

Teacher Resource Bank

GCE Psychology A

Further Practice Questions Mark Schemes

- PSYA1
- PSYA2



Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

Dr Michael Cresswell, Director General.

MARK SCHEME FOR FURTHER PRACTICE QUESTIONS

PSYA1 Cognitive Psychology

1 Zac is playing a computer game which involves sorting coloured shapes that appear on the screen. He has to capture the shapes and drag them to the appropriate collection box. While he plays, he chats to Dan about a football match.

When he has completed Level 1, he moves on to Level 2. Here, the shapes are replaced by words that have to be sorted according to their meaning. Zac begins to make mistakes and so stops talking to Dan.

With reference to features of the working memory model, explain why Zac can easily cope with Level 1 and chat to Dan but, when he gets to Level 2, he cannot do both things at the same time.

(6 marks)

AO2 = 6 marks for analysis of the behaviour and application of knowledge of working memory model to explain the behaviour

Features of the WMM relevant to the scenario:

Zac is doing the following.

- Using visuo-spatial sketchpad to play the game that involves sorting coloured shapes into the collection boxes
- Using articulatory loop/articulatory control process, phonological loop and primary acoustic store to manage the conversation with Dan
- When the task changes at Level 2, it becomes a task involving both visuo-spatial sketch pad to drag the words to the collection box and the articulatory loop/articulatory control process in deciding on the meaning of the word. Thus the articulatory loop/articulatory control process becomes involved in two tasks.
 Because the slave systems have limited capacity, Zac can no longer chat to Dan and play the game.

Or accept a more general explanation: CE which plays a role in attention may be being over-extended.

6 marks Effective analysis and application

Effective analysis of the scenario to identify features of the WMM that are used to explain why Zac can cope with both tasks initially but later cannot. Outline demonstrates sound knowledge of features of the WMM.

4-5 marks Reasonable analysis and application

Reasonably effective analysis of the scenario to identify some features of the WMM that are used to explain why Zac can cope with both tasks initially but later cannot. Outline demonstrates some knowledge of features of the WMM.

3-2 marks Basic analysis and application

Basic analysis of the scenario to identify one feature of the WMM that is used to explain why Zac can cope with both tasks initially or why later he cannot. Outline demonstrates basic knowledge of one feature of the WMM.

1 mark Rudimentary analysis and application

Rudimentary analysis of the scenario identifying one feature of the WMM that could explain why Zac can cope with both tasks initially or why he later cannot. Outline of a feature of the WMM is very brief and flawed or outline of the WMM is accurate but has not been applied to the scenario.

0 marks

No creditworthy material.

2 Below is a table summarising the main differences between short term memory and long term memory. Complete the table. (2 marks)

AO1 = 2 marks for correct completion of the table as below.

	STM	LTM	
Capacity	7 +/- 2 items	Unlimited	
Duration	Seconds	Up to a lifetime	
Encoding	Encoding Mainly acoustic Mainly semantic		
	·	·	

3 It is argued that encoding in STM is mainly acoustic. In an experiment to investigate this, a psychologist compared participants' recall of the following two lists of letters.

List 1 BVTCDGEP List 2 MRWLZYQA

All participants were read List 1 and then, after recalling List 1, were read List 2 and asked to recall it. The data was recorded in the table below and the number of correctly recalled letters for each list was compared.

3 (a) Examine the letters in each of the lists and explain why the investigator selected the letters in each list.

(3 marks)

AO2 = 1 Analysis of unfamiliar material, recognising the basis for letter selection

AO3 = 2 Understanding of how IV has been operationalised

1 AO2 mark for recognising that the letters in List 1 all sound similar/are acoustically similar while those in List 2 are not acoustically similar.

Up to 2 AO3 marks for *explaining* that if STM codes acoustically, the investigator would expect the acoustically-similar letters to cause confusion and be less well recalled.

Candidates who provide more superficial rudimentary reasons, such as identical number of letters or same number of vowels in each list, so both lists are equally demanding, can gain 1 AO2 mark for analysis and 1 AO3, as the explanation is not complete.

3 (b) For each participant, the number of correctly recalled letters for List 1 and List 2 was entered on a table of results.

Participants	Number of letters	Number of letters Number of letters	
-	recalled from List 1 recalled		
1	4	7	
2	3	5	
3	4	5	
4	6	8	
5	7	7	
6	3	7	
7	5	6	
8	3	5	
9	6	7	
10	8	7	

3 (b) (i) Explain how you could summarise the findings of this investigation.

(4 marks)

AO3 = 4 marks for detail of how data could be summarised

Reference to an appropriate measure of central tendency, dispersion and/or graphical displays of either or both of these should gain credit.

Up to 2 marks for reference to an appropriately justified measure of central tendency, such as mean (1 mark), as it is reasonable to assume interval level of measurement (1 mark), or median, as the data is ordinal.

Up to 2 marks for reference to an appropriately justified measure of dispersion, such as SD (1 mark), as it is reasonable to assume interval level of measurement (1mark), or range, as the data is ordinal.

Up to 2 marks for identification or description of appropriate graphical display.

Full marks can be gained for actual execution of these as opposed to writing about them.

3 (b) (ii) Explain what the data seem to show.

(4 marks)

AO3 = 4 marks for the interpretation of data from the investigation

1 mark for reference to the number of letters recalled in the two conditions, such as more letters were recalled from List 2.

1 further mark for elaboration/suggesting an explanation for this, such as:

- evidence to support the view that STM codes acoustically
- as the same people participated in both conditions, these differences could not be explained by participant variables
- as they all heard the lists in the same order, the better recall of List 2 could reflect a practice effect.

1 mark for reference to the range of letters recalled, such as the range was much greater for List 1 than List 2.

1 further mark for elaboration/suggesting an explanation for this, such as:

• this suggests variability in the effect of acoustic similarity.

If a candidate focuses in depth on possible explanations of the number of letters recalled OR the dispersion of the scores, they can access the full range of marks.

3 (c) Like many studies in cognitive psychology, this was a laboratory experiment involving something the participants were unlikely to do in everyday life.
 Using your knowledge of research methods, discuss the value of such studies in cognitive psychology. (8 marks)

AO3 = 4 marks Knowledge and understanding of research methods (how science works)

AO2 = 4 marks Commentary on the value of laboratory-based experiments involving such tasks in cognitive psychology

For AO1, candidates need to show understanding of features of lab experiments, including the operationalising of variables in cognitive psychology. They may do this by reference to:

- features of the experiment, isolation and manipulation of the IV, measurement of the DV, control of extraneous variables
- features of the lab setting, unfamiliar, isolating one aspect of a complex task
- unlikely tasks. Candidates may interpret unlikely tasks as those involving unfamiliar materials, such as lists of letters or trigrams, or unlikely procedures, such as counting backwards.

Alternatively, candidates may outline particular laboratory experiments selected from their studies of memory. To gain credit, these must be lab experiments and must involve unlikely tasks.

Up to 2 marks for showing knowledge of experimental method.

Up to 2 marks for showing knowledge of lab setting.

Up to 2 marks for illustrating unlikely tasks.

For AO2, candidates need to discuss the value of such studies. They may do this by reference to:

- the contribution of findings of lab studies to understanding of different aspects of cognitive psychology (in particular, memory). This may focus on building theories and models or more applied areas such as EWT.
- strengths of lab experiments, eg isolating, manipulating and controlling variables, drawing causal inferences
- limitations of lab experiments in terms of how variables are operationalised, ecological validity
- contradictory evidence from naturalistic experiments and studies using other methods.

Up to 2 marks for identifying strengths/weaknesses in such research.

Up to 2 further marks for elaboration and development of the line of argument to judge the value of such studies.

PSYA1 Developmental Psychology

1 This is an observation record of an infant's behaviour at a mother and toddler group. Baby G is male, 16 months old.

Mother enters carrying G, sits down in low seat with child on her lap. Hands child rattle. G grasps it, shakes it. Looks at mother (eye contact), throws it on the floor. Mother puts child on floor. G crawls to rattle, picks it up. Returns to mother. Crawls off again, starts to play with toy car. Moves further away. Plays with ball and bricks. Mother gets up and goes to other side of room to talk. G looks round at seat. Looks round (mother out of sight). Crawls to seat fast. Stands up by seat. Starts to cry, looks round, cries louder, sits down next to chair, miserable look.

Mother returns, G reaches out to her. Mother cuddles G. G stops crying and cuddles. Crawls a little way off then returns fast with toy. Plays, giving mother toy. Crawls further away and resumes play with bricks.

1 (a) Identify the type of attachment displayed by G. Justify your answer by citing evidence from the observation record above. (4 marks)

AO2 = 4 marks for analysis of the novel situation and application of knowledge of attachment types

1 mark for identifying the type of attachment depicted – securely attached or Type B.

Up to 4 marks for drawing out from the description explicit examples that justify the attachment type and making the justification clear. 1 mark for the evidence from the text and 1 for the justification (any two can gain full credit).

Evidence

- Exploration using mother as safe base:
 "Looks at mother (eye contact), throws it on the floor. Mother puts child on floor. G crawls to rattle, picks it up. Returns to mother. Crawls off again, starts to play with toy car. Moves further away. Plays with ball and bricks."
- Child exhibits distress at mother's absence 'leaving':
 "Mother gets up and goes to other side of room to talk. G looks round at seat.
 Looks round (mother out of sight). Crawls to seat fast. Stands up by seat. Starts to cry, looks round, cries louder, sits down next to chair, miserable look."
- On her return, the mother is able to placate the child fairly easily and G shows pleasure at her return:
 "Mother returns, G reaches out to her. Mother cuddles G. G ceases crying, cuddles. Crawls a little way off then returns fast with toy. Plays, giving mother toy. Crawls further away and resumes play with bricks."

 Candidates could gain credit by suggesting mother's behaviour on entry shows sensitivity – a caregiver behaviour associated with secure attachment:

"Mother enters carrying G, sits down in low seat with child on her lap. Hands child rattle. G grasps it, shakes it."

- **1** (b) (i) Explain one ethical problem associated with an observational study of infants such as this. (3 marks)
- 1 (b) (ii) Explain one practical problem associated with an observational study of infants such as this. (3 marks)

AO3 = 3 marks for identification and explanation of ethical problem AO3 = 3 marks for identification and explanation of practical problem

For each problem, 1 mark for identification of relevant problem and up to 2 further marks for explanation.

Ethical problems might include:

- Informed consent
- Failure to protect, in that the absence of mother causes distress
- Confidentiality
- Right to withdraw might bias sample

Practical problems might include:

- Reliable categorisation of behaviours
- Correct interpretation of behaviours
- Actual noticing and recording behaviour without bias. Behaviour sampling.
- 1 (c) The researcher recorded observational data from nine other infants in the group. Explain how the researcher would go about doing a content analysis of the data collected. Illustrate your answer by reference to the observation record above.

 (4 marks)

AO3 = 4 marks for description of the process of content analysis appropriate to this data.

Up to 4 marks for description of the process. For full marks, there should be reference to what a researcher would do - either stages identified but not elaborated, or some stages in more detail.

Identify a theme or category of behaviour that would distinguish between each of the
attachment types (with example - 1 mark), 1 further mark for elaboration by
reference to the behaviours in the text. For example, exploration - moving away
from mother to play/investigate. Using mother as safe base – returning then leaving
again, looking back to check mother still there, returning to where mother was.

Showing distress at mother leaving/gone. Showing pleasure at her return. Mother able to calm child on her return.

- Define each category so that behaviour could be categorised reliably and so that the categories are clear/mutually exclusive.
- Count how many times each behaviour/category occurred for each of the nine observation records.
- Based on the frequency of Type A, Type B and Type C behaviours, each observation could then be classed as Type A, B or C or undefined if no one category prevailed.

Credit alternative approaches that describe how the content analysis may be carried out.

PSYA2 Biological Psychology

1 Outline the impact that stress may have on the immune system.

(6 marks)

AO1 = 6 marks for outline of how stress can affect immune system

Candidate may approach this question in a number of different ways.

They are most likely to focus on the process by which the stress impacts on the immune system, making reference to the following:

- Stress reduces the immune system's ability to deal with antigens such as viruses (immuno-suppressive effect)
- Body produces more corticosteroids and in turn more cortisol
- Continuous production affects leucocyte activity and antibody production (lymphocytes)
- This decreases production of B cells immunoglobulins involved in infection control and T cells that detect and attack cells in the body harbouring viruses.

Alternatively, candidates could focus more on the outcome of the effect of stress on the immune system:

- Chronic stress as evidenced by wound-healing (Kielcolt-Glaser et al 1995) and susceptibility to influenza, herpes, virus infection (Stone et al 1987)
- Acute stress, in contrast, can give rise to increased secretion of immunoglobulin A (IgA) eg exam stress (Evans et al (1994), Kielcolt-Glaser et al 1984) but other studies (Lowe & Greenman 2000) suggest that IgA increased after oral exams where the outcome was immediately clear (time-limited acute stress) but not after written exams where the results are not known for some time.

6 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed

Accurate and reasonably detailed outline of the impact of stress on the immune system that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding.

There is appropriate selection of material to address the question.

5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate

Less detailed but generally accurate outline that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding.

There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.

3-2 marks Basic

Basic outline that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled.

There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.

1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate

Very brief or flawed outline demonstrating very little knowledge.

Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate.

0 marks No creditworthy material.



2 Outline the use of drugs in the control of stress.

(4 marks)

AO1 = 4 marks for outline of the use of two or more drugs in managing stress.

For each drug, award 1 mark for a brief statement of the action of the drug, 1 further mark for elaboration of the mode of action.

Drugs are used to treat directly the physiological symptoms of stress. They are fast-acting and easy to use. Anxiolytic drugs/minor tranquillisers are used to treat stress symptoms.

- Benzodiazepines (Diazepam, Librium, Valium) act on neurotransmitters, enhance activity of GABA causing relaxation and reducing serotonin activity, and thus reducing anxiety.
- Beta blockers act on ANS to reduce activity of ANS associated with anxiety, ie reduce blood pressure, heart rate, levels of cortisol.

For example: Benzodiazepines cause relaxation and reduce anxiety (1 mark). They regulate activity of GABA, a neurotransmitter that plays a role in reducing levels of serotonin (1 mark)

If a candidate focuses on the action of one drug in detail, they can gain full marks.

3 "Psychological research has provided evidence to support the view that stress can be caused by life changes. It has also provided evidence of individual differences in response to sources of stress."

Discuss the view that stress is environmentally determined. (12 marks)

AO1 = 6 marks for description of environmental determinants of stress **AO2 = 6 marks** for commentary and evaluation of this view

Candidates may focus on one environmental source of stress in detail or on a wider range of environmental sources of stress in less detail. The most likely environmental sources would be:

- life event and daily hassles Holms and Rahe (1967), Kanner (1981)
- workplace stressors both physical (such as noise, crowding, temperature) and jobrelated stressors (such as role conflict, lack of control, workload) (Johansson et al, Marmot et al).

Discussion may focus on:

- the amount and quality of the evidence to support the view that stress is environmentally determined, including consideration of methodological issues relevant to the research, eg retrospective correlational data
- contradictory evidence including consideration of methodological issues relevant to the research, eg Schaubroeck et al (2001) showing individual differences in response to lack of control
- alternative views, such as material on type A/B personality (Friedman and Rosenman (1959), hardiness Korbasa (1979)).

A01	AO2 and AO3	
Knowledge and understanding	Application of knowledge and understanding	
6 marks Accurate and reasonably	6 marks Effective evaluation	
detailed	Effective use of material to address the question	
Accurate and reasonably detailed	and provide informed commentary.	
description of environmental	Effective evaluation of research.	
determinants of stress that	Broad range of issues and/or evidence in	
demonstrates sound knowledge and	reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater	
understanding of relevant research.	depth.	
There is appropriate selection of	Clear expression of ideas, good range of	
material to address the question.	specialist terms, few errors of grammar,	
	punctuation or spelling.	
5-4 marks Less detailed but	5-4 marks Reasonable evaluation	
generally accurate	Material is not always used effectively but	
Less detailed but generally accurate	produces a reasonable commentary is produced.	
description that demonstrates	Reasonable evaluation of research.	
relevant knowledge and	A range of issues and/or evidence in limited	
understanding of research.	depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.	
There is some evidence of selection	Reasonable expression of ideas, a range of	
of material to address the question.	specialist terms, some errors of grammar,	
	punctuation and spelling.	

3-2 marks Basic	3-2 marks Basic evaluation	
Basic description that demonstrates	The use of material provides only a basic	
some relevant knowledge and	commentary.	
understanding but lacks detail and	Basic evaluation or research.	
may be muddled.	Superficial consideration of a restricted range of	
There is little evidence of selection of	issues and/or evidence.	
material to address the question.	Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist	
	terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and	
	spelling detract from clarity.	
1 mark Very brief/flawed or	1 mark Rudimentary evaluation	
inappropriate	The use of material provides only a rudimentary	
Very brief or flawed description	commentary.	
demonstrating very little knowledge.	Evaluation of research is just discernible or	
Selection and presentation of	absent.	
information is largely or wholly	Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms	
inappropriate.	used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling	
	often obscure the meaning.	

PSYA2 Social Psychology

- 1 It is the first week of Sam's new job. He arrives at work to find the other till operators all drinking coffee in the rest room, even though it is past the store opening time. He knows that this is frowned upon by the management but even so he joins them. Later in the day, he is asked to move from the tills to the shelf-stacking team as they are short staffed. He has not been trained for this, so at first he hangs back and watches what the others do and then follows their lead.
- 1 (a) From the description of Sam's behaviour above, identify one example of normative social influence. Explain why you think this is an example of normative social influence. (3 marks)

AO2 = 3 marks for analysis of a novel situation to identify an example of normative social influence and justifying the choice

1 mark for identifying an example of normative social influence, eg Sam joining his colleagues in rest room.

Up to 2 further marks for explanation in terms of adopting the behaviour to fit in with the group, even though he knows it is wrong.

Note: these marks are for analysis and application to novel situation (AO2) NOT for knowledge (AO1), so a stand-alone rote-learned definition of normative social influence will not gain marks.

1 (b) From the description of Sam's behaviour above, identify one example of informational social influence. Explain why you think this is an example of informational social influence. (3 marks)

AO2 = 3 marks for analysis of a novel situation to identify an example of informational social influence and justifying the choice.

1 mark for identifying an example of informational social influence, eg Sam at first hanging back and watching what the others do and then following their lead.

Up to 2 further marks for explanation in terms of copying the behaviour of the other shelf fillers as he does not *know* what to do in this new situation.

Note: these marks are for analysis and application to novel situation (AO2) NOT for knowledge (AO1), so a stand-alone rote-learned definition of informational social influence will not gain marks.

1 (c) Explain the difference between normative and informational social influence. (3 marks)

AO2 = 3 marks for explanation of difference(s)

Full marks could be gained by one difference explained in detail or three differences identified.

Differences between normative and informational social influence include:

- need to be accepted by others v need to be right/have an accurate perception of reality
- use others to identify behaviour that leads to group acceptance v using others with seemingly more information to identify the correct behaviour
- associated with internalisation v associated with compliance.

Other relevant comparison points should be credited.

2 Ali and Nadine are at a peace march in London. Ali has spent much of the day talking to other marchers about their views and beliefs and has agreed to march with them again the following week. Nadine has enjoyed the company of other marchers and is beginning to feel as if she is part of the group. When they discuss marching the next week, she does not commit herself and sign up for the march until she sees that most of the others are going to march again, whereas Ali is one of the first to sign up for the march next week.

Explain how social influence research can help us to understand Ali and Nadine's behaviour. (6 marks)

AO2 = 6 marks for applying knowledge of social influence theories/concepts/evidence to explain Ali and Nadine's behaviour

Candidates will need to identify one or more features of Ali's behaviour and one or more features of Nadine's behaviour and show how social influence research would explain them.

In this question, there is a breadth-depth trade-off. Candidates can gain up to 4 marks for identifying links between concepts and material in the stem and providing less comprehensive explanation, or they can identify two links and provide a more detailed explanation.

Up to max of 4 marks for linking behaviours to appropriate social influence models/concepts/research findings, such as:

- Ali talks to others about beliefs/views and agrees to march next week informational social influence
- Ali is first to sign up, suggests internalisation
- Nadine begins to feel she is part of the group normative social influence
- Nadine waits till others sign up before committing, suggests compliance

Up to 4 marks for explaining the links (already credited) between the behaviour and the feature of social influence, such as:

- Ali is gaining information which has helped her to decide on the *right* course of action. Ali does not need to wait to see if others are going to sign up for the march: she is guided by what have become *her* views and she is unlikely to change even if others did not sign up.
- Nadine is enjoying the company of the group and wants to be accepted as one of the group. She will adopt behaviour that will result in acceptance irrespective of her real views, hence she waits to see the group norm (march next week or not march). Only when she see the others sign up does she comply.
- 3 Identify whether each of the statements below represents internal or external locus of control.
 - A Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
 - B People's misfortunes are the result of the mistakes they make.
 - C In the long run, people get the respect they deserve in this world.
 - D No matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.

(4 marks)

AO1 = 4 marks Understanding of the concepts of internal and external locus of control

One mark for correct identification of each item as either representing internal or external locus of control.

Internal = B, C External = A, D

4 "Milgram's research is of no value because it was conducted in a laboratory."

Discuss the methodological difficulties faced by social psychologists conducting their research in a laboratory. (5 marks)

AO3 = 5 marks for outline and commentary on methodological difficulties of laboratory-based social psychology research.

Up to 2 marks for identifying difficulties (no partial performance, as difficulties are not discrete).

Up to 3 further marks for elaboration of the difficulties in terms of why they arise and how they impact on the conclusions that can be drawn.

It will be tempting for candidates to describe the work of researchers such as Milgram or Asch, but such descriptions can only gain credit in so far as they explicitly describe or comment on difficulties of the laboratory setting.



Difficulties might include:

- artificial environment, fails to replicate the context in which social behaviour occurs and therefore the dynamics of social behaviour
- because the setting is artificial, the task is inevitably not natural and is more likely to involve deception of participants, eg Milgram, Asch paradigm
- because the tasks/material/procedure lack mundane realism, participants may not believe the deception and so are less likely to behave in a way that they might in a real social situation, experimental validity
- lack of mundane realism may encourage demand characteristics, giving rise to questionable ecological validity and scope for generalising findings to the real world.

Discussion of difficulties of experimental method rather than the laboratory setting should not gain credit.

5 Outline **two** explanations of obedience to an authority figure.

(2 marks + 2 marks)

AO1 = 4 marks for outline of two explanations of obedience to authority

For each explanation:

- 1 mark for identification of the explanation
- 1 further mark for elaboration of the explanation

Possible reasons include:

- gradual commitment initially obey a small order then gradually obey more serious orders
- legitimacy of the authority the person giving the order has a right to do so because of expertise, role
- agentic state the person sees him/herself as an agent and thus not responsible for actions
- buffers something preventing the person from seeing the consequences of their actions

For example: The agentic shift (1 mark) refers to a move from an autonomous state in which we make our own decisions, to one where we are merely acting on behalf of someone else of higher authority, and so do not feel answerable for what we are doing (1 mark).

6 What is meant by *compliance* in the context of conformity research?

Give a real-life example of compliance.

(3 marks)

AO1 = 2 marks for definition of compliance

AO2 = 1 mark for application providing a real life example

Up to 2 marks (AO1) for definition such as publicly acting in accordance with the wishes/action of others although privately disagreeing

1 mark (AO2) for providing a specific example from real life. Simple repetition of the definition will not gain credit.

For example: In spite of privately disagreeing with the group (1 AO1), behaving in a way that is consistent with the group norm in order to be accepted (1 AO1): for example, when asked by the class teacher where we would like hold the school prom, everyone else thought Lucky was the best place. Although I don't like that club, I said it would be good just so I was not the odd one out (AO2 1).

7 With reference to psychological research, discuss the view that people will not always conform to others in group situations.
(12 marks)

AO1 = 6 marks for description of what psychological research shows about whether or not people conform in group situations.

AO2 = 6 marks Commentary on and evaluation of the research

Description is likely to focus on rates of conformity in psychological studies. These vary with Asch, Crutchfield citing average rates of one third showing that participants are more likely *not* to conform than to conform.

More recent research, Perrin and Spencer (1980), provides evidence that people in the 1970s in England were even less likely to conform than those in the 1950s in the USA. Candidates may introduce research relating to situational and dispositional factors that affect levels of conformity, such as stimulus ambiguity, task difficulty, individual differences/personality, minority influences.

Commentary and evaluation should focus on:

- the amount and quality of evidence to show that people will not always conform to others in group situations.
- cultural values and historical context of conformity research 'child of its time'
- consideration of methodological issues in so far as they are relevant
- introduction and use of research into minority influence and independence that demonstrates lack of conformity.

Application of knowledge and understanding 6 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed description of conformity research that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of what the research shows about conformity levels. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. 5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is is tittle evaluation of research. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is open evidence of selection of material to address the question. The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Saciencial to evidence of selection of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas gaod and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to	AO1	AO2 and AO3	
Effective use of material to address the question and provide informed commentary. Effective evaluation of research. Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 5-4 marks Reasonable evaluation Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 5-4 marks Reasonable evaluation Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 5-4 marks Reasonable evaluation Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable explession of ideas, a range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 5-4 marks Reasonable evaluation Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable evaluation of research. Reasonable expression of ideas, a range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of research. Reasonable evaluation of research. Reasonable evaluation of research is guest depth. Reasonable evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, error		Application of knowledge and understanding	
Accurate and reasonably detailed description of conformity research that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of what the research shows about conformity levels. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. 5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 5-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly invented to sound should describe that demonstrates some relevant knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. and provide informed commentary. Effective evaluation of research. Broad range of issues and/or evidence in reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 5-4 marks Reasonable evaluation Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of research. Seasonable evaluation of re			
description of conformity research that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of what the research shows about conformity levels. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. 5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is ome evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is of material provides only a basic commentary. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. There is little evidence of selection of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Effective evaluation of research. Broad range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of research. Reasonable evaluation of ideas, a range of specialist terms used in terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling deviate terms in limited depth,		·	
that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of what the research shows about conformity levels. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. 5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.	I	1	
reasonable depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate Less detailes on always used effectively but produces a reasonable evaluation of research. Reasonable evaluation of research. Reasonable evaluation of research. Seasonable evaluation of research. Seasonable evaluation of research. Seasonable evaluation of research. Seasonable ev	l •		
depth. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. depth. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 5-4 marks Reasonable evaluation Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of ideas, a range of specialist terms, some errors of ideas, a range of specialist terms, some errors of ideas, a range of specialist terms understanding but lacks detail and material to address the question. Seasonable evaluation of ideas (a range		1	
Ievels. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. 5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate 1 mark Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 5-4 marks Reasonable evaluation Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable expression of ideas, a range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of research. Reasonable evaluation of research. Seasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence of specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling designation of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.	l		
There is appropriate selection of material to address the question. 5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation or research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.	1		
material to address the question. 5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling of evidence. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of inappropriate. 5-4 marks Reasonable evaluation Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of ideas, ar range of specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 3-2 marks Basic evaluation The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable expression of ideas, a range of specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate 1 mark Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of inappropriate. Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of ideas, a range of specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 3-2 marks Basic evaluation The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of gramma			
Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 3-2 marks Basic Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. produces a reasonable commentary. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable expression of ideas, a range of specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 3-2 marks Basic evaluation The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of research. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable evaluation of issues and/or evidence, specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.	U	1	
relevant knowledge and understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable expression of ideas, a range of specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 3-2 marks Basic evaluation The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
understanding of research. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. or a narrower range in greater depth. Reasonable expression of ideas, a range of specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. Reasonable expression of ideas, a range of specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.	ı	, ,	
specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. Specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctues only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.	ı		
3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. 2-2 marks Basic evaluation The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
3-2 marks Basic Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. Thark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. 3-2 marks Basic evaluation The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation or research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.	of material to address the question.		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. The use of material provides only a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.	•	1	
may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. The is little evidence of selection of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
material to address the question. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.		· ·	
terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.	material to address the question.		
1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate1 mark Rudimentary evaluationVery brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge.The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary.Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate.Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent.Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
inappropriateThe use of material provides only a rudimentaryVery brief or flawed descriptioncommentary.demonstrating very little knowledge.Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent.Selection and presentation ofExpression of ideas poor, few specialist termsinformation is largely or whollyused, errors of grammar, punctuation and spellinginappropriate.often obscure the meaning.	4 mark Vany briefflawed or		
Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.	1 • • •	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.			
information is largely or wholly inappropriate. used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
inappropriate. often obscure the meaning.	<u> </u>		
	1		
II marke No creditworthy material 11 marke No creditworthy material	0 marks No creditworthy material.	O marks No creditworthy material.	

PSYA2 Individual Differences (Psychopathology)

1 Describe the use of electro-convulsive therapy in the treatment of mental disorders. (6 marks)

AO1 = 6 marks for description of the use of ECT

Answer may focus on how ECT is conducted and/or on what it is used for. Both approaches are creditworthy.

Procedure:

- Patient on bed
- Atropine given as pre-aesthetic followed by aesthetic and muscle relaxant
- Electrodes placed on temples and 70-150 volt shock administered for .04-1.0 seconds
- Produces convulsions
- Repeated 3 times per week for up to 4 weeks.

Purpose:

- Originally used to induce grand mal epileptic fit to eliminate the symptoms of schizophrenia
- Bilateral found to be more effective than unilateral to non-dominant hemisphere (Benton 1981)
- Found to be more effective in treatment of severe depression than antidepressants. (Sackeim 1989)

6 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed

Accurate and reasonably detailed description of the use of ECT that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding.

There is appropriate selection of material to address the question.

5-4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate

Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding.

There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.

3-2 marks Basic

Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled.

There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.

1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate

Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge.

Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate.

0 marks No creditworthy material.

2 Describe the use of drugs to treat psychological disorders.

(4 marks)

AO1 = 4 marks for description of the use of drugs to treat psychological disorders

Award one mark for each descriptive point regarding the use of drugs. These may focus on the disorders the drugs are used to treat or the mode of action of specific drugs/drug groups.

- Drugs are used to treat directly the symptoms of psychological disorders. They are fast-acting and easy to use.
- Antipsychotic drugs reduce the activity of the neurotransmitter dopamine in the brain
- Anti-depressant drugs work by raising levels of neurotransmitters noradrenalin and serotonin in the brain
- Minor tranquillisers used to treat anxiety disorder reduce serotonin activity.

Specific drug action

- Chlorpromazine reduces symptoms of schizophrenia, in particular hallucinations, delusions and thought disorder
- Clozapine reduces symptoms of schizophrenia, acts on wider range of neurotransmitters including dopamine and serotonin
- MAOIs, tricyclic antidepressants and SSRIs used in the treatment of depression raise levels of noradrenalin and serotonin
- Benzodiazepines, minor tranquillisers such as Valium, Librium, Mogodon used in the treatment of anxiety, enhance activity of GABA causing relaxation and reducing serotonin activity, thus reducing anxiety.

3 Discuss the use of drugs to treat psychological disorders.

(6 marks)

AO2 = 6 marks for commentary on drug treatments

Discussion/commentary is likely to focus on the strengths and weaknesses of drug therapy and may deal with a number of issues briefly, or narrow range of issues in greater depth.

Issues might include:

- treats symptoms not the cause
- stabilises symptoms so other, psychological, therapies can be used
- effectiveness in comparison with other therapies
- not all disorders respond to drug therapies, eg eating disorders, phobias, panic attacks
- physical and psychological dependence
- ethical issues of side effects, informed consent.

Reference to specific disorders and the mode of action of particular drugs/drug groups may gain some credit if it forms the basis of discussion.

6 marks Effective commentary

Effective discussion of the use of drugs to treat psychological disorders demonstrating sound analysis and understanding.

5-4 marks Reasonable commentary

Reasonable discussion of the use of drugs to treat psychological disorders demonstrating reasonable analysis and understanding.

3-2 marks Basic commentary

Basic discussion of the use of drugs to treat psychological disorders that demonstrates superficial understanding, lacks in detail and may be muddled.

1 mark Rudimentary/absent or irrelevant commentary

Rudimentary discussion that may be very brief or flawed.

Discussion of the use of drugs to treat psychological disorders is just discernible.

0 marks

No creditworthy material.

4 Outline one definition of abnormality.

(3 marks)

AO1 = 3 marks for correct definition

1 mark for the definition

Up to 2 further marks for elaboration/outline of the definition. Likely definitions that are named on the specification are:

- Deviation from social norms
- Deviation from ideal mental health
- Failure to function adequately.

Also credit other appropriate definitions, eg statistical infrequency, but models of abnormality should not be credited.

For example: Failure to function adequately (1 mark) defines abnormality as behaviour that means the person is unable to cope with everyday life (1 mark). Their behaviour is maladaptive, disrupts their ability to work and conduct satisfying relationships, and causes personal distress and distress to others (1 mark).

- **5** (a) The following are four approaches to the understanding of mental disorder.
 - **A** Psychodynamic
 - **B** Behaviourist
 - **C** Cognitive
 - **D** Biological

In the table below, write down which approach, **A**, **B**, **C** or **D**, is associated with each assumption. (3 marks)

AO1 = 3 marks for correct completion of the table

Assumptions about abnormality	Approach
People become ill because of negative thoughts	С
People become ill due to imbalances of neurotransmitters	D
People become ill due to unresolved unconscious conflicts	Α

5 (b) Select **one** of the approaches, **A**, **B**, **C** or **D**, and explain **one** strength of this approach. (3 marks)

AO2 = 3 marks for explanation of one strength

1 mark for identification of the strength Up to 2 further marks for explanation/elaboration

For example: The biological (medical) model is a 'humane' approach to abnormality (1 mark) as it attaches no blame to the mentally ill individual (1 mark). People with mental illness are unlucky. In this way, the fear and stigma attached to mental illness are diminished (1 mark).