



**General Certificate of Education**

**Psychology 2186**

*Specification B*

**Unit 3 (PSYB3) Child Development and  
Applied Options**

**Mark Scheme**

***2010 Examination – June Series***

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://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 Child Development

### Topic Social Development

#### Question 01

[AO1 = 2]

One mark for knowledge of Schaffer's multiple attachment theory or knowledge that Schaffer disagreed with Bowlby's theory on Monotropy.

One mark for likely outcome - the older children (in the multiple attachment stage) will show a greater number of attachments (than the younger children) (in the single strong attachment stage).

#### Question 02

[AO3 = 1]

Independent groups/measures (or cross-sectional), unrelated.

#### Question 03

[AO3 = 2]

One mark for identifying a relevant limitation. Most likely answer is individual differences. The second mark is for explanation of how or why this is a limitation eg different children have different temperaments/family circumstances which might affect the number of attachments.

One mark for any valid limitation of the independent design without application to the stem.

#### Question 04

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** One mark for a relevant difference. Likely answers: boys' friendships are extensive/activity-based, girls' are intensive/intimate.

**AO2** Up to two marks for discussion/comment/elaboration. Candidates may present evidence or refer to the reasons for sex differences eg evolutionary explanations - male competitiveness to assert dominance, female nurturance. Credit implications eg girls worry more about friendship.

## Question 05

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12 marks), Good (7-9 marks), Weak to Average (4-6 marks) or Poor (1-3 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for psychological theory/evidence in relation to caregiver-infant interaction. Candidates may focus on one area in depth or refer to several in less depth. Likely content: Ainsworth's sensitive responsiveness hypothesis; research into early bonding (Klaus & Kennell, 1976); interactional synchrony (Condon & Sander, 1974, Brazelton, 1982); turn-taking, interaction and reciprocity; motherese (Snow & Ferguson, 1977); animal studies (Harlow, 1959); imitation (Melzoff & Moore, 1977). Credit up to 2 marks for description of relevant evidence.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion. Possible issues: validity of Ainsworth's (1970) work/conclusions; findings of Van Ijzendoorn (1988) re cultural differences; contradictory evidence eg against Klaus & Kennell; arguments against intentionality eg Kaye's (1984) theory about imputed meanings; evidence for intentionality (Trevarthen, 1976); implications of cases where attachments can be formed even after severe deprivation/privation eg Koluchova (1991); problem of establishing cause and effect; role of other factors. Credit use of relevant evidence.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

### Mark Bands

#### **10 -12 marks Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of the role of infant-caregiver interaction in the development of attachment. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to evidence are accurate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured.

#### **7 - 9 marks Good answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of the role of infant-caregiver interaction in the development of attachment. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. References to research are relevant but are perhaps not linked so clearly to the discussion as for the top band.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and paragraphs. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

**4 - 6 marks    Weak to average answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of infant-caregiver interaction. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The candidate expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The candidate uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

The candidate shows deficiencies in expression of ideas resulting in frequent confusion and/or ambiguity. Answers lack structure, consisting of a series of unconnected ideas. Psychological terminology is used occasionally, although not always appropriately. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent, intrusive and often obscure meaning.

**0 marks        No relevant content**

**Topic Cognitive Development**

**Question 06**

**[AO1 = 2]**

Up to two marks for knowledge of guided participation. Possible content: a type of scaffolding (1) that occurs in the process of transmission of culturally specific knowledge (1) from older/more experienced members of a community to younger members of the community (1).

**Question 07**

**[AO2 = 2]**

Up to two marks for application of guided participation to the given scenario. One mark for the behaviour being transmitted and one mark for who is doing the guiding. Answer should be an applied example of older/more experienced person (parents, grandparents) informing/guiding younger family member about 'correct' procedures/ traditions in this context ie family celebration eg mother showing/helping daughter with preparation of food/presents/decorations etc.

**Question 08**

**[AO1 = 1]**

The Concrete Operational stage

**Question 09**

**[AO3 = 3]**

Very generic Piaget criticism – 1 mark

Criticism linked to conservation – 2 marks

Clear and explicit link to conservation fully explained ie why it creates a problem in this type of study – 3 marks.

Likely answers: asking same question twice; deliberate re-arrangement is misleading; lacks human sense; alternative findings.

## Question 10

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12 marks), Good (7-9 marks), Weak to average (4-6 marks) or Poor (1-3 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge and description of nativist explanations re early infant abilities. Likely content: certain abilities are innate; newborns are equipped from birth; perception research eg Bower et al. (1970) and Fantz face perception (1961); Baillargeon's work on object permanence using impossible events (truck experiment – 1986 and carrot experiment 1991); object permanence arises before 8 months; intermodal perception and amodal perception (Bahrick, 1992, 2000); Chomsky innate language acquisition device (LAD). Up to 2 marks for description of relevant evidence.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion and evaluation. Possible content: status of arguments in relation to nature-nurture; biological versus environmental determinism; contrast with Piaget's findings on object permanence and his theory that the child's knowledge is constructed through experience (constructivist theory); Baillargeon's experiments only have a narrow focus ie object permanence, which is just one aspect of cognitive development; Piaget's theory is far more wide ranging; comparisons with Vygotsky – importance of social world. Credit also links to broader approaches eg behaviourism and social learning. Credit use of relevant evidence and evaluation of evidence.

## Mark Bands

### 10 -12 marks **Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of Nativist explanations. Evaluation is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured

### 7 - 9 marks **Good answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of Nativist explanations. Evaluation is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and paragraphs. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

**4 - 6 marks    Weak to average answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of Nativist explanations. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The candidate expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The candidate uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

The candidate shows deficiencies in expression of ideas resulting in frequent confusion and/or ambiguity. Answers lack structure, consisting of a series of unconnected ideas. Psychological terminology is used occasionally, although not always appropriately. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent, intrusive and often obscure meaning.

**0 marks        No relevant content**



**Topic Moral Development**

**Question 11**

**[AO1 = 3]**

One mark for identification of a relevant method (either named or briefly outlined): eg moral comparison (moral dilemma is acceptable); studying rules of marbles; studying lying.

Up to two further marks for expansion/description of the chosen method. Expect reference to some of the following; content of comparison stories, use of different age groups, observation of children playing marbles; questions about the rules of the game and where rules come from; giving examples of big ludicrous lies and small but malicious lies; looking at focus on consequence versus intent.

**Question 12**

**[AO3 = 3]**

Up to 3 marks for evaluation of method given in 11. Content will depend on method chosen but likely issues include: problem of changing two variables at once (intent and consequence) in the comparison stories – Nelson’s 4-version alternative; problem of cognitive load for small children; lack of control – informality of interviews; focus on reasoning rather than moral behaviour and the issue of validity. Accept ethical issues if made specifically relevant.

Credit 12 in respect of answer to 11 even if answer to 11 was incorrect.

**Question 13**

**[AO2 = 2]**

One mark for each limitation. Answers need only be very brief. Likely answers include: assumes no morality pre 5 years; assumes morality is fixed thereafter (no further development); assumes females have inferior morality; cannot be tested scientifically.

## Question 14

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12 marks), Good (7-9 marks), Weak to Average (4-6 marks) or Poor (1-3 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of the contributions of Gilligan and Kohlberg, usually two marks for each. Contributions may be theoretical or research based. Likely content: Gilligan's 3 levels; Gilligan's ethics of care and justice; Gilligan's applied research on abortion; Kohlberg's dilemma technique; Kohlberg's 3 levels/6 stages; Kohlberg's longitudinal research. Credit description of relevant evidence up to 2 marks (1 mark maximum per study).

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion of the contributions of the two theorists. Likely issues include: importance and significance of their research (Kohlberg's hypothetical dilemmas versus the real-life dilemmas used by Gilligan; contributions in terms of theory (Kohlberg's detailed delineation of the 6 stages and focus on justice & law versus Gilligan's broader levels of focus on self, others, universal care); findings in relation to sex differences (Kohlberg's male bias and Gilligan's female bias – also Walker's research into sex differences); credit comparison eg similarities between the two (gradual shift from self-oriented to other oriented). Credit use of relevant evidence.

**Maximum 7 marks if only one theorist presented**

### Mark Bands

#### **10 -12 marks Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of both Kohlberg's and Gilligan's contributions. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured.

#### **7 - 9 marks Good answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of Kohlberg's and Gilligan's contributions. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. An otherwise very good answer on just one researcher can gain a maximum of 7 marks.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and paragraphs. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

**4 - 6 marks    Weak to average answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of Kohlberg's and/or Gilligan's contributions. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The candidate expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The candidate uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

The candidate shows deficiencies in expression of ideas resulting in frequent confusion and/or ambiguity. Answers lack structure, consisting of a series of unconnected ideas. Psychological terminology is used occasionally, although not always appropriately. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent, intrusive and often obscure meaning.

**0 marks        No relevant content**

## Section B Applied Options

### Topic Cognition and Law

#### Question 15

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** One mark for knowledge of each possibility: memory is false ie the event never happened (1); memory is true, and has recently become conscious (1).  
Very brief answer eg true or not – 1 mark.

**AO2** One mark for explanation of each possibility: False memory must be the product of reconstruction/implanted (1) True memory has just become conscious and was repressed in the unconscious for a time (1).

#### Question 16

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** One mark for each relevant reason for unreliability of child eye-witnesses. Likely reasons: poor source monitoring; increased risk of post-event contamination; increased deterioration of memory over time; demand characteristics – children more likely to guess/produce an answer in order to appease researcher. Accept other valid reasons.

**AO2** One mark each for elaboration of the reason, use of evidence or application.  
Evidence: Poole & Lindsay (2001) Mr. Science – source monitoring; Candel (2007) post-event contamination; Baker-Ward (1993) medical examination.  
Application: example of how Jamila may have confused two separate events or may think an event happened to her when she had only been told about it.  
Credit may also be awarded for further relevant analytical issues, eg conflicting evidence eg Fivush & Shukat 1994, Marin 1979; criticisms of research - studies focus on positive events whereas in real-life the event is often negative.

---

**Question 17****[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]**

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12 marks), Good (7-9 marks), Weak to Average (4-6 marks) or Poor (1-3 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of composite systems/line-up procedures. Likely content: first generation paper-based versus later computer-based composite systems; blending; addition of default standard features; Identikit, Photo-fit, E-fit, FACE; sequential and simultaneous line-ups; video line-ups - the VIPER system (Kemp et al 2001); number of foils. Up to 2 marks for description of relevant evidence(1 mark maximum per study) eg Ellis et al. (1978) photo-fit v sketches; Davies et al 2000 new generation composites; Wells et al 1998 false positives; Steblay et al 2001 superiority of sequential line-ups.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion, analysis and evaluation. Possible content: effectiveness as aids to recognition; advantages of feature blending and changes in spacing with newer composites; comparative effectiveness of sequential versus simultaneous line-ups; issue of absolutist versus relative judgements; the chance of false positives (especially with simultaneous); issue of legal equivalence for video line-ups; issue of control in line-up procedures; demand characteristics; researcher effects; characteristics of foils; role of feedback (Wells); ecological validity of studies. Credit use of relevant evidence.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

**Mark Bands****10 -12 marks Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of composite systems and/or line-up procedures. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to evidence are accurate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured.

**7 - 9 marks Good answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of composite systems and/or line-up procedures. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. References to evidence are relevant but are perhaps not linked so clearly to the discussion as for the top band.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and paragraphs. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

**4 - 6 marks    Weak to average answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of composite systems and/or line-up procedures. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The candidate expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The candidate uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

The candidate shows deficiencies in expression of ideas resulting in frequent confusion and/or ambiguity. Answers lack structure, consisting of a series of unconnected ideas. Psychological terminology is used occasionally, although not always appropriately. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent, intrusive and often obscure meaning.

**0 marks    No relevant content**

---

**Topic Schizophrenia and Mood Disorders**
**Question 18****[AO1 = 2]**

Up to two marks for knowledge of a relevant behavioural treatment. This is most likely to be a token economy. Award marks for detail as follows: operant conditioning/positive reinforcement/tokens/secondary reinforcers; for desired behaviour (with examples of desired behaviour); to be exchanged for primary reinforcers. Credit references to a specific example eg Paul & Lentz (1977).

**Question 19****[AO2 = 4]**

One mark for each relevant limitation (up to two), plus one further mark for expansion of each. Likely limitations: ethical issue re withholding of basic needs – this may be seen as manipulation/bribery; lack of transfer beyond the institutional setting – use of evidence to support this point; token economies lead to token learning and not real learning ie patient may still experience bizarre delusions/hallucinations but may not be voicing them out loud; need for consistency that is difficult to achieve in an institution where there may be changes in personnel and temporary bank staff. Credit comparison with other treatments. Credit answer to 19 in respect of answer given to 18 even if 18 is not a behavioural treatment.

**Question 20****[AO1 = 2]**

One mark for each relevant behavioural symptom eg social withdrawal; crying; lack of volition; lack of self-care. Accept also cognitive symptoms that would be demonstrated in behaviour eg poor concentration, memory etc.

**Question 21****[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]**

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12 marks), Good (7-9 marks), Weak to Average (4-6 marks) or Poor (1-3 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of two explanations for depression, usually two marks for each explanation. Do not credit simple naming of the explanation eg cognitive, behavioural etc. Possible explanations: biological – genetic inheritance and altered levels of serotonin and/or norepinephrine; cognitive – negative cognitive set, cognitive triad, characteristics of negative thinking eg catastrophising etc, attribution theory; psychodynamic – loss event leading to anger and the introjection of hostility, regression to the oral stage, childhood loss leading to adult dependency; behavioural – Lewinsohn's theory of social withdrawal leading to lack of reinforcement, reinforcement of depressive behaviour, learned helplessness (Seligman). Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion/evaluation and application. Content may include: use of evidence in favour and against; similarities/differences in the two explanations eg behavioural may better explain the maintenance of the disorder whereas biological/psychodynamic may better explain the root cause; issues of determinism (biological determinism, psychic determinism, environmental determinism) and reductionism; need for an interactionist approach; implications for treatment. Reserve two marks for application to stem eg Josie's family history (biological); attention from friend is reinforcement; reference to hopelessness/no future - Josie has a negative cognitive set; reference to a loss event (husband's death) – psychodynamic. Credit use of relevant evidence.

**Maximum 7 marks if only one explanation presented**

### Mark Bands

#### **10 -12 marks Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of two explanations for depression. Evaluation is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Application to the stem is clear. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured.

#### **7 - 9 marks Good answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of two explanations for depression. Evaluation is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and paragraphs. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

#### **4 - 6 marks Weak to average answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of two explanations for depression. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The candidate expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The candidate uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.



**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

The candidate shows deficiencies in expression of ideas resulting in frequent confusion and/or ambiguity. Answers lack structure, consisting of a series of unconnected ideas. Psychological terminology is used occasionally, although not always appropriately. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent, intrusive and often obscure meaning.

**0 marks        No relevant content**

**Topic Stress and Stress Management**

**Question 22**

**[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 2]**

- AO1** Up to 4 marks for actions of the ANS/endocrine system in mediating/responding to stress. Credit any of the following: sympathetic and parasympathetic sections of ANS; sympathetic (flight or fight) adrenal medulla releases adrenalin and noradrenaline; parasympathetic restores normal function; endocrine system secretes hormones via pituitary and adrenal glands increasing heart-rate/blood flow; hypothalamus produces corticotropin releasing factor (CRF), stimulates pituitary to secrete adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH); ACTH causes adrenal cortex to produce corticosteroids (cortisol). Reference to GAS. Not all this detail is necessary for full marks. Must refer to both ANS and endocrine system for 4 marks.
- AO2** Up to 2 marks for application to Nicky. Her stress is long-term, physical and emotional, long-term stress may weaken immune system causing illness; prolonged cardiovascular reactivity can cause strokes/enlarged heart.

**Question 23**

**[AO2 = 2]**

One mark for knowledge of a type of social support for Nicky eg instrumental, informational, emotional, esteem, appraisal.

The second mark is for the example of how the support would help in this case. Possible answer: Nicky's neighbour might offer to baby-sit so she could go out occasionally – this would be instrumental support. Credit more general examples.

**Question 24**

**[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]**

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12 marks), Good (7-9 marks), Weak to Average (4-6 marks) or Poor (1-3 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

- AO1** Up to 4 marks for outline of the two ways of measuring stress, usually two marks for each. Likely measures include: physiological measures eg blood or urine to measure hormone levels (cortisol); polygraph to measure arousal; self-report scales including Kanner's Hassles and Uplifts scale, Holmes & Rahe's life events scale; behavioural measures eg speech hesitations, rapidity of speech. Accept two measures from the same category eg two physiological measures. Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for comparison of the two ways. Points of comparison will depend on the two measures chosen. Possible content: objectivity of some measures eg physiological measures, versus the subjectivity of others eg self-report measures; objectivity will affect reliability; test-re-test reliability; extent to which the two measures are valid ie measure what they are supposed to measure eg some physiological measures (eg heart-rate) measure arousal rather than stress, self-report measures have some validity but their scope is limited by predetermined items; qualitative v quantitative including ease of analysis; time; practicalities eg need for specialist equipment. Credit ethical issues. Credit use of relevant evidence.

### **Mark Bands**

#### **10 -12 marks Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of two ways of measuring stress. Comparison is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Most analytical comments are well developed and presented in the context of the comparison as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured.

#### **7 - 9 marks Good answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of two ways of measuring stress. Comparison is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and paragraphs. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

#### **4 - 6 marks Weak to average answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of two ways of measuring stress. There must be some analysis/comparison for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The candidate expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The candidate uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

The candidate shows deficiencies in expression of ideas resulting in frequent confusion and/or ambiguity. Answers lack structure, consisting of a series of unconnected ideas. Psychological terminology is used occasionally, although not always appropriately. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent, intrusive and often obscure meaning.

**0 marks        No relevant content**

**Topic Substance Abuse**

**Question 25**

[AO2 = 1]

Maintenance

**Question 26**

[AO2 = 1]

Contemplation

**Question 27**

[AO2 = 1]

Action/active change

**Question 28**

[AO2 = 1]

Precontemplation

**Question 29**

[AO1 = 4]

Most candidates will refer to twin studies although any study relevant to explaining substance abuse is acceptable. Likely studies: Kaij 1960, Kendler 1994, Goldstein 1994, Melo 1996, Morgenstern 1997, Garnier & Stein 2002.

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

1 mark - information about the method

1 mark - indication of results

1 mark - indication of conclusion to be drawn

### Question 30

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12 marks), Good (7-9 marks), Weak to Average (4-6 marks) or Poor (1-3 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of treatment/s of substance abuse. Most answers will focus on aversion therapy and self-management although other treatments (eg cognitive therapy) are acceptable. Detail may include general aims or specific procedures. Possible content: Aversion therapy: based on classical conditioning; learning by association; pairing of undesired behaviour with a noxious stimulus; rapid smoking as an example; covert sensitisation. Self-management: monitoring of intake; awareness of reasons; awareness of consequences; AA as an example. Cognitive therapy: behavioural self-control training (Miller et al. 1992); monitoring of behaviour to identify risk situations; acquisition of coping strategies eg limiting and relaxation. Credit description of relevant evidence up to 2 marks.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for evaluation of the treatment/s presented. Possible content: practical issues eg ease of application, time etc; short-term/long-term effectiveness; rates of relapse; use of evidence to support assertions; difficulty accessing data about effectiveness; privacy issues in relation to research; ethical issues associated with aversion therapy; patient control of the treatment – passivity versus active involvement; suitability for different types of substance abuse; need for other support eg social support; need to avoid peer pressure; self-management in combination with community programmes; need for commitment; combining various treatments including use of medication. Credit use of relevant evidence.

### Mark Bands

#### 10 -12 marks **Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of at least one psychological treatment for substance abuse. Evaluation is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured.

**7 - 9 marks    Good answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of at least one psychological treatment for substance abuse. Evaluation is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and paragraphs. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

**4 - 6 marks    Weak to average answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of at least one psychological treatment for substance abuse. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The candidate expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The candidate uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

The candidate shows deficiencies in expression of ideas resulting in frequent confusion and/or ambiguity. Answers lack structure, consisting of a series of unconnected ideas. Psychological terminology is used occasionally, although not always appropriately. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent, intrusive and often obscure meaning.

**0 marks    No relevant content**

## Topic Forensic Psychology

### Question 31

[AO1 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for knowledge of the typology approach. Relevant content: involves categorising offender (1) as either organised or disorganised (1) according to their behaviour at the scene, the type of victim etc (1) organised/disorganised type each has a set of characteristics eg live alone-lives with partner (1) top-down approach (1).

For full marks answer must include reference to organised/disorganised distinction.

### Question 32

[AO2 = 2]

One mark for an appropriate limitation. Relevant answers include: oversimplification; addition of catch-all category; validity of the two categories (Canter's evidence against the disorganised type); category system based on limited sample (36 cases).  
One further mark for explanation/expansion/elaboration of the limitation.

### Question 33

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** One mark for each problem briefly outlined/identified. Possible answers: the deviance (legal) definition is an oversimplification; cultural differences/cultural specificity; historical context; age of perpetrator; individual circumstances (eg need, necessity, self-defence etc); importance of conscious awareness of rule-breaking. Decisions about right and wrong are subjective, therefore different people have different ideas about what is a crime.

**AO2** One mark for explanation of each problem; either through further elaboration of how or why it is a problem, or through example.

### Question 34

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12 marks), Good (7-9 marks), Weak to Average (4-6 marks) or Poor (1-3 marks). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of two explanations for offending, usually two marks for each. Given the stem, the most likely explanations include: genetic explanations; psychodynamic explanations eg Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation and superego-based explanations; learning theory explanations including Sutherland's differential association theory and social learning. Accept any explanations that are made relevant to Harry's case. Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.



**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion, analysis and application. Possible issues include: use of evidence; evaluation of evidence eg problems of twin studies and lack of evidence for psychodynamic explanations; Bowlby's confusion between privation and deprivation; implications eg for genetic explanations – determinism and the usefulness of treatment; role of free will; reductionism; comparison of alternative explanations; ethical issues eg issues of blame; offending as a rational choice.

Reserve two marks for application to the stem: family history of offending, difficult family life - perhaps family offended (genetic or SLT- modelling); trouble at school (Bowlby's delinquency); deprived area and role of peers (differential reinforcement). Credit use of relevant evidence.

**Maximum 8 marks if only one explanation presented**

### Mark Bands

#### **10 -12 marks Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of two relevant explanations for offending. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Application to the stem is clear. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured.

#### **7 - 9 marks Good answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of two relevant explanations for offending. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and paragraphs. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

#### **4 - 6 marks Weak to average answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of one/two explanations for offending. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The candidate expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The candidate uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

The candidate shows deficiencies in expression of ideas resulting in frequent confusion and/or ambiguity. Answers lack structure, consisting of a series of unconnected ideas. Psychological terminology is used occasionally, although not always appropriately. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent, intrusive and often obscure meaning.

**0 marks        No relevant content**