



General Certificate of Education

Psychology 1186

Specification B

**Unit 2 (PSYB2) Social Psychology,
Cognitive Psychology and
Individual Differences**

Mark Scheme

2010 Examination – June Series

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

Copyright © 2010 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 Social Psychology

Topic: Social Influence

Question 01

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 1]

AO1 1 mark for defining social facilitation.

AO2 1 mark for sport related example.

Possible answer: Performance of a task is changed in the presence of others (AO1), for example, a basketball player scores more goals when watched by supporters (AO2).

Question 02

[AO1 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for a description of a recognisable study; candidates may briefly describe the aim, method, results and/or conclusion. Alternatively candidates may get **full credit** for focusing on only two sections of the study when there is sufficient detail provided. Likely studies include: Bartis et al (1988), Henchy and Glass (1968), Worryingham and Messick (1983), MacCracken and Stadulis (1985).

If there is no reference to judgement of performance in the study max 2.

Question 03

[AO2 = 2]

1 mark for a weak attempt at explaining the problem (ethical or methodological).

2 marks for a clear explanation.

For full credit the explanation must be linked to evaluation apprehension.

Possible answer: it is difficult for the researchers to be sure that the evaluation apprehension exhibited (or induced), in a laboratory study is the same as that exhibited in the natural environment, (1) so the research might lack ecological validity (1).

0 marks for just stating a problem.

Question 04

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 2]

AO1 1 mark for identifying the factor

AO2 1 mark for the direction of the effect and one further mark for explanation of reason(s).
Likely factors: location/legitimacy; proximity of authority figure; proximity of victim; social support.

Possible answer: One factor that affects obedience to authority is the location in which the order is issued (AO1). It has been shown that when the location/place is prestigious/of high status (such as a well-regarded university), obedience is higher (AO2) than when the location is run down. This is because the run down location lacks legitimacy/authority (AO2).

Question 05

[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very good (9-10 marks), Good (6-8 marks), Average to weak (3-5 marks) or Poor (1-2 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating the script.

AO1 Up to 5 marks for identifying and elaborating factors. Likely factors: group size, unanimity/size of majority, task difficulty, presence of another dissenter, presence of another dissenter who then begins to conform, opinion expressed in public, (rather than in private), fear of ridicule, perceived competence of other members, personality of individual.

Maximum of 1 mark for a list of factors only. Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks. Likely studies: Sherif (1935), Asch (1951), Crutchfield (1954).

AO2 Up to 5 marks for discussion of the factors. This might include the conditions under which the factor increases or decreases conformity and explanation of why this might be so; the implications of evidence/use of evidence specifically to support or refute influence of stated factors. Discussion of the wider implications of the factors, eg in real life conforming situations. Comparison of relative power of factors. Evaluation of methodology of conformity studies if made relevant to chosen factors.

Maximum 6 marks – only one factor

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of at least two factors that affect conformity. The evaluation is clear, coherent and detailed. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer is well-structured with effective use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are few errors of spelling and punctuation.

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of at least two factors and some reference to evidence for more than 6 marks, though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer has some structure with appropriate use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are some errors of spelling and punctuation.

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of factor(s) and/or basic/limited evaluation. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately though the answer may lack structure. Psychological terminology may be missing or used inappropriately. There may be intrusive errors of grammar, spelling and punctuation.

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is extremely limited knowledge/evaluation of factor(s), but there must be some relevance.

Basic ideas are poorly expressed. There is little evidence of structure. There may be significant errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation.

0 marks No relevant content.

Topic: Social Cognition

Question 06

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 1]

AO1 1 mark for defining the affective component.

AO2 1 mark for example.

Possible answer: This is the emotional component towards/concerned with how the individual feels about an attitude object (AO1), for example, I **hate** football (AO2).

Question 07

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 2]

AO1 1 mark for identifying a function.

AO2 2 marks for explaining how it might affect behaviour. This might be by example. Likely functions: adaptive; knowledge, ego expressive, ego defensive, social adjustment.

Possible answer: One function of an attitude is the adaptive function (AO1). This is concerned with how an attitude can help us to gain rewards and avoid negative consequences (AO2). We express specific attitudes in order to increase our chances of a good outcome (AO2).

Question 08

[AO1 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for a description of a recognisable study; candidates may briefly describe the aim, method, results and/or conclusion. Alternatively candidates may get **full credit** for focusing on only two sections of the study when there is sufficient detail provided. Likely studies include: Asch (1946), Kelley (1950).

Up to 2 marks for a plausible “trait” if not warm or cold.

Question 09

[AO2 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for a problem, (ethical or methodological), that is elaborated.

For full credit the explanation must be linked to impression formation.

Possible answer: it is difficult for the researchers to be sure that the impression formed in a laboratory study is the same as that exhibited in the natural environment, so the research might lack ecological validity.

Question 10

[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very good (9-10 marks), Good (6-8 marks), Average to weak (3-5 marks) or Poor (1-2 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating the script.

AO1 Up to 5 marks for identifying and elaborating biases. Likely biases: the fundamental attribution error, the self-serving bias and the actor-observer effect. (Also credit effect of severity of consequences.)

Maximum of 1 mark for a list of biases only.

Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks. Likely studies include: Walster (1966), Kingdon (1967), Storms (1973), Abramson et al (1978), Quattrone (1982), Miller (1984), Fiske & Taylor (1991), Arkin et al (1980), Darley & Huff (1990), Davison & Neale (1994).

AO2 Up to 5 marks for: Analysis of why each bias occurs, eg lack of information about a person's circumstances/situation, need to protect self-esteem.

Max 2 marks for examples of different bias.

Evaluation of conditions under which the biases occur or do not occur, or in which they are reversed.

Evaluation of methodology of bias studies if made relevant. Analysis of implications of biases; eg, for misunderstandings.

Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 6 marks – only one bias

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of at least two attributional biases. The evaluation is clear, coherent and detailed. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer is well-structured with effective use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are few errors of spelling and punctuation.

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of at least two attributional biases and some reference to evidence for more than 6 marks, though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer has some structure with appropriate use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are some errors of spelling and punctuation.

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of attributional bias(es) and/or basic/limited evaluation. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately though the answer may lack structure. Psychological terminology may be missing or used inappropriately. There may be intrusive errors of grammar, spelling and punctuation.

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is extremely limited knowledge/evaluation of attributional bias(es), but there must be some relevance.

Basic ideas are poorly expressed. There is little evidence of structure. There may be significant errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation.

0 marks No relevant content.

Section B Cognitive Psychology

Topic: Remembering and Forgetting

Question 11

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

AO1 1 mark each for a descriptive point about procedural memory and autobiographical memory. Likely answers: Procedural memory – a motor or action-based memory/ knowing how to do something.

Autobiographical memory – (a special type of episodic) memory of events we have experienced ourselves.

AO2 Up to 2 marks for explanation of a distinction point such as: content of the stores – they hold different types of long term information; declarative/not – autobiographical is easy to express in words, but procedural is not; whether the memory is conscious or not. Differences may be illustrated by example.

1 mark for a weak attempt to distinguish between the types of memory.

2 marks for a clear distinction.

Question 12

[AO1 = 4]

Likely study – Craik and Tulving (1975)

1 mark – why the study was conducted (must go beyond the stem)

1 mark – information about the method

1 mark – indication of results

1 mark – indication of a conclusion to be drawn

Question 13

[AO2 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for a limitation that is elaborated.

Possible answer: the definition of depth of processing is circular (1), deep processing is assumed to have occurred (in the semantic condition) since/only because recall was higher for that condition (1).

Accept other valid answers such as there is an assumption that in the shallow condition people did not process the words deeply.

Question 14

[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very good (9-10 marks), Good (6-8 marks), Average to weak (3-5 marks) or Poor (1-2 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating the script.

AO1 Up to 5 marks for identifying and elaborating **two** explanations. Likely explanations: interference theory: pro- and retro-active inhibition; retrieval failure: lack of state/context cues/organisation; lack of consolidation: interruption of the time period/physical disruption; motivated forgetting: repression/inaccessible memory; trace decay: fading of memory due to passage of time; displacement: limited capacity of STM. Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks. Likely studies: Jenkins and Dallenbach (1924), Keppel and Underwood (1962), Schmidt et al (2000), Tulving and Pearlstone (1966), Bower et al (1969), Godden and Baddeley (1975), Drachman and Sahakian (1979), Yarnell and Lynch (1970), Waugh and Norman (1965), Glucksberg and Lloyd (1967), Williams (1994), Groome and Soureti (2004).

AO2 Up to 5 marks for analysis and evaluation of the two explanations. Likely points: why memory is affected according to the explanation(s) chosen, evaluation of studies of forgetting if made relevant to the explanations. Comparison of explanations. Credit use of examples up to 1 mark for each explanation. Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 6 marks – only one explanation

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of two explanations for forgetting. The evaluation is clear, coherent and detailed. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer is well-structured with effective use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are few errors of spelling and punctuation.

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of two explanations and some reference to evidence for more than 6 marks, though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer has some structure with appropriate use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are some errors of spelling and punctuation.

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of explanation(s) and/or basic/limited evaluation. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately though the answer may lack structure. Psychological terminology may be missing or used inappropriately. There may be intrusive errors of grammar, spelling and punctuation.

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is extremely limited knowledge/evaluation of explanation(s), but there must be some relevance.

Basic ideas are poorly expressed. There is little evidence of structure. There may be significant errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation.

0 marks No relevant content.

Topic: Perceptual Processes

Question 15

[AO1 = 2]

1 mark for identification either by name or drawing of one distortion illusion such as: Muller-Lyer, Ponzo illusion, moon illusion, Ebbinghaus illusion. 1 mark for the effect.

Accept valid alternatives and diagrams which aid description.

Possible answer: Muller-Lyer illusion (1) where the shaft with out-going fins is usually perceived as longer than that with in-going fins although both are the same length (1).

Question 16

[AO1 = 2]

1 mark for an example of an ambiguous figure such as: Necker cube, Rubin's vase, Leeper's lady. 1 mark for the definition/description of ambiguity.

Accept valid alternatives and diagrams which aid description.

Possible answer: Rubin's vase (1) has two possible interpretations as a vase or two faces (1).

Question 17

[AO2 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for an explanation of size constancy.

Possible answer: Size constancy enables us to perceive objects as the same size/constant size/ (1) despite differences in size of the retinal image/changes in distance (1).

Question 18

[AO1= 2, AO2 = 2]

AO1 One mark for each feature, up to 2 marks. Likely features: affordances, optic/visual array, sensation is perception, direct/data-driven process/bottom-up.

AO2 One mark for each explanation, up to 2 marks.

Possible answer: Gibson proposes that perception is affected by affordances (AO1) which are visual cues from objects that enable us to perceive their properties immediately (AO2). He also said that the human eye has evolved to be extremely sensitive to visual cues like texture (AO2) and this enables the process of visual perception to be direct/data-driven/bottom-up (AO1).

Question 19

[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very good (9-10 marks), Good (6-8 marks), Average to weak (3-5 marks) or Poor (1-2 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating the script.

AO1 Up to 5 marks for identifying and elaborating the effects of 2 factors. Likely factors: expectation, motivation, culture, emotion. Accept other valid factors.

Credit description of evidence up to 3 marks. Maximum of 2 for any one study. Likely studies include: Turnbull (1961), Segall et al (1963), Gilchrist & Nesberg (1952), Toch and Schulte (1961), McGinnies (1949), Lazarus & McCleary (1951), Brislin (1993), Deregowski (1972), Bruner & Minturn (1955).

AO2 5 marks for discussion of the factors.

Credit relevant links to Gregory's theory or other theory eg psychodynamic – repression, perceptual defence.

Credit use of examples up to 1 mark for each factor.

Credit use of evidence and evaluation of evidence if made relevant.

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Maximum 6 marks – only one factor

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of two factors that influence perception. The evaluation is clear, coherent and detailed. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer is well-structured with effective use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are few errors of spelling and punctuation.

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of two factors and some reference to evidence for more than 6 marks, though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer has some structure with appropriate use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are some errors of spelling and punctuation.

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of factor(s) and/or basic/limited evaluation. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately though the answer may lack structure. Psychological terminology may be missing or used inappropriately. There may be intrusive errors of grammar, spelling and punctuation.

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is extremely limited knowledge/evaluation of factor(s), but there must be some relevance.

Basic ideas are poorly expressed. There is little evidence of structure. There may be significant errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation.

0 marks No relevant content.

Section C Individual Differences

Topic: Anxiety Disorders

Question 20

[AO1 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for a description of features of a phobia. Likely points include: an extreme fear (1) which is disproportionate to the danger/irrational (1)/leads to avoidance (1).

Question 21

[AO3 = 1]

One mark for a key feature of quasi-experiments. Likely points: An experiment in which there is: no random allocation to conditions/no direct manipulation of the IV/the IV is a pre-existing variable.

Question 22

[AO3 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for an explanation of matched pairs design, including the idea that for every person in one condition there is a 'twin' in the other. Likely points: The participants are put into pairs, one for each condition/tested before taking part in the study (1) based on certain characteristics (that are important) such as age/gender (1).

Or

A design in which different people take part in each condition of the experiment (1), but they are put into pairs based on a characteristic (that is important to the study) (1).

Question 23

[AO3 = 2]

One mark for an advantage and one further mark for an explanation of why this is an advantage. Possible answer (Apart from having or not having a phobia), participant variables are controlled/reduced (1), this means that the validity of the results of the study is increased (1), the researcher can be more sure that the results are due to a phobia rather than any other variables.

Question 24

[AO3 = 1, AO2 = 2]

- AO3** 1 mark for stating the likely outcome.
Possible answer: The likely outcome is that the number of negative events expected by the phobic group will be higher(1) than for the group without a phobia.
- AO2** Up to 2 marks for discussion/elaboration of these likely results based on cognitive theory including any of the following points. Possible points: This is because the people with a phobia have automatic negative thoughts/overgeneralise negative events/are hypersensitive to environments in which negative events have happened previously/have selective perception of danger/negative self-talk/catastrophic or irrational thoughts.

Question 25

[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very good (9-10 marks), Good (6-8 marks), Average to weak (3-5 marks) or Poor (1-2 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating the script.

- AO1** Up to 5 marks for description of **two** explanations. Likely explanations: Biological – genetic, biochemical or neurophysiological factors; behavioural – classical conditioning and reinforcement; cognitive – undesirable thoughts/catastrophic misinterpretations/hypervigilant attentional system; psychodynamic – conflict between personality components in psychosexual stages and use of defence mechanisms.
Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks. Likely studies include: Bellodi et al (2001), Mackeon and Murray (1987), Rapoport and Wise (1988), Insel (1991), Aylward (1996), Rachman and Hodgson (1980), Trevidi (1996), Rachman (1997) and (2004).
- AO2** Up to 5 marks for analysis and evaluation of the two explanations. Likely points: how each explanation accounts for the behaviours seen in the disorder. The effectiveness of therapies proposed by the explanations which in turn support the explanations. Use of examples to illustrate the behaviours/explanations up to 1 mark for each. Lack of evidence to support theoretical explanations. Strengths and limitations of explanations. Comparison of the 2 explanations.
Credit use of evidence and evaluation of evidence if made relevant.

Maximum 6 marks – only one explanation

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of two explanations for obsessive-compulsive disorder. The evaluation is clear, coherent and detailed. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer is well-structured with effective use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are few errors of spelling and punctuation.

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of two explanations and some reference to evidence for more than 6 marks, though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer has some structure with appropriate use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are some errors of spelling and punctuation.

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of explanation(s) and/or basic/limited evaluation. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately though the answer may lack structure. Psychological terminology may be missing or used inappropriately. There may be intrusive errors of grammar, spelling and punctuation.

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is extremely limited knowledge/evaluation of explanation(s), but there must be some relevance.

Basic ideas are poorly expressed. There is little evidence of structure. There may be significant errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation.

0 marks No relevant content.

Topic: Autism

Question 26

[AO1 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for symptoms of autism. Likely points include: impairment in social interaction (1) impairment in verbal communication (1) restricted repertoire of activities or interests (1).

Credit other relevant behavioural characteristics.

Question 27

[AO3 = 1]

One mark for a key feature of quasi-experiments. Likely points: An experiment in which there is: no random allocation to conditions/no direct manipulation of the IV/the IV is a pre-existing variable.

Question 28

[AO3 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for an explanation of matched pairs design, including the idea that for every person in one condition there is a 'twin' in the other. Likely points: The participants are put into pairs, one of each condition/tested before taking part in the study (1) based on certain characteristics (that are important) such as age/gender (1).

Or

A design in which different people take part in each condition of the experiment (1), but they are put into pairs based on a characteristic (that is important) to the study (1).

Question 29

[AO3 = 2]

One mark for an advantage and one further mark for an explanation of why this is an advantage. Possible answer (Apart from having or not having autism), participant variables are controlled/reduced (1), this means that the validity of the results of the study is increased (1)/ the researcher can be more sure that the results are due to autism rather than any other variables.

Question 30

[AO3 = 1, AO2 = 2]

AO3 1 mark for stating the likely outcome.

Possible answer: The likely outcome is that the number of responses that are 'pencil' will be higher for the children with autism (1) than for the children without autism.

AO2 Up to 2 marks for discussion/elaboration of these likely results based on cognitive theory including any of the following points.

This is because the children with autism do not have theory of mind / the ability to understand what others know. This means that they will respond based on their own knowledge of the fact that the pencil has been placed in the tube.

Accept other valid answers, eg those based on false belief.

Question 31

[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very good (9-10 marks), Good (6-8 marks), Average to weak (3-5 marks) or Poor (1-2 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating the script.

AO1 Up to 5 marks for description of **two** therapeutic programmes. Likely programmes: Behaviour modification – based on operant conditioning and reinforcement and shaping, Lovaas technique (including language training), ABA approaches; Aversion therapy – for self harming. Parental involvement techniques – consistency in reinforcement and reward of adaptive behaviours. Credit drug therapy – for example, the use of antipsychotics and antidepressants for repetitive behaviours.

Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks. Likely studies: Wolf et al (1964), Lovaas (1977), and (1987), Cohen et al (2006), Sallows and Graupner (2005), Koegal et al (1982/86), McCracken et al (2002).

AO2 Up to 5 marks for analysis and evaluation of the two programmes. Likely points include the success of the programmes as measured by changes in behaviour and the interactions of people with autism. Discussion of the negative effects reported in some cases. Comparison of the programmes. Discussion of the ethical implications of some programmes.

Credit use of evidence

Maximum 6 marks – only one programme

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of two therapeutic programmes for autism. The evaluation is clear, coherent and detailed. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer is well-structured with effective use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are few errors of spelling and punctuation.

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of two therapeutic programmes and some reference to evidence for more than 6 marks, though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

The answer has some structure with appropriate use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are some errors of spelling and punctuation.

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of therapeutic programme(s) and/or basic/limited evaluation. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately though the answer may lack structure. Psychological terminology may be missing or used inappropriately. There may be intrusive errors of grammar, spelling and punctuation.

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is extremely limited knowledge/evaluation of therapeutic programme(s), but there must be some relevance.

Basic ideas are poorly expressed. There is little evidence of structure. There may be significant errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation.

0 marks No relevant content.