



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

Psychology B

PSYB3

(Specification 2185)

Unit 3: Child Development and Applied Options

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 Child Development

Topic Social Development

Question 01

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 1]

AO1 One mark for psychological knowledge of sex differences in friendship eg girls prefer intensive friendships (sharing intimacies etc) and boys prefer extensive friendships (sharing activities etc)

AO2 One mark for outcome: More girls will play in pairs and more boys will play in large groups.

Question 02

[AO3 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for discussion/evaluation. Allow up to two marks for general points re valid strengths and/or limitations of the observational method. For final mark there must be clear application to the study of children's friendships eg reference to the need for studying friendship in context of children's normal social behaviour. Credit also comparison with other methods used to study children's friendships eg interviews, writing essays etc. Credit also ethical issues.

All three marks may be gained through evaluation applied to observation of children's friendships.

Question 03

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 1]

AO1 One mark for knowledge of a valid consequence eg depression and other psychiatric problems, alcoholism, deviant behaviour etc.
One mark for knowledge of underpinning evidence eg Kuperschmidt & Coie 1990 longitudinal study of antisocial behaviour outcomes, Duck 1991 study of mental and behavioural disorders, Cowen et al 1973 longitudinal study of psychiatric problems.

AO2 One mark for discussion eg brief explanatory comment re how or why early rejection might lead to negative life outcomes. Candidates may focus on issues relating to correlation rather than cause and effect eg the complicating variable of aggression or Parker and Asher's two models.

Question 04

[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 Bowlby's work on attachment and maternal deprivation. Likely content: focus on survival; innate desire for proximity seeking; monotropy; irreversibility; critical period; consequences of maternal deprivation eg delinquency; affectionless psychopathy; low IQ etc. Function of attachment eg internal working model. Credit also knowledge of Bowlby's research eg 44 thieves. Up to 1 mark for description of relevant evidence.

AO2 Up to 8 marks for discussion and evaluation, including contrasts with the work of at least one other researcher (most likely Rutter, Schaffer and Tizard). Likely content: confusion between privation and deprivation; extrapolation from and comparison with animal studies (Harlow); overemphasis on mother and contradictory evidence eg Schaffer's multiple attachments; links with delinquency and Rutter's Isle of Wight study; critical period and reversibility - Rutter's Romanian orphan research and Hodges and Tizard's work on delayed adoption; alternative findings re consequences of short-term separation eg Quinton and Rutter. Positive comments might include: focus on importance of childhood experiences; wider implications eg changes in child hospitalisation; any supporting evidence. Credit use of relevant evidence.

Maximum 8 marks if no reference to other researcher

Mark Bands

10 -12 marks **Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of the work of Bowlby. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to other researcher(s) 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 work of Bowlby. Some discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. At the top of the band references to other researcher(s) are apparent but are 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 **Average to weak answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of Bowlby's work. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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 clearly 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 on relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracies 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 05

[AO1 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for a description of the procedure in any relevant Baillargeon impossible event experiment. Most candidates will refer to the short/long carrot study, the cube and the screen study or the truck and the cube study.

Marks should be awarded for any relevant aspects of procedure eg basic task outline; apparatus description; reference to the familiarisation/habituation stage; reference to the impossible event or how expectations are violated; control versus experimental conditions. Not all of these aspects need be described in detail. Candidates may choose to focus on a limited number in more detail.

Question 06

[AO3 = 3]

One mark for briefly identifying a problem, plus up to two marks discussion/application. Given the previous question, candidates are likely to focus on the problem of **determining a suitable DV/validity** of the dependent measure since young infants cannot talk and therefore cannot express understanding directly and the **need to infer** from the DV. Eg using duration of looking time/attention, sucking rate to infer interest and therefore surprise and therefore object concept. Credit other valid methodological problems.

Points may be embedded in an example.

Maximum 2 marks for a general issues that could apply in studies of very young infants without explicit application.

Question 07

[AO2 = 2]

Up to two marks for application of the concept of ZPD to the example of Victoria.

One mark for a general idea of the ZPD: the **gap/difference** between what a child can achieve alone and what a child can achieve with assistance/their potential. Second mark for analysis: Victoria's level of actual ability is sufficient for her to complete a 15-piece puzzle, but her potential ability is greater, and eventually she will be able to complete the 30-piece puzzle alone.

Question 08

[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 differences in thinking between a child in the pre-operational stage and a child in the concrete operational stage. Most likely differences will be as follows:

- pre-op cannot conserve – concrete op can conserve
- pre-op is egocentric – concrete op is not egocentric
- pre-op cannot perform class inclusion tasks – concrete op can
- pre-op cannot sort by more than one feature – concrete op can

Also accept more general differences eg increased symbolic thought, serial ordering and other valid differences eg animistic thinking at pre-op stage.
Credit description of relevant evidence up to 2 marks.

AO2 Up to 8 marks for discussion/analysis of relevant concepts and evidence. Credit specific criticisms of relevant studies eg alternative interpretations; demand characteristics in the 2-question conservation study and the unfamiliar context of the 3-mountain study. Credit discussion of alternative findings and evidence against eg McGarrigle and Donaldson's class inclusion study, Hughes's and Borke's alternative egocentrism research etc. Note that discussion points should focus on issues related to proposed differences between pre-operational and concrete operational thought.
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 differences between preoperational and concrete operational thinking and evidence in this area. 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 focused, 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 differences between preoperational and concrete operational thinking. Some discussion is evident at the top of the band (8-9) and the answer is mostly focused on the issue of differences and associated evidence, 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 **Average to weak answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of differences between preoperational and concrete operational thinking. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information but without proper focus on the question (eg no explicit focus on differences, lack of reference to evidence) 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 Stem

A psychologist is carrying out a study of moral reasoning based on one of Piaget's investigations. Participants hear a story about two boys. The participants in one group are aged 4 years and the participants in the other group are aged 9 years.

This is the story the participants hear:

*"Kyle tips over a small cup of juice because he is cross with his mother.
Tom knocks over a whole bottle of juice when he slips and falls in the kitchen."*

Question 09

[AO1 = 1]

'Who is the naughtier?' 'Who should be punished?' or similar. Answers based on ratings scales are also acceptable eg on a scale of 1-5 how naughty do you think...?

Question 10

[AO2 = 2]

One mark for likely outcome: 4-year-olds will say that Tom is naughtier (and 9-year-olds will say that Kyle is naughtier) or vice versa.

One mark for further analysis via reference to Piaget's theory: Because 4-year-olds reason by consequence (are moral realists) and 9-year-olds reason by intent (are moral relativists).

Question 11

[AO3 = 1]

Age of participants

Question 12

[AO3 = 2]

One mark for appropriate suggestion. Data would be frequency form so the following methods would be suitable: Table of frequencies; Bargraph; Percentages in pie chart

One mark for any sensible justification eg Data is in frequency form; individuals do not get a score and therefore cannot calculate averages; the scores are discontinuous; study is about differences between the two groups; study is looking for an association between age of participant and type of moral decision. Although not expected or required, some candidates may be aware that this is categorical/nominal data and should be credited for this.

Question 13

[AO1 = 2]

Award one mark for each outline – note the stage does not have to be named but there does have to be some outline:

Punishment/heteronomous stage - where judgement about wrongdoing is based on whether or not the person is/would be punished.

Reward/Instrumental Gain/Individualism stage – where any actions that benefit the person's own needs are deemed to be morally acceptable.

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 a psychodynamic explanation of moral development: role of the superego as moderator of the id; notion of internal parent or conscience; ego-ideal as the upholder of moral standards; advent of morality around the age of 4/5 years; as consequence of **identification with same-sex parent** in Phallic stage; **internalisation of parent's moral code**; Oedipus and Electra complex. Credit references to forms of inadequate superego (weak, deviant, over-harsh). Credit descriptions of relevant evidence – 1 mark
Candidates must make reference to emboldened points for full 4 marks

AO2 Up to 8 marks for discussion and evaluation. Possible points: lack of evidence for concepts associated with moral development; lack of evidence that males are morally superior as theory would predict; evidence to the contrary eg evidence that pre-Phallic stage children show moral understanding (eg Nelson 1980); neglect of environmental influences such as modelling and conditioning; existence of moral reasoning in children brought up without a same-sex parent; discounting of other explanations eg cognitive theories. 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 psychodynamic explanation/s of moral development. 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 psychodynamic explanation/s of moral development. 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 **Average to weak answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of psychodynamic explanation/s of moral development. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information but without proper focus on the question (eg overemphasis on psychodynamic theory in general) 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 Stem

Psychologists conducted a study of face recognition.

In **stage one** of the study, participants were asked to look carefully at 20 photographs of faces of people they had never seen before.

Ten of these photographs were then digitally adjusted on a computer so that the eyes were further apart than on the original. The remaining ten photographs were not adjusted. These 20 photographs (10 digitally adjusted and 10 unadjusted) were mixed together with another 40 distracter photographs of different faces, giving a total of 60 photographs of faces in all.

In **stage two** of the study, the participants were shown all 60 photographs of faces and asked to pick out the 20 faces they saw in stage one of the experiment.

Question 15

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

AO1 Up to 2 marks for knowledge of explanations for face recognition (holistic role-role of configuration, feature – importance of features).

Possible answer: According to holistic theory of face recognition we rely not just on the features; but also on the configuration of the whole face; even though the features remain the same if the appearance of the whole is changed then recognition will be more difficult.

AO2 Up to 2 marks for application to the stem. One mark for stating likely outcome plus one mark for explaining why.

Possible content: Participants are likely to be able to identify the unadjusted faces better (or more quickly) than the adjusted faces (1) because the digital adjustment has altered the layout/configuration/appearance of the whole (1).

An answer based on just one explanation can gain full marks.

Question 16

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

AO1 One mark for each valid factor. Likely factors: leading questions; post event contamination; emotion/stress; different context; stereotypes/expectation; weapon focus; race; age.

AO2 One mark each for brief explanation of why/how the factor operates to make memory less reliable. Candidates should do more than simply state that the factor increases unreliability. Examples: leading questions set up an expectation, perhaps by use of the definite article 'the' rather than 'a'; stressful events create emotional arousal which lead to an increase in error; young children's memories are especially vulnerable to peer contamination; expectation occurs because we rely on top-down information ie existing stereotypes rather than actual observed events.

For each factor the AO2 mark may be gained through reference to a research example which illustrates the issue.

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 concepts, theory and evidence relating to the recovered memory controversy. Possible content: concept of motivated forgetting as an unconscious Freudian defence mechanism; defence mechanisms ie repression as a means of protecting the psyche from unpleasant events; analysis as a means of accessing repressed memories; techniques of analysis; specific cases of supposed recovered memory eg Jane Doe, Eileen Franklin; context in which such cases arise ie childhood abuse; knowledge of characteristics that typify cases of recovered memory (Gudjonsson 1997) Credit descriptions of relevant evidence up to 2 marks.

AO2 Up to 8 marks for discussion of the controversy, underlying concepts, theory and evidence. Likely issues: reliability of evidence; demand characteristics; counterarguments eg alternative explanations – reconstruction theory and the work of Loftus; why these memories might arise; role of the therapist; contradictory evidence eg Loftus & Ketcham 1994, Loftus, Feldman & Dashiell 1995; flashbulb memory findings; dissociation amnesia theory (Brown 1998); implications of the controversy and outcomes; the Brandon report (1998) and work of the British False Memory Society. 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 controversy surrounding the recovery of repressed memories and evidence in this area. 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 the controversy surrounding the recovery of repressed memories. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the controversy and associated evidence, 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 **Average to weak answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of the controversy surrounding the recovery of repressed memories. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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 = 4]

Up to two marks for each explanation outlined. In each case award one mark for a brief outline (not just naming) and two marks for an expanded or more detailed outline.

Likely answers:

Labelling (eg Szasz (1979) label is assigned as a way of explaining behaviour that is undesirable or difficult to understand – in fact there is no illness it is just a 'problem in living')

Labelling (eg Scheff (1966) /Rosenhan's (1973) view that once the label is assigned all person's behaviour comes to be construed as abnormal, person then lives up to expectations and starts to behave less normally – self-fulfilling prophecy)

Family dysfunction theories including expressed emotion (Brown 1958), double-bind (Bateson 1966), schismatic and skewed families (Lidz 1957).

Accept other valid answers.

Question 19

[AO2 = 4]

Up to two marks for each limitation briefly discussed. In each case award one mark for a brief explanation and two marks for an expanded or elaborated discussion point.

Likely answers: lack of consistent monitoring by medical professionals leading to lapses in medication and thence to relapse; inadequate funding – community care as a poor substitute for high quality professional care in hospitals; over-reliance on family and charity organisations who are not always equipped to care for patients with severe psychiatric disorders; normal but not normal – ostensibly a more normal environment but a small group living together is still an enclave; social isolation still possible – patients in community care may be ostracised by the local community because of fear/lack of understanding. Accept other valid answers.

Question 20

[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 biological and cognitive treatments for unipolar depression (and associated evidence), usually two marks for each treatment. Likely content:

Biological: drug therapies eg MAOIs, tricyclics, SSRIs (**not** lithium) – mode of action should be given eg SSRIs prevent reuptake leaving serotonin active at the synapse for longer. Can credit diagrams to illustrate mode of action and examples of named drugs. ECT – unilateral, bilateral, 65-140volts, course of 6/7 sessions, muscle relaxants, seizure/convulsion.

Cognitive: expect description of specific elements of CBT, RET or SIT or a generic approach involving features common to all cognitive therapies. Likely content may include: aim to change negative cognitive set; recognition of automatic negative thoughts (thought catching); identification of illogical/irrational beliefs; reinforcement of positive thinking; hypothesis generation; patient as scientist – data gathering to refute negative thoughts; rational confrontation; positive self-talk; engagement in positive activities; homework; diary keeping etc.

Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.

AO2 Up to 8 marks for strengths and limitations of the two treatments. Do not expect a perfect balance of positive and negatives.

Biological Drugs/ECT: Positives include – suitability for severe cases; evidence of effectiveness; requires little effort from the patient; quick acting. Negatives include – side effects; dependency (drugs); memory loss and possible LT damage (ECT); treating symptoms but not initial cause?

Cognitive: Positives include – patient takes active role; general life enhancement leading to more permanent all round benefit; evidence for effectiveness. Negatives include: takes time; requires patient to be motivated and committed.

Studies of effectiveness include: Elkin 1995, Hollon 2006

Credit comparison between the two treatments and use of relevant evidence.

Maximum 7 marks if only one type of treatment presented

Mark Bands

10 -12 marks **Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of both biological and cognitive treatments for unipolar depression and their strengths and limitations. 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 biological and cognitive treatments for unipolar depression and some awareness of their strengths/limitations. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. A very good answer dealing with only one treatment may be awarded 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 **Average to weak answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of biological and/or cognitive treatments for unipolar depression and some understanding of relevant strengths/limitations at the top of the band. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable, relevant information 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 reasonable 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 21

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 1]

- AO1** One mark for knowledge of rationalisation: finding a sensible, logical explanation/justification, turning a negative event into something positive
- AO2** One mark for explicit application to scenario eg a person might rationalise the end of the relationship by saying 'We were not good for each other. We were both too young when we met.'

Question 22

[AO2 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for evaluation of defence mechanisms in relation to coping with stress. One mark for a brief valid point, with a further two/three marks for expansion or further comment. Possible content: defence mechanisms such as rationalisation make the experience more positive and help in the short-term; have an ego enhancing function; they may not always be helpful in the long-term; they are essentially avoidance strategies, ways of deflecting attention away from the source of stress; intuitively plausible but little evidence they exist as they are unconscious strategies.

For full marks must be contextualised ie about coping with stress.

Question 23

[AO1 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for description of some of the physiological responses to stress. Credit reference to any of the following: GAS – three stages; role of the ANS - connects the NS to the smooth-muscle organs eg heart; ANS controls involuntary mechanisms eg heart rate; ANS prepares the body for fight or flight; role of the sympathetic and parasympathetic sections; endocrine system via pituitary gland causes hypothalamus to trigger the release of corticosteroids; corticosteroids help the body to fight inflammation and provide energy; endocrine system also governs release of cortisol to counteract effects of corticosteroids.

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 knowledge of individual differences/personal variables in coping with stress. Likely content: behaviour types and CHD (Friedman & Rosenman 1974); A – competitive, time urgent, achievement oriented, anger/hostility; B – relaxed, not competitive, less driven and C – passive, suppressive, compliant; links between the three types and stress-related illness; hardiness (Kobasa 1979) – control, challenge, commitment; locus of control (Rotter 1966) – internal/external and links to stress. Relevant studies: Frankenhauser (1975) study of stress in work-place; Kobasa (1982) link between hardiness and illness in workplace managers, Credit other relevant individual differences/personal variables. Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark

AO2 Up to 8 marks for discussion and application to stem. Possible content: criticisms of specific studies or variables eg evaluation of the Friedman and Rosenman study; poor correlation of elements of hardiness proposed by Kobasa; emphasis on hostility element of Type A rather than the other characteristics; hardiness as a ‘male’ concept that does not apply in the same way to females; general issues eg problems of measuring individual differences/personal variables and over-reliance on self-report measures; interaction between locus of control and stress ie very high locus of control is not positive; relative importance of personal variables in relation to other key factors eg physiological reactivity and social support; personal variables vs biological reductionism. 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 applied to the stem. There is sound knowledge and understanding of personal variables that mediate a person's response to stress. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. There is a clear and direct attempt to address the views expressed in the statement. 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 personal variables that mediate a person's response to stress. 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 **Average to weak answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of personal variables that mediate a person's response to stress. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band are likely to be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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

[AO1 = 2]

Up to two marks for briefly describing one of the named techniques. Possible content: identifying risk groups – description of types of risk factors/studies/examples; fear arousal appeals – description of key elements of the message that create shock/fear or examples; social inoculation – description of the four elements identified by Flay (1985) – knowledge/discussion/skill development/public commitment or an example.

Question 26

[AO2 = 4]

Up to 4 marks for brief discussion of two problems involved in using the technique given in 25. One mark for each relevant problem, plus one mark each for analysis/discussion. Likely answers:

Identification of risk groups – focus on risk groups requires coordinated effort of services, often lacking; problems of social stereotyping and cultural awareness/sensitivity; real issue is social circumstances which can often not be altered.

Fear arousal – inverted U effect – the switch off factor; often not targeted sufficiently; competing media messages eg advertising

Social inoculation – trainer variables – who should do the inoculating?; research limited to teenagers; evidence is for short term effectiveness; attractiveness of peer group; evidence is correlational only.

Question 27

[AO1 = 2]

Up to two marks for a brief outline of method/procedure and/or findings/conclusion. Likely studies: Drummond (2002) A & E identification of alcohol abusers; Cuijpers (2002) social inoculation and drug use in Dutch schools; Janis & Feshbach (1953), Janis and Terwilliger (1962), Insko (1965) fear arousal. Award one mark for each relevant point.

Question 28

[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 personality-based explanation(s) for substance abuse. Candidates may focus on one personality factor in more depth or several in less detail. Likely content: linked traits eg anti-social personality disorder and psychopathic traits (Morgenstern 1997); extraversion (Flory 2002); high dependency (Shedler & Block 1990), low conscientiousness (McAdams 2000) high anxiety, novelty seeking, type A (Davison & Neale 2001).
Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark

AO2 Up to 8 marks for discussion/ analysis/evaluation and use of evidence. Likely content: research is correlational only; no cause and effect can be determined; personality may be inherited therefore really a biological explanation; inability to disentangle personality and social/environmental factors; research limited to alcohol abuse neglecting other substances; analysis of how the personality factors might predispose a person to abusing behaviour eg psychodynamic explanation of how dependency is rooted in childhood or extraversion leading to sensation-seeking behaviour; downward drift theory - APD leading to social exclusion, leading to risk of abuse; difficulty of assessing personality characteristics; stability/change in personality.
Credit alternative explanations used to evaluate personality theory.
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 possible links between personality and abusing behaviour. 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 possible links between personality and abusing behaviour. 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 **Average to weak answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of possible links between personality and abusing behaviour. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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 29

[AO1 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for knowledge of atavistic form. Likely content: criminal is a primitive sub-species – an evolutionary genetic throwback; with particular physical characteristics eg sloping brow, extra nipples etc; which makes him/her unsuited to demands of civilised society; reference to Lombroso's evidence. Award one mark for each relevant point.

Question 30

[AO1 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for knowledge of somatotype theory. Likely content: offending behaviour is linked to body type; the criminal body type is the mesomorph; mesomorphic characteristics include strong build, well-developed musculature etc; personality traits associated with mesomorphy eg aggression; reference to Sheldon's evidence. Award one mark for each relevant point.

Question 31

[AO2 = 4]

Up to 4 marks for analysis of how Lombroso's/Sheldon's theories might have influenced modern-day thinking about offending. Candidates may make a number of brief analytical points or explore fewer points in more detail. Possible content: led to a more scientific approach rather than a moralistic approach; influenced the idea of the criminal stereotype; atavism theory may have contributed to the idea of certain races as inferior leading to prejudice and discrimination; the self-fulfilling prophecy – we expect those with a certain look to behave badly so they do; Lombroso erroneously linked criminality with other conditions eg epilepsy; biological determinism; forerunner of later biological theories eg genetic, neurophysiological etc.

Question 32

[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 two ways, usually 2 marks for each way. In each case, award one mark for a brief outline, and 2 marks for an outline with further detail or briefly elaborated description. Likely answers:

Official statistics – crime that is reported/otherwise discovered and recorded either by the police/home office/customs officials etc. to become part of official figures.

Evidence/example: Home Office figures

Victim surveys – structured interview, extremely large sample survey asking people whether they have been a victim of crime in last year, plus extension questions.

Evidence/example: BCS

Offender surveys/self-reporting – focussing on likely groups eg young adults, previous offenders etc.

Evidence/example: OCJS survey of antisocial behaviour and drug use.

Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.

AO2 Up to 8 marks for evaluation and analysis. Possible content:

Official statistics – tends to under-represent figures gathered from other sources; hides dark figure; reasons for not reporting/not recording; distortions due to police recording rules or local/national priorities; massaging statistics.

Victim surveys – rely on accurate recall and retrospective self-reporting so issues of reliability; telescoping; generally considered more accurate than official statistics; comparison with official figures; reasons for unreliable reporting; can also be used to assess fear of/attitude to crime; ways of ensuring validity; does not include victimless crimes; sampling issues.

Offender surveys/self-reporting – reveal who is committing crime not just overall figure; suspect validity – reasons for under reporting/over reporting eg fear of retribution or bravado; longitudinal so can see patterns over time.

Credit comparison of different methods and general issues such as need for a combination of measures.

Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 8 marks if no evidence or published examples

Maximum 7 marks if only one way presented

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 crime with accurate reference to evidence or published examples. 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 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 crime with some reference to evidence or published examples at the top of the band. Evaluation is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. A very good answer dealing with only one way may be awarded 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 **Average to weak answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of way/s of measuring crime and/or example/evidence. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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 show 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**

PSYB3 Grid January 2011

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3
01	1	1	
02			3
03	2	1	
04	4	8	
05	3		
06			3
07		2	
08	4	8	
09	1		
10		2	
11			1
12			2
13	2		
14	4	8	
15	2	2	
16	2	2	
17	4	8	
18	4		
19		4	
20	4	8	
21	1	1	
22		3	
23	3		
24	4	8	
25	2		
26		4	
27	2		
28	4	8	
29	2		
30	2		
31		4	
32	4	8	