



**General Certificate of Education (A-level)
January 2011**

Psychology B

PSYB2

(Specification 2185)

**Unit 2: Social Psychology, Cognitive
Psychology and Individual Differences**

Post-Standardisation

Mark Scheme

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process 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 standardisation each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 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 = 2]

Up to two marks for describing a dominant response. This can be by use of an example. The behaviour/action most likely to occur (1) in a given situation (1) or when an individual is highly aroused/in a stressful situation (1) or a well learned/well practised response (1) the dominant response is different in skilled and unskilled people (1).

Question 02 [AO2 = 4]

1 mark each for knowledge of explanation.
1 mark each for application to the stem.

Likely explanations:

Distraction: Simon was distracted and less able to concentrate (1) due to the noisy audience (1).

Arousal: presence of an audience increases arousal (1) increased arousal increases the likelihood of dominant responses (1) Simon's dominant response is poor gymnastics as he is a novice gymnast (1).

Evaluation apprehension: Simon felt he was being judged by the audience (1) this leads to over-arousal and poor performance as he is a novice gymnast (1).

Social inhibition: in this case Simon's poor performance is due to a dominant response (1) that is not required (1) in this situation of performing his gymnastics routine (1).

Credit reference to Yerkes-Dodson and drive theory.

Question 03 [AO1 = 4]

Likely studies include:

Feldman and Scheibe (1972) Gamson et al (1982) Milgram (1965) Bickman (1974) Holfing (1966).

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

1 global mark for a description that is very muddled but recognisably about defiance.

Maximum 2 marks no reference to defiance or "did not obey".

Question 04

[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 the normative and informational explanations of social influence. Normative explanations refer to the social rules that govern behaviour and the need to be seen as a member of the social group. These relate to a desire for social approval and acceptance and avoidance of rejection. Normative explanations suggest that conformity is public agreement with the group. Informational explanations refer to the idea that the individual believes the group has more knowledge/expertise and that conformity is agreement with the group due to uncertainty about correct responses or behaviour on the part of the individual. Conformity is driven by the need to be right/have accurate perception of reality. Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks.

AO2 Up to 5 marks for discussion of the explanations and explanation of the results seen in different studies of conformity. Normative social influence can explain the results of conformity studies in unambiguous situations. The behaviour relates to compliance where the individual goes along with the group but privately holds a different opinion, few of Asch's participants believed their incorrect responses to be correct. The effects can be seen in everyday life: avoiding ridicule, the normative influence of body size. Informational influence can explain conformity in ambiguous situations in which both public and private agreement occurs. It also explains why people are more likely to conform as task difficulty increases. This is internalisation because the individual now accepts the group response and his/her own. Limitations of these explanations eg underestimating the need for belonging to a group. Discussion of alternative explanations of conformity eg dispositional factors and other explanations such as ingratiation. Evaluation of research into normative and informational social influence; issues of methodology, validity and ethics when made relevant to discussion of the two explanations. Maximum 2 marks for examples (1 mark for each explanation). Credit use of evidence

Likely studies:

Sherif (1935), Asch (1951), Anderson et al (1992), Baron, Vandello and Brunzman (1996)

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Maximum 6 marks – only reference to one explanation

Marks bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of normative and informational social influence. The discussion/analysis 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 normative and informational social influence though some detail may be lacking. Discussion/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. 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 normative and/or informational social influence and/or basic/limited discussion/analysis. 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/ discussion/analysis of normative and/or informational social influence, 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 05

[AO1 = 2]

Up to two marks for describing what is meant by a stereotype or the process involved in stereotyping. This can be by use of an example.

It is a belief that all members of a particular group (1) share certain traits or characteristics (1)

or

the belief that people who possess a common trait (eg red hair) (1) also share other characteristics (1).

Question 06

[AO2 = 4]

1 mark each for knowledge of the primacy effect and central traits.

1 mark each for application to the stem.

Likely explanations:

Primacy effect: In Aisha's case the **first** information about her was that she was on time/smarty dressed (1) and this had a good/positive impact on the impression formed of her (1) that she was therefore suitable for the job.

Central traits: In Aisha's case the characteristics of warmth and friendliness (and possibly punctuality, smartness) had a larger impact on the impression formed of her as a suitable employee (1) than getting some answers wrong, (possibly these traits acted as peripheral traits) (1) and she was therefore seen to be suitable for the job.

Question 07

[AO1 = 4]

Likely studies include:

Storms (1973) Nisbett et al (1972) Herzog (1966.)

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.

1 global mark for a description that is very muddled but recognisably about actor/observer effect.

Question 08

[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 Maximum of 3 marks for any one explanation

Likely explanations include Social Identity Theory which emphasises the role of cognitive and motivational factors in the development and maintenance of prejudice, the world is divided into us/them, social categorisation and the enhancement of ingroup over outgroup;

Competition for Resources or Relative Deprivation Hypothesis/Realistic Conflict Theory in which resources such as housing/land/employment are scarce and groups develop negative attitudes and prejudice towards each other;

The Authoritarian Personality in which those of a particular personality type exhibit prejudice and discrimination towards groups who are different, roots in Freudian theory characterised by blind obedience to authority, stereotyping others quickly, submissive to superiors etc, measured by F scale.

Other relevant answers, such as acquisition of attitudes/stereotypes through social learning and conformity, scape-goating and frustration – aggression hypothesis should also be credited.

Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks.

AO2 5 marks for discussion of the explanations which might include:

Specifically applying an explanation to a scenario and illustrating answer with an example such as how members are identified as an in-group or as competitors.

Evaluation: relevant positive and negative points of each explanation: Social identity theory may not apply to all cultural groups and people belong to many groups so the research has simplified human behaviour, however, much evidence supports the behaviours demonstrated both in research and real world relationships; there is evidence that competition for resources does tend to demonstrate self-interest overrides the needs of others but it has been demonstrated that prejudice arises without competition, merely through categorisation; criticism of the Authoritarian personality explanation as unlikely to explain prejudices shared by most members of a group, lack of education or response bias to the Fscale may be more convincing explanations.

Credit use of evidence.

Likely studies:

Sherif (1961), Tajfel (1971), Adorno et al (1950)

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Maximum 6 marks – only one explanation

Marks bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of two explanations of prejudice. The discussion/analysis 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 of prejudice though some detail may be lacking. Discussion/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. 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 one or two explanations of prejudice and/or basic/limited discussion/analysis. 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/ discussion/analysis of one or two explanations of prejudice, 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 Stem

In a study of coding in short-term memory, participants were given lists of words to learn. An independent groups design was used. There were two conditions:

Condition A

The list contained words that sounded similar to each other (man, mad, cap, can, map.....)

Condition B

The list contained words that sounded different from each other, (pen, day, few, sup, cow.....)

After 20 seconds, the participants were required to recall the words in the same order as on the list. The mean number of words recalled in the correct order in each condition was compared.

Question 09

[AO3 = 2]

Independent variable: whether the word list contained words of similar sounds or different sounds. Answer must imply two lists or two types of word.

Dependent variable: the number of words recalled (in the correct order).

Question 10

[AO3 = 1]

An experimental design in which participants complete only one condition of the study/different people in each condition/groups are randomly allocated/2 groups that have not been matched.

Accept other valid answers.

Question 11

[AO3= 2]

One mark for identifying an advantage of independent groups and one mark for explaining why it is an advantage. Can also credit advantages of independent groups that do not apply to this study eg can use the same materials.

Likely answers will focus on lack of order effects or naivety:

Possible answer:

There are no order effects so participants' performances in one condition are not affected/practiced/fatigued by performance in the other condition.

Question 12

[AO3 = 1, AO2 = 2]

AO3 1 mark for stating the likely outcome.

Likely answer:

More words will be recalled from the list containing words of different sounds, Condition B word list. OR, fewer words would have been recalled from the list containing words of similar sounds (Condition A list).

AO2 Up to 2 marks for explanation of these likely results based on knowledge of the short-term memory store including any of the following points.

In short-term tasks there is confusion with sound based material (1) this suggests that STM involves acoustic coding (1).

Credit reference to components of working memory.

Question 13

[AO2 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for an explanation of one limitation. One mark for stating the limitation, one further mark for expansion.

Possible limitations include the emphasis on rehearsal as a mechanism for transferring information from STM to LTM when it is clear that long term memories can be stored without the use of rehearsal, the process of rehearsal either rote or elaboration is not made clear, the storage systems are not fully described and explained – both STM and LTM seem to be oversimplified.

Credit limitations based on comparisons with other models.

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 5 marks. Maximum of 3 marks for any one explanation

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.

AO2 Up to 5 marks for analysis and evaluation of the two explanations. Likely points: discussion of accessibility/availability factors, evaluation of studies of forgetting where relevant to the explanation. Comparison of explanations. Analysis of distinction between availability and accessibility. Use of alternative explanations. Reasons why memory is affected according to the explanation(s) chosen. Credit use of examples up to 2 marks, one mark for each different example.

Credit use of evidence.

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).

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Maximum 6 marks – only one explanation

Marks bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of two explanations of forgetting. The evaluation/analysis 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 of forgetting though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. 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 one or two explanations of forgetting and/or basic/limited evaluation/analysis. 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/analysis of one or two explanations of forgetting, 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 Stem

In a study of perception, participants were asked to look at **Figure 1**. In this figure, **Line A** and **Line B** are the same length.

An independent groups design was used. There were two conditions:

Condition A

Participants were asked to estimate the length of **Line A**, in millimetres

Condition B

Participants were asked to estimate the length of **Line B**, in millimetres.

The mean estimates of length for **Line A** and **Line B** were compared.

Question 15

[AO3 = 2]

Independent variable: whether they had to estimate the length of Line A or Line B
Or whether the line is at the top of the figure or at the bottom of the figure
Or the position of the lines in relation to the converging lines. Answer must imply that there were two lines.

Dependent variable: the **estimate** of the length of the line (in millimetres).

Question 16

[AO3 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for an explanation

Likely points:

Making Lines A and B the same length enables the researcher to be sure that the position of the line has affected the estimates of its length (1) not any other factor/variable (1). Lines of different length would produce estimates of different length (1)

Credit knowledge of control such as: to avoid an extraneous/possibly confounding variable (1) this is an aspect of control (1).

Question 17

[AO3=1, AO2 = 2]

AO3 1 mark for stating the likely outcome.

Likely answer:

Estimates of line length in mm will be longer for Line A than for Line B. Or, Estimates of line length in mm will be shorter for Line B than for Line A.

AO2 Up to 2 marks for discussion or elaboration of these likely results based on knowledge of constancy scaling including any of the following points.

Depth cues affect perception of how far away Lines A and B are (1) OR Line A is perceived to be further away than Line B because of depth cues (linear perspective/ height in plane) (1). Constancy scaling is misapplied (1), the top line is scaled up mentally to compensate for its apparent distance from the viewer (1).

Question 18
[AO2 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for an explanation of what studying these types of figures tells us. The following points could be made:

Studying ambiguous figures tells us:

- that perception is influenced by past experience (1) and we form hypotheses about what we are seeing when we look at objects. (1)
- we have a predisposition/tendency (1) to perceive images presented in 2 dimensions as 3 dimensional objects (1).
- the Gestalt theorists were correct to suggest (1) that we look for figure-ground distinctions in the visual world (1)
- visual perception is an active process (1) in which we try to extract meaning from the retinal images we have (1)

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 a description of Gibson's theory of visual perception. Likely points include: direct perception/bottom-up/data driven not concept driven process; ecological process, cues from the environment are important, there is no need for past experience; the importance of texture gradient; affordances; the optic flow and movement.
Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks

AO2 Up to 5 marks for evaluation which will probably focus on strengths and weaknesses of the theory. Ecological relevance including the shift from laboratory based research to real tests such as optic flow patterns in long-jumping/flying or explaining face recognition over time with reference to invariants. Demonstrating the innateness of some perceptual abilities – depth perception. The difficulty the theory has dealing with the effects of illusions/mistaken perceptions and with the idea that affordances must change over time due to past experiences. The theory fails to distinguish between sensation and perception. Comparison with alternative explanations – Gregory, Neisser compromise.
Credit use of evidence up to 2 marks

Likely studies:

Lee and Lishman (1975) Bower (1971) Lieberman (1963) Deregowski (1972), Bruner and Postman (1949), McGinnies (1949), Bruner and Minturn (1951).

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Marks bands

9 – 10 marks **Very good answers**

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of Gibson's theory of visual perception. The evaluation/analysis 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 Gibson's theory of visual perception though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. 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 Gibson's theory and/or basic/limited evaluation/analysis. 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/analysis of Gibson's theory, 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 = 1]

One mark for an accurate description of obsessions – intrusive/persistent thoughts (1)

Question 21

[AO1 = 1]

One mark for an accurate description of compulsions – ritual/repetitive behaviours/acts (1)

Question 22

[AO1 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for description of feature(s) of the psychodynamic explanation. Answers may provide extended description of one feature for full credit.

Maximum of two marks if there is no reference to OCD in the response.

Likely points include:

A result of unconscious conflict between the components of personality; the conflict arises in the anal and phallic stages of psychosexual development in early childhood; the id becomes aggressive and dominant and this may lead to intrusive thoughts/obsessions; defence mechanisms such as reaction formation may be used to reduce or eliminate obsessions by carrying out ritualistic behaviours – compulsive acts. Anal fixation resulting in excessive orderliness.

Question 23

[AO2 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for a discussion of a limitation of the psychodynamic explanation of OCD.

Likely points:

The link between childhood trauma and adult OCD is not well supported. Often relying on a few case studies so the evidence is not generalisable.

The reliance on unconscious processes is not testable.

The link between childhood experiences and later anxiety responses could be due to feelings of separation anxiety rather than conflict in psychosexual stages (Erikson).

Attempts to treat the disorder using psychodynamic techniques have largely been unsuccessful.

Possible answer:

There is limited research to support the psychodynamic theory of OCD that childhood trauma accounts for the disorder (1) and the evidence that exists generally relies on a small sample of case studies (1). These case studies are not generalisable to the wider population (1).

Question 24
[AO1 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for a description of features of a phobia.

Likely points:

An **extreme** fear of an object/situation/activity (1)

An **irrational** fear or fear that is **disproportionate** to the actual danger (1)

A fear that leads to **avoidance** (1)

A fear that is **disruptive/maladaptive** to everyday life

Maximum of 1 mark if no reference to 'fear'.

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 Maximum of 3 marks for any one treatment for phobias

Likely treatments:

Systematic desensitisation based on idea that two competing emotions cannot co-exist, getting people to learn to relax, a stepped approach to exposure to the feared object/situation – anxiety hierarchy, example of procedure leading to facing fear. (VRET)

Flooding/ exposure therapy in which the person's senses are overwhelmed with exposure to the feared object/situation, there is no opportunity for avoidance/escape, when anxiety response subsides person recognises the response as an irrational one – no harm occurred, distinction between implosion (imagined) and in vivo (real exposure.)

Cognitive therapy is a treatment where the therapist aims to get the client to replace the irrational thinking with more realistic thinking, challenging distorted thinking – cognitive restructuring/or cognitive rehearsal – client mentally practises appropriate behaviours in the feared situation. (CBT)

Drug therapy generally involves attempting to change the level of implicated neurotransmitters in the brain, these are usually anti-depressants, they do not attempt to change the behaviours exhibited by phobics, but to reduce the anxiety experienced.

Psychodynamic treatment aims to provide client with insight into the unconscious cause of the symptoms, techniques include free association to encourage verbalisation so that the ego eventually cannot censor the content and dream analysis in which manifest content is interpreted to uncover latent content.
Credit description of evidence up to 1 mark

AO2 up to 5 marks for evaluation of these treatments: discussion of the strengths and limitations of the chosen therapies, especially in relation to type of phobia and type of client; duration of success outside clinical situation; comparison with alternative treatments; discussion of time required and ethical implications. Any evaluation based on cost must be well reasoned.

Credit use of evidence.

Likely studies:

Graziano and Mooney (1980), Marks (1987), Lang and Lazovik (1963)

Maximum 6 marks – only one treatment

Mark Bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of at least two treatments used for phobias. The evaluation/analysis is clear, coherent and detailed. 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 treatments used for phobias though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation/analysis 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 one or more treatment(s) used for phobias and/or basic/limited evaluation/analysis. 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, analysis of treatment(s) used for phobias, 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 a description of behaviours that indicate lack of joint attention. This might be by example.

Likely points:

The child will not co-ordinate his/her gaze towards an object another person shows interest in (1) or does not check the reaction of the person he/she is with (1) does not gaze or point at a shared item of interest (1) or does not show an object to another (1).

Credit pointing (1) sharing (1) showing (1). Do not credit gazing unless reference to another person gazing at the same thing.

Question 27

[AO1 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for a description of the term central coherence deficit.

Likely points:

The idea that a child with autism is not able to process information looking for its wider/general meaning (1) instead the child has a tendency to focus on tiny details or single elements (1), the child fails to think about different ways of viewing a stimulus (1) or to take into account the context of the stimulus (1).

Credit an example, 1 mark.

Question 28

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 3]

Up to 2 marks for description of features of the genetics explanation.

Likely points:

The genetics explanation focuses on the idea that a predisposition to develop autism (1) is inherited (1); research has shown that if one member of a family has the disorder, there is an increased likelihood that other members will also have the disorder (1).

Up to 3 marks for a discussion of the genetics explanation described. Answers may develop one evaluative point or include more than one point.

Likely points: reference to use of concordance rates, chromosomes and prevalence in boys, limited samples of autistic twin pairs, links with other syndromes such as Fragile X which support the theory. Twins usually share environments so high concordance rates can be interpreted as support for the nurture/environment argument, credit reference to reductionist, deterministic, implications for treatment, wider implications eg antenatal screening/genetic counselling. Removes parental blame.

Possible answer:

As the concordance rate for MZ twins with autism is very high (90%) this supports the genetic explanation (1) especially when compared with the rate for DZ which is much lower (23%) (1). However, the DZ rate is much higher than for other siblings which also suggests that the shared environments of the twins might play a part in the disorder (1)

Question 29

[AO1 = 5, AO1 = 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 or more 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.

AO2 Up to 5 marks for analysis and evaluation of the 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. Any evaluation based on cost needs to be well reasoned.
Credit use of evidence.

Likely studies: Wolf et al (1964), Lovaas (1977), and (1987), Cohen et al (2006), Sallows and Graupner (2005), Koegel et al (1982/86), McCracken et al (2002).

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 at least two therapeutic programmes for autism. The evaluation/analysis 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 therapeutic programmes for autism though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. 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 one or more therapeutic programme(s) for autism and/or basic/limited evaluation/analysis. 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/analysis of therapeutic programme(s) for autism, 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.

Assessment Grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3
1	2		
2		4	
3	4		
4	5	5	
Total	11	9	
5	2		
6		4	
7	4		
8	5	5	
Total	11	9	
9			2
10			1
11			2
12		2	1
13		2	
14	5	5	
Total	5	9	6
15			2
16			3
17		2	1
18		2	
19	5	5	
Total	5	9	6
20	1		
21	1		
22	3		
23		3	
24	2		
25	5	5	
Total	12	8	
26	2		
27	3		
28	2	3	
29	5	5	
Total	12	8	