



General Certificate of Education

Psychology
Specification A

**Unit 4 PSYA4 Psychopathology,
Psychology in Action and
Research Methods**

Specimen mark scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards
This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#)

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the first operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2009 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Section A Psychopathology

Topic: Schizophrenia**Total for this question: 25 marks**

01 Outline and evaluate **one or more** biological explanations for schizophrenia. In your evaluation you should refer to research evidence. *(25 marks)*

AO1 = 9 marks Outline of one or more biological explanations

Examiners need to be mindful of the breadth/depth trade-off here. The most likely explanation to be offered is the genetic explanation but it is probable that the dopamine hypothesis and the biochemical explanation will also be described. Neuroanatomical explanations are also acceptable. The diathesis-stress model is also relevant here and could be credited descriptively (AO1) as an explanation in its own right or evaluatively (AO2), depending on how the material is used. The focus in this question is on biological explanations. Psychological or socio/cultural explanations only attract credit if they are used as part of a sustained commentary on biological explanations.

AO1 Mark bands

9-8 marks sound

Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed.
A good range of relevant material has been selected. There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.

7-5 marks Reasonable

Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed.
A range of relevant material has been selected. There is evidence of breadth and/or depth
Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.

4-3 marks Basic

Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial. A restricted range of material has been presented.

2-1 marks Rudimentary

Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be muddled and/or inaccurate.
The material presented may be very brief or largely irrelevant.
Lacks organisation and structure.

0 marks No creditworthy material.

AO2 / AO3 = 16 marks Evaluation of biological explanation(s) and methodological evaluation of studies/evidence

Candidates are likely to evaluate the explanation(s) of schizophrenia in terms of their strengths and weaknesses, effectiveness, including comparison with alternative explanations and the extent to which the explanations are supported by evidence. Credit evaluation of research studies in terms of their methodology, reliability, validity and the extent to which generalisations can be made. It is legitimate to use psychological explanations as evaluation but the material must be used effectively to offer commentary on the biological explanation(s). Straightforward descriptions of psychological explanations will not attract credit.

AO2/3 Mark bands**16-13 marks Effective**

Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding.
The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.
Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively.
There is substantial evidence of synopticity.
Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

12-9 marks Reasonable

Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding.
The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident.
Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner.
There is evidence of synopticity.
Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

8-5 marks Basic

Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding.
The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration.
Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches.
There is some evidence of synopticity.
Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

4-1 marks Rudimentary

Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding.
The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant.
If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled or inaccurate.
There is little or no evidence of synopticity.
Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

0 marks

No creditworthy material is presented.

Topic: Depression**Total for this question: 25 marks**

02	Explain the use of one cognitive-behavioural therapy as applied to the treatment of depression.	(10 marks)
-----------	--	-------------------

AO1 = 4 marks Knowledge of one cognitive-behavioural therapy

Candidates need to identify and briefly outline the procedural aspects of one cognitive-behavioural therapy. Likely choices are CBT and RET. Behavioural therapies are not acceptable here.

4 marks	Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent.
3-2 marks	Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent.
1 mark	Outline is weak and muddled.
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

AO2 / AO3 = 6 marks

Explanations should go beyond description of the procedural aspects of the use of each therapy and may highlight appropriateness of the therapy, the justification/reason for the elements of the process, for example, how it relates to the underpinning theory.

AO2 / AO3 Mark bands

6 marks Effective	Explanation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
5-4 marks Reasonable	Explanation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.
3-2 marks Basic	Explanation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.
1 mark Rudimentary	Explanation is rudimentary demonstrating very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.
0 marks	No creditworthy material is presented.

03	Outline and evaluate biological therapies as treatments of depression. <i>(15 marks)</i>
-----------	---

AO1 = 5 marks Outline of two or more biological therapies as treatments for depression

Biological therapies for depression will include ECT and drug/chemotherapy. Outlines should refer to the key features of the therapy and their mode of action. Two or more therapies are required though not necessarily in equal detail.

5 marks	Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent.
4-3 marks	Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent.
2-1 marks	Outline is weak and muddled.
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

AO2 / AO3 = 6 marks Evaluation of the therapies and methodological evaluation of empirical evidence and of the impact of research into biological therapies

Candidates are likely to evaluate ECT and drug therapies in terms of the following.

- Their effectiveness. Studies of effectiveness might include comparison of tricyclics and SSRIs, for example the WHO report (2001), or studies including comparison with alternative therapies or comparison with a placebo. Credit evaluation of research studies in terms of their methodology, reliability, validity and the extent to which generalisations can be made.
- Their appropriateness. Evaluation may focus on the types of depressions, severity of depression, alternative therapies, side effects, ethical considerations; drug therapies are not cures, discouragement of patient responsibility.

AO2/3 Mark bands**10-9 marks Effective**

Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding.
 The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.
 Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively.
 There is substantial evidence of synopticity.
 Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

8-6 marks Reasonable

Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding.
 The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident.
 Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner.
 There is evidence of synopticity.
 Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

5-3 marks Basic

Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding.
 The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration.
 Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches.
 There is some evidence of synopticity.
 Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

2-1 marks Rudimentary

Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding.
 The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant.
 If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled or inaccurate.
 There is little or no evidence of synopticity.
 Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

0 marks No creditworthy material is presented.

Topic: Anxiety Disorders**Total for this question: 25 marks**

04 Outline clinical characteristics of one anxiety disorder.	<i>(5 marks)</i>
--	------------------

AO1 = 5 marks Accurate description of defining characteristics

Outline may refer to:

- physiological, behavioural, emotional symptoms
- demographic factors
- incidence and prevalence
- course and prognosis

Candidates would not be expected to cover all these points to access the top marks. However, they do need to identify clearly a particular anxiety disorder and refer to diagnostic criteria.

5 - 4 marks	Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent
3 - 2 marks	Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent
1 mark	Outline is weak and muddled
0 marks	No creditworthy material

05 Explain issues associated with classification and diagnosis of anxiety disorders.	<i>(10 marks)</i>
---	-------------------

AO2 / AO3 = 10 marks Identification and explanation of 2 or more

issues Likely issues include:

- classification rooted in medical model
- differences in systems of classification
- validity of system
- ethnic/cultural appropriateness
- reliability diagnosis
- biases, gender, race, culture
- differentiation between different types of anxiety disorder.

Very brief identification of issue can attract credit in that it is the product of analysis. Examiners need to be mindful of the breadth/depth trade-off.

AO2 / AO3 Mark bands**10-9 marks Effective**

Explanation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding.
 The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.
 Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively.
 There is substantial evidence of synopticity.
 Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

8-6 marks Reasonable

Explanation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding.
 The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident.
 Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner.
 There is evidence of synopticity.
 Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

5-3 marks Basic

Explanation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding.
 The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration.
 Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches.
 There is some evidence of synopticity.
 Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

2-1 marks Rudimentary

Explanation is rudimentary demonstrating very limited understanding.
 The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant.
 If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches it is muddled or inaccurate.
 There is little or no evidence of synopticity.
 Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

0 marks No creditworthy material is presented.

06 Outline and evaluate one or more explanations of the anxiety disorder outlined in your answer to Question **06**. Refer to research evidence in your answer.
 (10 marks)

AO1 = 4 marks Outline of key features of one or more explanations

The explanation(s) must be appropriate to and applied to the target anxiety disorder. Candidates can take a broad approach here and describe, for example, the behavioural explanation or the biological explanation or a narrower approach, eg preparedness or genetics. Examiners need to be mindful of the breadth/depth trade-off here.

4 marks	Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent.
3 - 2 marks	Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent.
1 mark	Outline is weak and muddled.
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

AO2 / AO3 = 6 marks Analysis and evaluation of the explanation(s) and evaluation of research evidence

Analysis and evaluation of the explanation of the target anxiety disorder in terms of coherence of the explanation, empirical support, conflicting evidence, alternative explanations, issues and debates in psychology, reductionism, determinism, nature/nurture.

Analysis and evaluation of empirical evidence in terms of its methodology and impact.

A02/3 Mark bands

<p>6 marks Effective Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. There is substantial evidence of synopticity. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p>
<p>5-4 marks Reasonable Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. There is evidence of synopticity. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.</p>
<p>3-2 marks Basic Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. There is some evidence of synopticity. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.</p>
<p>1 mark Rudimentary Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. There is little or no evidence of synopticity. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.</p>
<p>0 marks No creditworthy material is presented.</p>

Section B Psychology in Action

Topic: Media Psychology

Total for this question: 25 marks

07 In an experiment 70 teenagers were asked to complete a rating scale to assess their hostility, anger and anxiety. They were then randomly allocated to play either a violent or non-violent video game. After the game they completed the rating scale again. Scores on the scale before and after playing the game were compared.

Both groups had higher ratings on hostility and anger after playing the games, though the effect was more pronounced for the group playing the game with the violent content.

Discuss the findings of the study in relation to research into media influence on aggression. *(15 marks)*

AO2 / AO3 = 16 marks Outline of what the findings of the study seem to show and analysis of the findings in relation to theories and studies of media influence on aggression

Study shows that:

- video game playing is associated with raised levels of hostility and anger, irrespective of content
- violent content associated with further increase in levels of hostility and anger

Suggests violence has a small effect but the majority of the effect is caused by other factors.

Likely discussion points include:

- comparison of the findings with other research into video games, or it would be acceptable to compare with studies of other media, eg TV.
- methodological/design issues, lack of ecological validity, such as lab studies fail to reflect the social context in which such games are played, causal inference can be drawn, measurement issues, eg self-report versus behaviour observation
- participants allocated to the violent game may have been people who would not choose such games in real life
- relate findings to explanations/mechanisms of influence.

AO2/3 Mark bands**16-13 marks Effective**

Discussion demonstrates sound analysis and understanding.
 Application of knowledge to unfamiliar material is effective.
 The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.
 Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively.
 Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology.
 Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

12-9 marks Reasonable

Discussion demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding.
 Application of knowledge to unfamiliar material is reasonably effective.
 The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident.
 Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner.
 Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

8-5 marks Basic

Discussion/analysis demonstrates basic, superficial understanding.
 Application of knowledge to unfamiliar material is basic.
 The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration.
 Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches.
 Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

4-1 marks Rudimentary

Discussion /analysis is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding.
 Application of knowledge to unfamiliar material is rudimentary.
 The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant.
 If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled or inaccurate.
 Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity.
 The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions.
 Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

0 marks

No creditworthy material is presented.

08 "There is an increasing body of psychological research into the phenomena of intense fandom and celebrity worship."

Describe what psychological research has shown about intense fandom **and/or** celebrity worship. (10 marks)

AO1 = 9 marks Description of what research has shown

Answers may focus on specific research examples or take a broader overview reporting on the findings/conclusions of a range of research. Likely findings include:

- the three dimensions of celebrity worship, entertainment-social, intense-personal, borderline-pathological, and how these differ in terms of para-social interaction.
- personality correlates - Eysenckian theory
- cognitive correlates - cognitive flexibility
- social developmental aspects
- methodological issues associated with measurement of fandom, eg via celebrity attitude scale, preponderance of correlational research
- large scale psychometric research has been important in establishing celebrity worship as a phenomena but has not contributed to understanding of the processes.

AO1 Mark bands

9-8 marks sound

Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed.
A good range of relevant material has been selected. There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.

7-5 marks Reasonable

Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed.
A range of relevant material has been selected. There is evidence of breadth and/or depth
Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.

4-3 marks Basic

Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial.
A restricted range of material has been presented.
Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.

2-1 marks Rudimentary

Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be muddled and/or inaccurate.
The material presented may be very brief or largely irrelevant.
Lacks organisation and structure.

0 marks

No creditworthy material.

Topic: The Psychology of Addictive Behaviour**Total for this question: 25 marks**

"Children who experiment with smoking can very quickly get hooked on nicotine and it only takes a few cigarettes to turn them into regular smokers, a new study has found. Two other studies published today show that smoking by peers and teachers can also independently influence the take up of smoking by young teenagers."

(Action on Smoking and Health 2002)

09	Explain why policy makers would be more inclined to accept the evidence of these "published studies" rather than mere opinion. <i>(5 marks)</i>
-----------	--

AO2 / AO3 = 5 marks Knowledge of the characteristics of published research in terms of replication, validation and review and rationale for the greater weight of published research

Rationale may include reference to:

- review undertaken by other experts in the field
- reliability, validity of data
- scrutiny of research method design/links to psychology as a science
- interpretation of the findings will have been scrutinised.

10	Outline and evaluate the learning model as an explanation of initiation and maintenance of smoking addiction in young people. <i>(10 marks)</i>
-----------	--

AO1 = 4 marks Outline of the learning model relevant to initiation, maintenance

The learning model might include reference to social learning theory (observation of parents and peers), operant conditioning (pleasure from smoking, social reinforcement), and classical conditioning (eg association of context cues with pleasure of smoking). SLT and OC may be more applicable to initiation, CC to maintenance. Candidates are required to address both initiation and maintenance, though they need not be equally balanced.

4 marks	Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent.
3 - 2 marks	Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent.
1 mark	Outline is weak and muddled.
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

AO2 / AO3 = 6 marks Evaluation of the effectiveness of the model as applied to the initiation and maintenance of smoking in young people

Candidates are likely to evaluate the learning explanations of smoking in terms of their strengths and weaknesses in relation to initiation and maintenance in several ways. Research evidence supports some aspects of the learning approach, but also implicates other factors, eg most young people are exposed to models yet many never start smoking. Smoking initiation may be linked to personality variables, while maintenance may be related to concerns about weight. The learning approach in general ignores cognitive (eg beliefs and expectancies) and biological (nicotine addiction) factors, emphasising the limited effectiveness of modelling as an explanation of initiation and maintenance. Explicit comparison with these alternative explanations would be an effective method of accessing marks, as long as the focus is on the learning model.

Candidates may refer to behavioural studies of learning and conditioning. These can only receive credit if explicitly linked to smoking behaviour.

AO2 Mark bands

<p>6 marks Effective Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. Application of knowledge is effective and shows coherent elaboration. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p>
<p>5-4 marks Reasonable Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. Application of knowledge is reasonably effective and shows some elaboration. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.</p>
<p>3-2 marks Basic Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding. Application of knowledge is basic. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.</p>
<p>1 mark Rudimentary Evaluation is rudimentary demonstrating very limited understanding. Application of knowledge is weak, muddled and may be mainly irrelevant. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.</p>
<p>0 marks No creditworthy material is presented.</p>

11 "We are all exposed to models of addictive behaviour, yet not everyone becomes addicted."

Discuss individual differences in vulnerability to addiction. *(10 marks)*

AO1 = 5 marks Outline of two or more factors that affect vulnerability to addiction

Vulnerability/risk factors may include:

- genetic background
- other biological factors
- individual differences, eg self esteem, attributional style, cognitions, 'addictive personality'

- family and social context
- current situation, eg current level of stress, weight concerns.

Whilst vulnerability is most likely to be considered in terms of initiating addiction, it can also be relevant to maintenance/relapse, and such material can be credited. Factors identified maybe related to any form of addiction.

5 - 4 marks	Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent.
3 - 2 marks	Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent.
1 mark	Outline is weak and muddled.
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

AO2 / AO3 = 5 marks Evaluation/commentary may include:

- evaluation of the relative explanatory value of particular factors. This is likely to be associated with different forms of addiction
- comparison with alternative factors/explanations of vulnerability
- the extent to which the explanations/factors are supported by evidence
- the complex nature of addiction and the need for multifactorial models.

Discussion may also include commentary on, for example, issues relating to cause and effect and a consideration of differential vulnerability in relation to initiation and relapse. Also relevant would be implications associated with different factors in terms of responsibility for addiction, including ethical implications.

AO2 / AO3

5 marks Effective Discussion demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
4-3 marks Reasonable Discussion demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.
2 marks Basic Discussion demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.
1 mark Rudimentary Discussion is rudimentary demonstrating very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and may be mainly irrelevant. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.
0 marks No creditworthy material is presented.

Topic: Anomalistic Psychology**Total for this question: 25 marks**

12	The 'ganzfeld' is a technique used to investigate extra-sensory perception (ESP).	
	Outline and critically evaluate findings from ganzfeld studies.	<i>(15 marks)</i>

AO1 = 5 marks Outline of findings from ganzfeld studies

Candidates are required to outline the *findings* of ganzfeld studies only. Description of the ganzfeld technique itself is not required.

5 - 4 marks	Outline of findings is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent.
3 — 2 marks	Outline of findings is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent.
1 mark	Outline of findings is weak and muddled.
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

AO2 / AO3 = 10 marks Evaluation of the findings from ganzfeld studies and methodological evaluation of empirical evidence

Candidates could focus on a number of issues related to the interpretation of findings, such as individual differences in ganzfeld responses, eg creative participants tend to perform better, non-ESP explanations, eg subliminal perception (SP).

Much of the ganzfeld debate has been around the methodological weakness of the technique for measuring ESP. Candidates could include such things as problems of participant selection, statistical error, inadequate reporting of procedure affecting replication, methodological weaknesses, eg lack of an agreed 'standard' ganzfeld.

AO2/3 Mark bands**10-9 marks Effective**

Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding.
 The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.
 Issues/debates/approaches are used effectively.
 There is substantial evidence of synopticity.
 Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

8-6 marks Reasonable

Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding.
 The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident.
 Issues/debates/approaches are used in a reasonably effective manner.
 There is evidence of synopticity.
 Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

5-3 marks Basic

Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding.
 The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration.
 Superficial reference may be made to issues/debates/approaches.
 There is some evidence of synopticity.
 Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

2-1 marks Rudimentary

Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding.
 The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant.
 If reference is made to issues/debates/approaches, it is muddled or inaccurate.
 There is little or no evidence of synopticity.
 Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

0 marks No creditworthy material is presented.

13 "Even if paranormal phenomena do not exist, paranormal experiences do, as surveys have shown that a considerable number of people report experiences which they interpret as paranormal." (Watt, 2001)

Discuss cognitive factors underlying paranormal beliefs.

(10 marks)

AO1 = 4 marks Knowledge of cognitive factors

Candidates might include such things as existing belief in the paranormal or cognitive biases in information processing such as judgement of probability, reasoning error, confirmatory bias, perceptual bias.

4 marks	Outline of findings is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent.
3 - 2 marks	Outline of findings is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent.
1 mark	Outline of findings is weak and muddled.
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

AO2 / AO3 = 6 marks Analysis and evaluation of cognitive factors

Candidates should present evidence of the existence of cognitive factors, eg research to suggest that believers are more prone to reasoning errors than non-believers. This might include evaluation of the evidence for cognitive factors, eg contradictory findings, lack of replication. The focus of the answer must be on *why people believe*, not on the explanation of any particular anomalous experience.

AO2 / AO3 Mark bands

6 marks Effective

Evaluation/discussion demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

5-4 marks Reasonable

Evaluation/discussion demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

3-2 marks Basic

Discussion demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

1 mark Rudimentary

Discussion is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and may be mainly irrelevant. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive,

0 marks

No creditworthy material is presented,

Section C Psychological Research and Scientific Method

Topic: Psychological Research and Scientific Method

Total for this question: 35 marks

A psychologist believed that people think of more new ideas working on their own than they do working in a group, and that the belief that people are more creative in groups is false. To test this idea he arranged for 30 people to participate in a study that involved generating ideas about how to boost tourism. Participants were randomly allocated to one of two groups. Fifteen of them were asked to work individually and generate as many ideas as they could to boost tourism in their town. The other fifteen participants were divided into three groups and each group was asked to "brainstorm" to generate as many ideas as they could to boost tourism in their town. The group "brainstorm" sessions were recorded and the number of ideas generated by each participant was noted.

The psychologist used a statistical test to find out if there was a significant difference in the number of ideas generated by the participants working alone as compared with the number of ideas generated by the participants working in groups. A significant difference was found at the 5% level for a two tailed test ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 1

Average number of ideas generated when working alone and when working in a group

	Working alone	Working in a group
Number of ideas generated	14	8
Standard deviation	1.89	2.98

AO1 =3 marks

AO2 / AO3 = 32 marks

14 Identify the type of experimental design used in this study. *(1 mark)*

AO2 / AO3 = 1 mark For correct identification of the design

Independent measures/samples design.

Note: reference to lab or field experiment should not be credited.

15 Identify **one** extraneous variable that the investigator addressed in the procedure for the study and explain how it was addressed. (4 marks)

AO2 / AO3 = 4 marks Analysis of the design to identify correctly extraneous variable.
Appropriate description of practical technique to address this.

Likely answer: participant variables dealt with by random allocation of the participants to the two different conditions working alone or in groups. For full marks, candidates need to explain the process of random allocation.

16 Name an appropriate test of statistical significance for analysing this data. Explain why this would be a suitable test to use. (4 marks)

AO1 = 1 mark Appropriate test named
AO2 / AO3 = 3 marks Explanation in terms of level of measurement, design, purpose of test

Mann Witney
Ordinal data, independent measures, test of difference

17 Explain what is meant by " $p \leq 0.05$ ". (2 marks)

AO1 = 2 marks Accurate explanation

The probability of the results occurring by chance is equal to or less than 5 times in 100.

18 Give **one** reason why the psychologist used a two tailed test. (2 marks)

AO2 / AO3 = 2 marks Accurate reason

Two-tailed test is used when the hypothesis is non-directional. Because there was no indication that research suggested the direction of difference, a non-directional hypothesis and a two-tailed test would be appropriate.

19 With reference to the data in **Table 1**, outline and discuss the findings of this investigation. (10 marks)

AO3 = 10 marks Outline of findings of the investigation and analysis, evaluation and interpretation of other's methodology and the impact of findings

Answers should describe the overall results and make reference to:

Average scores for 2 conditions
Range or sd for each condition
Explain what the mean and sd seem to tell us
Realism of the task
Reliability of identifying who generated each idea when working in groups
What constitutes "an idea".

AO2/3 Mark bands**10-9 marks Effective**

Discussion and application of knowledge to unfamiliar material are effective.
Overall, the material shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.
There is substantial evidence of synopticity.

8-6 marks Reasonable

Discussion and application of knowledge to unfamiliar material is reasonably effective.
Overall, the material shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. There is evidence of synopticity.

5-3 marks Basic

Discussion and application of knowledge to unfamiliar material is basic.
Overall, the material shows some evidence of elaboration.
There is some evidence of synopticity.

2 - 1 marks Rudimentary

Discussion is rudimentary. It is weak, muddled and incomplete. Application of knowledge to unfamiliar material is rudimentary. The material presented may be mainly irrelevant.
There is little or no evidence of synopticity.

0 marks No creditworthy material is presented.

20 The psychologist noted that younger participants seemed to generate more ideas than older participants.

Design a study to investigate the **relationship** between age and ability to generate ideas. You should include sufficient details to permit replication, for example a hypothesis, variables, detail of design and procedure, sampling.

(12 marks)

AO2 / AO3 = 12 marks

Clear well-reasoned design with sufficient detail for reasonable replication.

- Hypothesis operationalised
- Method - correlational
- Variables age in years and number of ideas generated
- Sampling method and sample size
- Procedure to include briefing consent/right to withdraw, step by step to permit replication

12-10 marks Thorough and well reasoned

Design is thorough. Design decisions are appropriate and well reasoned. Sufficient detail for the study to be implemented.

9 - 7 marks Reasonable

Design is reasonable. Most design decisions are appropriate and some justification is provided. Sufficient detail for most aspects of the plan to be implemented.

6- 4 marks Basic

Design is basic. Some design decisions are appropriate. Justification provided is very limited. Insufficient detail for the plan to be implemented.

3- 1 marks Rudimentary

Design is rudimentary. Design decisions are muddled and incomplete and are not justified. The plan could not be implemented.

0 marks

No creditworthy material is presented.

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES UNIT 4

Question	AO1 mark	AO2 mark	AO3 mark	Total
01	5			
02		10		
03	4	2	4	
04	9	12	4	
05	4	6		
06	5	6	4	
Total	9	12	4	25
07		1	4	
08	4	6		
09	5	5		
10	5	6	4	
11	4	6		
12		12	4	
13	9			
Total	9	12	4	25
14			1	
15			4	
16	1		3	
17	2			
18			2	
19		4	6	
20			12	
Total	3	4	28	35
TOTALS	21	28	36	85