Describe the key study by Simons et al. (2003) on pain in newborn babies.</b></p> <p>Abstract from the article:</p> <p><b>Background:</b> Despite an increasing awareness regarding pain management in neonates and the availability of published guidelines for the treatment of procedural pain, preterm neonates experience pain leading to short- and long-term detrimental effects.</p> <p><b>Objective:</b> To assess the frequency of use of analgesics in invasive procedures in neonates and the associated pain burden in this population.</p> <p><b>Methods:</b> For 151 neonates, we prospectively recorded all painful procedures, including the number of attempts required, and analgesic therapy used during the first 14 days of neonatal intensive care unit admission. These data were linked to estimates of the pain of each procedure, obtained from the opinions of experienced clinicians.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> On average, each neonate was subjected to a mean <math>\pm</math>SD of <math>14 \pm 4</math> procedures per day. The highest exposure to painful procedures occurred during the first day of admission, and most procedures (63.6%) consisted of suctioning. Many procedures (26 of 31 listed on a questionnaire) were estimated to be painful (pain scores <math>&gt;4</math> on a 10-point scale). Pre-emptive analgesic therapy was provided to fewer than 35% of neonates per study day, while 39.7% of the neonates did not receive any analgesic therapy in the neonatal intensive care unit.</p> <p><b>Conclusions:</b> Clinicians estimated that most neonatal intensive care unit procedures are painful, but only a third of the neonates received appropriate analgesic therapy. Despite the accumulating evidence that neonatal procedural pain is harmful, analgesic treatment for painful procedures is limited. Systematic approaches are required to reduce the occurrence of pain and to improve the analgesic treatment of repetitive pain in neonates.</p> <p><i>The question is a specific 'key study' question and so it is expected that candidates will focus specifically on the key study. Contextualising the study at the beginning is creditworthy as is any 'explore more' that a candidate may include showing how the key study itself has been extended.</i></p>	12

Question	Answer	Marks
19(b)	<p><b>Evaluate the key study by Simons et al. (2003) on pain in newborn babies.</b></p> <p><i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</i></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> <p><i>The question is a specific ‘key study’ question and so it is expected that candidates will focus evaluation specifically on the key study. Credit can also be given for evaluation of contextualisation of the study and any ‘explore more’.</i></p>	16

Question	Answer	Marks
20(a)	<p><b>Patients missing doctors' appointments is a problem. Perhaps if patients were fined when they missed appointments, this problem would be reduced.</b></p> <p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology, design an experiment to assess the effectiveness of fining patients for missed appointments.</b></p> <p>In this question part candidates are either directed to design a study based on a named method or are free to suggest any way in which the assessment request could be investigated. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme.</p> <p><b>General features</b> that could be included: Sampling technique &amp; sample, type of data, ethics, reliability, validity, data analysis (descriptive and/or inferential).</p> <p><b>Specific features:</b> The question requires an experiment to be conducted. This could be natural, field or laboratory. Features could include:</p> <p><b>Experiments:</b> Type, IV, DV, controls, experimental design.</p>	8
20(b)	<p><b>Explain the evidence on which your suggestion is based.</b></p> <p>In this question part candidates are expected to justify his or her decisions or evidence presented regarding the design made in answer to question part (a).</p> <p><i>Evidence can include theory and research.</i></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of methodology, specifically that appropriate to the investigation in question.</li> <li>• Knowledge of strategies for improving adherence.</li> <li>• Knowledge of Behavioural strategies (DiMatteo and DiNicola, 1982).</li> </ul> <p><i>Any appropriate evidence to receive credit.</i></p>	6

Question	Answer	Marks
<b>PSYCHOLOGY AND SPORT</b>		
21(a)	<p><b>Describe what is meant by ‘social loafing’ in humans, using any example from sport psychology.</b></p> <p>Research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social loafing in humans: Kerr and Bruun (1981).</li> </ul> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Social loafing is when people are prone to exert less effort on a task if they are in a group versus when they work alone. Classic example: In 1913 Ringleman found that when he asked groups of men to pull on a rope, they did not pull as hard, or put in as much effort, as they did when they were pulling alone.</p> <p><b>3 marks:</b> accurate description with understanding and example. <b>2 marks:</b> basic description and example. <b>1 mark:</b> description with no example.</p>	<b>3</b>
21(b)	<p><b>Outline <u>two</u> explanations for social loafing outlined by Kerr and Bruun.</b></p> <p>Quote from study in italics:</p> <p>Abstract: <i>‘The ‘me first’ explanation holds that social loafing occurs only when an individual performs in several different size groups.’</i> If a person performs alone then they would not hold back any energy. If they worked in a small group they would hold back a little energy, and in a large group they would probably allocate much less energy.</p> <p>Abstract: <i>‘The ‘hide-in-the crowd’ explanation holds that member anonymity increases with group size for the tasks which have yielded the effect.’</i> Put another way: <i>‘the possibility of detecting and identifying loafing by any single member of the group decreases as group size increases.’</i> And: <i>‘for fatiguing motor tasks like those considered here, subjects take advantage of the anonymity afforded by working in larger groups and reduce their efforts.’</i></p> <p><b>1 mark:</b> description of one explanation. <b>1 mark:</b> description of second explanation. <b>1 mark:</b> elaboration, use of example, understanding evident.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
21(c)	<p><b>Suggest <u>two</u> weaknesses of conducting experiments to investigate social loafing.</b></p> <p>Note: Kerr and Bruun conducted two experiments (description of experiments not required)</p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task might be artificial (mundane realism)</li> <li>• Participants know they are performing in a study (and so not social loaf!)</li> <li>• All extraneous variables might not be controlled, leading to confounding.</li> <li>• Weaknesses in measuring social loafing (the DV)</li> </ul> <p><i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</i></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for each weakness.  <b>1 mark:</b> elaboration, use of example, understanding evident.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer	Marks																																																																																																													
22(a)	<p><b>The key study by Widmeyer and Williams on group cohesion in a coaching sport used correlations to analyse data.</b></p> <p><b>Identify <u>three</u> variables that were positively correlated with the variable of ‘attraction to their group’s task’ (ATG-T).</b></p> <p><b>Key study:</b> Widmeyer, WN and Williams, M (1991) Predicting Cohesion in a Coaching Sport. Small Group Research, 1991; 22; 548.</p> <p><b>TABLE 1: Means and Standard Deviations for the Variables</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="331 589 1023 1016"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Variables</th> <th rowspan="2">M</th> <th rowspan="2">SD</th> <th colspan="4">Correlations With</th> </tr> <tr> <th>ATG-S</th> <th>ATG-T</th> <th>GI-S</th> <th>GI-T</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Team size</td> <td>8.13</td> <td>1.92</td> <td>.11</td> <td>.27</td> <td>.09</td> <td>.05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total satisfaction</td> <td>26.17</td> <td>6.74</td> <td>.63</td> <td>.61</td> <td>.56</td> <td>.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Similarity of experience</td> <td>3.72</td> <td>1.03</td> <td>.32</td> <td>.18</td> <td>.28</td> <td>.14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Coaches’ fostering of cohesion</td> <td>3.08</td> <td>1.07</td> <td>.31</td> <td>.27</td> <td>.25</td> <td>.24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Team differential (prior performance)</td> <td>19.31</td> <td>10.18</td> <td>-.16</td> <td>-.36</td> <td>-.17</td> <td>-.29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total communication</td> <td>21.11</td> <td>6.16</td> <td>.26</td> <td>.15</td> <td>.28</td> <td>.43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Having a team goal</td> <td>1.30</td> <td>.46</td> <td>-.09</td> <td>-.28</td> <td>-.11</td> <td>-.26</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Importance of achieving goal</td> <td>7.61</td> <td>2.05</td> <td>.57</td> <td>.35</td> <td>.25</td> <td>.35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Prior liking</td> <td>26.97</td> <td>5.07</td> <td>.50</td> <td>.33</td> <td>.41</td> <td>.34</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="7">Cohesion variables</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ATG-S (5 items)</td> <td>32.27</td> <td>9.46</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>ATG-T (4 items)</td> <td>26.74</td> <td>7.54</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>GI-S (4 items)</td> <td>21.20</td> <td>8.19</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>GI-T (5 items)</td> <td>29.04</td> <td>8.69</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="331 1025 662 1048">NOTE: <math>r &gt; .22 = p &lt; .05</math>; <math>r &gt; .28 = p &lt; .01</math>.</p> <p>Quote from study:</p> <p>Predictors of members’ attraction to their group’s task (ATG-T). It can be seen in Table 1 that there were significant positive correlations between members’ attraction to their group’s task (ATG-T) and</p> <ul data-bbox="319 1294 1037 1467" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team size,</li> <li>• Each of the satisfaction measures,</li> <li>• Prior liking,</li> <li>• The efforts coaches make to foster team cohesion,</li> <li>• The perceived importance of the team goal, and</li> </ul> <p>Not related to ATG-T was the similarity of experience.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for identification of each aspect.</p>	Variables	M	SD	Correlations With				ATG-S	ATG-T	GI-S	GI-T	Team size	8.13	1.92	.11	.27	.09	.05	Total satisfaction	26.17	6.74	.63	.61	.56	.68	Similarity of experience	3.72	1.03	.32	.18	.28	.14	Coaches’ fostering of cohesion	3.08	1.07	.31	.27	.25	.24	Team differential (prior performance)	19.31	10.18	-.16	-.36	-.17	-.29	Total communication	21.11	6.16	.26	.15	.28	.43	Having a team goal	1.30	.46	-.09	-.28	-.11	-.26	Importance of achieving goal	7.61	2.05	.57	.35	.25	.35	Prior liking	26.97	5.07	.50	.33	.41	.34	Cohesion variables							ATG-S (5 items)	32.27	9.46					ATG-T (4 items)	26.74	7.54					GI-S (4 items)	21.20	8.19					GI-T (5 items)	29.04	8.69					3
Variables	M				SD	Correlations With																																																																																																									
		ATG-S	ATG-T	GI-S		GI-T																																																																																																									
Team size	8.13	1.92	.11	.27	.09	.05																																																																																																									
Total satisfaction	26.17	6.74	.63	.61	.56	.68																																																																																																									
Similarity of experience	3.72	1.03	.32	.18	.28	.14																																																																																																									
Coaches’ fostering of cohesion	3.08	1.07	.31	.27	.25	.24																																																																																																									
Team differential (prior performance)	19.31	10.18	-.16	-.36	-.17	-.29																																																																																																									
Total communication	21.11	6.16	.26	.15	.28	.43																																																																																																									
Having a team goal	1.30	.46	-.09	-.28	-.11	-.26																																																																																																									
Importance of achieving goal	7.61	2.05	.57	.35	.25	.35																																																																																																									
Prior liking	26.97	5.07	.50	.33	.41	.34																																																																																																									
Cohesion variables																																																																																																															
ATG-S (5 items)	32.27	9.46																																																																																																													
ATG-T (4 items)	26.74	7.54																																																																																																													
GI-S (4 items)	21.20	8.19																																																																																																													
GI-T (5 items)	29.04	8.69																																																																																																													

Question	Answer	Marks
22(b)	<p><b>Suggest why this study found a positive correlation between team size and task cohesion when other studies found a negative correlation.</b></p> <p>Quote from study:</p> <p>In the previous work of Widmeyer et al. (1990), a <b>negative relationship</b> was found between team size and task cohesion. By contrast, in the present study, there was a <b>positive relationship</b> between these variables.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The lower attractiveness of the task as the size of the basketball and volleyball teams increased was attributed to the lower satisfaction brought on by the fewer opportunities to participate. In golf, all members had equal opportunities to participate during practices.</li> <li>2. Any difference in opportunity to participate during competition brought on by team size would not be shown in the present study, because the only golfers surveyed were those on the current traveling squad. It could be that the members of larger teams were highly attracted to the group's task because they felt it was more prestigious to represent a large rather than a small constituency.</li> <li>3. The differences in the size-cohesion relationships between this study and previous research cannot be attributed to differences between coaching and interacting groups but, instead, are likely to be due to differences in the size of the 'small' teams or the extent of interaction among members in the teams studied.</li> </ol> <p><b>1 mark</b> for one side.  <b>1 mark</b> for other side.  <b>1 mark:</b> elaboration, use of example, understanding evident.</p>	3
22(c)	<p><b>Suggest <u>one</u> strength and <u>one</u> weakness of using correlations in this study.</b></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correlations can provide useful information about the specific strength of the relationship between two variables.</li> <li>• Correlations can be used to check agreement between observers (inter-rater reliability).</li> <li>• Correlations may provide information that could prompt future research. Researchers can then investigate whether there is cause and effect.</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not possible to show causality. i.e. correlation does not mean that one thing causes the other, simply that they vary together.</li> <li>• It is not possible to use a correlation to analyse non-linear relationships (where data shows a curve)</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> for one side.  <b>1 mark</b> for other side.  <b>1 mark:</b> use of appropriate example.</p>	3

Question	Answer	Marks
23(a)	<p><b>Describe what psychologists have learned about motivation in sport.</b></p> <p>Theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Deci, 1975).</li> <li>• Achievement motivation (McClelland-Atkinson 1953).</li> <li>• Competence motivation theory and PCSC (Harter, 1978, 1982).</li> </ul> <p>Research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attributions: (Weiner, 1972; McAuley, 1992).</li> </ul> <p>Key study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• McAuley, E, Duncan, T E and Russell, D W (1992) Measuring Causal Attributions: The Revised Causal Dimension Scale (CDSII). Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1992; 18; 566.</li> </ul> <p>Applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-confidence (Vealey, 1986).</li> <li>• Learned helplessness (Dweck, 1978).</li> </ul> <p><i>The question is a general, topic area question and so it is expected that candidates will show a wider knowledge of the topic area.</i></p>	12
23(b)	<p><b>Evaluate what psychologists have learned about motivation in sport.</b></p> <p><i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</i></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> <p><i>The question is a general, topic area question and so it is expected that candidates will show evaluation of the wider topic area.</i></p>	16

Question	Answer	Marks
24(a)	<p><b>Describe the key study by Kajtna et al. on personality in high risk sports athletes.</b></p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>The research investigated personality traits of high-risk sports athletes. The aim was to investigate the personality dimensions and compare the results to the results of non-risk sports athletes and non-athletes. Thirty eight high-risk sports athletes participated in the research (alpinists, sky divers, paragliders, white-water kayakers, downhill mountain-bikers, motocross riders, downhill skiers and ski jumpers). The non-risk sports athletes consisted of 38 swimmers, track athletes, sailors, flat-water kayakers, rowers, Nordic skiers, sports climbers and karatekas. The non-athletes were equalled with both groups in age and education and included 76 non-athletes. The Big Five Observer Scale was used. It was found that high-risk sports athletes scored highest in emotional stability, they were followed by the non-athletes and the lowest scores were achieved by non-risk sports athletes. The same order of groups was shown in conscientiousness and energy. Openness was highest in the non-risk sports athletes, followed by the non-athletes and the lowest score was achieved by the high-risk sports athletes. The differences in acceptability were not significant. Four out of five hypotheses were accepted.</p> <p><i>The question is a specific 'key study' question and so it is expected that candidates will focus specifically on the key study. Contextualising the study at the beginning is creditworthy as is any 'explore more' that a candidate may include showing how the key study itself has been extended.</i></p>	12

Question	Answer	Marks
24(b)	<p><b>Evaluate the key study by Kajtna et al. on personality in high risk sports athletes.</b></p> <p><i>Any appropriate evaluative point to receive credit.</i></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> <p><i>The question is a specific ‘key study’ question and so it is expected that candidates will focus evaluation specifically on the key study. Credit can also be given for evaluation of contextualisation of the study and any ‘explore more’.</i></p>	16

Question	Answer	Marks
25(a)	<p><b>It is not known whether athletes experience more performance anxiety when competing on their ‘home’ track than when they are competing on an ‘away’ track.</b></p> <p><b>Using your knowledge of psychology, design study to investigate ‘home’ and ‘away’ performance anxiety.</b></p> <p>In this question part candidates are either directed to design a study based on a named method or are free to suggest any way in which the assessment request could be investigated. Each answer should be considered individually as it applies to the mark scheme.</p> <p><b>General features</b> that could be included: Sampling technique &amp; sample, type of data, ethics, reliability, validity, data analysis (descriptive and/or inferential).</p> <p><b>Specific features:</b> The question does not name a method and the candidate is free to choose. The main features of the chosen method should be included. Specific features could include:</p> <p><b>Experiments:</b> Type, IV, DV, controls, experimental design.</p> <p><b>Observations:</b> Type, setting, response categories, sampling frame, number of observers.</p> <p><b>Questionnaires / Interviews:</b> Type, setting, example questions. Scoring / rating scale, analysis of responses.</p>	8
25(b)	<p><b>Explain the evidence on which your study is based.</b></p> <p>In this question part candidates are expected to justify his or her decisions or evidence presented regarding the design made in answer to question part (a).</p> <p><i>Evidence can include theory and research.</i></p> <p>Most likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of methodology, specifically that appropriate to the investigation in question.</li> <li>• Knowledge of anxiety in sport (performance anxiety);</li> <li>• Knowledge of audience effects (‘homefield’ advantage).</li> </ul> <p><i>Any appropriate evidence to receive credit.</i></p>	6