13.1 Explanations for the Success and Failure of Dieting: 30-minute Pack

AQA 7182 · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions.

1 Explain Wegner's ironic processes theory as an explanation for why actively trying not to think about tempting foods can undermine dieting in everyday contexts.

(Total for Question 1 is 2 marks)

2 Identify two common triggers of disinhibition in restrained dieters and briefly explain how each trigger undermines restraint, using examples such as alcohol or stress.

(Total for Question 2 is 3 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

3 Explain two cognitive factors, other than restraint and ironic processes, that help explain why some dieters succeed while others fail. For each factor, give a short explanation of how it helps success or causes failure.

(Total for Question 3 is 6 marks)

4 Discuss psychological explanations for the success and failure of dieting. In your answer include reference to restraint theory and the boundary model, ironic processes theory, and at least two pieces of supporting or challenging research evidence. Evaluate these explanations and reach a reasoned conclusion about their usefulness for understanding why dieting sometimes works and sometimes fails.

(Total for Question 4 is 16 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 13.1 Explanations for the Success and Failure of Dieting: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

states the core of Wegner's theory: intentional suppression uses a monitoring process that ironically increases the accessibility of the thought oe	**M1**
applies this to food: trying not to think of tasty foods can make the thought more salient, increasing craving and the chance of lapse oe	**A1**

Answer: Wegner's ironic processes theory proposes that active thought suppression uses a monitoring process that makes the suppressed thought more accessible, so trying not to think about tempting foods can make them more salient and increase cravings and lapses.

Question 2

identifies alcohol as a trigger and explains it reduces self control and lowers perceived consequences oe	**M1**
identifies stress as a trigger and explains it shifts behaviour toward comfort eating and reduces cognitive resources for restraint oe	**M1**
each explanation links the trigger to a mechanism that undermines restraint, e.g. reduced inhibition or cognitive load leading to lapse oe	**A1**

Answer: Alcohol can undermine restraint by reducing inhibition and perceived costs of breaking the diet, leading to disinhibited eating. Stress uses up cognitive resources and increases emotional eating, so a stressed dieter is more likely to lapse.

Question 3

identifies first cognitive factor, e.g. habits and food cue reactivity, and explains how it affects dieting success or failure oe	**M1**
develops the first point with mechanism, e.g. strong habits and high cue reactivity make restraint harder and predict lapses, whereas new adaptive habits support success oe	**A1**
identifies second cognitive factor, e.g. executive function and working memory capacity, and explains its relevance oe	**M1**
develops the second point, e.g. better executive control supports sustained restraint and planning, while low cognitive control makes suppression and self regulation more likely to fail oe	**A1**
provides an applied example or brief evidence to illustrate one of the factors oe	**M1**
links back to dieting outcomes, explaining why these cognitive factors create individual differences in success or failure oe	**A1**

Answer: One factor is habitual responding and cue reactivity: strong learned habits and high sensitivity to food cues make it easy to lapse when cues appear, so changing the environment or forming new habits supports success. A second factor is executive function, including working memory and inhibitory control: dieters with stronger self control and planning abilities can sustain restraint and resist tempting cues, whereas those with poorer cognitive control are more likely to succumb to impulses.

Question 4

Level 4 Knowledge of psychological explanations is accurate and detailed. Discussion is thorough and evaluative, integrating evidence and alternative explanations. Evaluation considers methodology, real world application and ethical issues, and the answer reaches a clear, supported conclusion on the usefulness of the explanations for understanding dieting outcomes. The response applies specialist terminology appropriately and is coherent.	**13-16**
Level 3 Knowledge is clear with some detail. Discussion includes evaluation and supporting evidence, though some points may be less developed. Alternative explanations are considered and a conclusion is offered but may lack depth. The answer is mostly organised and uses specialist terms correctly.	**9-12**
Level 2 Knowledge is present but limited. Discussion includes some evaluation but is superficial or unbalanced. Limited use of evidence and limited application to real world implications. Conclusion is weak or descriptive rather than reasoned. Some relevant terminology used inconsistently.	**5-8**
Level 1 Very limited knowledge and understanding. Discussion is largely descriptive with little or no evaluation. No coherent conclusion. Little or no use of specialist terminology.	**1-4**
Level 0 No creditworthy material.	**0**

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Indicative content:

- AO1: Restraint theory and the boundary model explain failure as a consequence of cognitive restraint and a discrete boundary; when dieters perceive a breach they show disinhibition and overeat.
- AO1: Ironic processes theory proposes active suppression increases the accessibility of forbidden thoughts, increasing craving and the chance of lapse.
- AO1: Other cognitive factors include habit and cue reactivity, executive control, and the impact of low calorie sweeteners disrupting appetite regulation.
- AO1: Social and situational cues such as peer modelling, abundance of food, alcohol and stress are environmental triggers that interact with cognitive vulnerability to produce lapses.
- AO3: Supporting evidence includes laboratory studies showing that restrained eaters consume more after a preload or alcohol prime, consistent with disinhibition and boundary breach. Experimental studies of thought suppression show rebound effects on accessibility of suppressed food thoughts, in line with ironic processes.
- AO3: Challenging evidence includes findings that not all restrained eaters binge, indicating individual differences such as high cognitive control or adaptive habits; ecological validity of laboratory taste tests is limited and may not reflect long term dieting outcomes.
- AO3: Methodological evaluation: laboratory experiments provide causal evidence but often use small, student samples and artificial tasks; naturalistic and longitudinal studies are needed to assess sustained dieting success and real world triggers.
- AO3: Ethical considerations when provoking lapses in vulnerable participants and the importance of debriefing and support.
- AO3: Practical applications include designing interventions that reduce exposure to cues, train alternative coping strategies, strengthen executive control, and avoid instructing thought suppression; using gradual habit change rather than strict cognitive restraint.
- Conclusion guidance: the theories together offer a useful, complementary account where cognitive restraint and boundary effects explain vulnerability, ironic processes explain why suppression can backfire, and situational and individual cognitive differences determine whether a lapse occurs. However, limitations in external validity and individual differences mean these explanations are not wholly sufficient on their own.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk