



**General Certificate of Education (A-level)
January 2012**

Psychology B

PSYB3

(Specification 2185)

Unit 3: Child Development and Applied Options

Final

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 © 2012 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

[AO3 = 2]

- AO3** Independent groups/unrelated – 1 mark.
Where different people/children/groups take part in each condition – 1 mark.
Where name repeated, other or no design can still gain outline mark.

Question 02

[AO3 = 1]

- AO3** DV – (number of) temper outbursts.

Question 03

[AO1 = 3]

- AO1** Award up to 3 marks for an outline of an appropriate study. The most likely studies are: Belsky (1988) more than 20 hours nursery care per week and attachment insecurity; Bowlby (1946) 44 thieves study; Quinton and Rutter (1976) hospital separations. Accept other valid studies.
Award marks as follows: credit detail of method and results and conclusion. If method/results is very detailed then 2 marks can be awarded for either aspect. Exclude studies where focus is clearly privation eg, Harlow, Koluchova, Genie, Romanian orphans, Goldfarb.

Question 04

[AO2 = 2]

- AO2** Award 1 mark for giving a very brief or general limitation. For second mark there must be some expansion ie why/how it limits the conclusions that can be drawn from the study. Points will depend on study used in answer to 03 eg Bowlby – possible researcher bias; retrospective data; inability to show cause and effect; poor validity. Credit in respect of 03 even if the answer to 03 is an inappropriate study.

Question 05

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

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

AO1 Up to 4 marks for description of Ainsworth's work (research and/or theory). Credit knowledge of: The Strange Situation as a method – stage sequence, controlled observation; Ainsworth's category system of three types (secure, anxious avoidant, anxious resistant/ambivalent); characteristics of each type; Ainsworth's conclusions that type of attachment is related to sensitive responsiveness. Any other relevant descriptive material.

AO2 Up to 8 marks for evaluation of Ainsworth's work and use of work of another researcher as part of the evaluation. Likely content: discussion of reliability; replication (De Woolf & van Ijzendoorn (1988); other cross-cultural research eg Takahaski (1990), Miyake (1985)); validity of dependent variables; need to consider other variables not just parental sensitivity eg temperament (Belsky 1984, Kagan 1984); Fraley & Spieker's (2003) alternative two dimensional system; Main & Solomon's 4th type (1990); alternative ways of measuring attachment eg AAI (1985); Attachment Q-sort (1995). Credit use of relevant evidence. Credit ethical issues only as part of reasoned argument.

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 Ainsworth's work. Evaluation is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to other researcher are accurate and linked to the evaluation of Ainsworth. 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 Ainsworth. Evaluation 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 there is relevant reference to another researcher but this may not be linked so clearly to the evaluation 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 the work of Ainsworth. 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 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

Total AO1 marks for topic = 7

Total AO2 marks for topic = 10

Total AO3 marks for topic = 3

Total marks for topic = 20

Topic: Cognitive Development

Question 06

[AO3 = 2]

- AO3** Independent groups/unrelated – 1 mark.
Where different people/children/groups take part in each condition – 1 mark.
Where name repeated, other or no design can still gain outline mark.

Question 07

[AO3 = 1]

- AO3** DV – whether the child gives a correct or an incorrect answer/type of answer/whether they say same or more.

Question 08

[AO1 = 2]

- AO1** Conservation (1). Also accept ability to decentre and reversibility.
Accept valid explanations, eg conservation - the ability to understand that properties of objects (number) stay the same, despite changes in appearance (spatial arrangement) (1).

Question 09

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 2]

- AO1** Award 1 mark identification (named or described) of another difference between pre-operational and concrete operational thinkers. Likely answers: class inclusion; egocentrism. Accept also animism, seriation and centration. Differences between formal operational thinking and pre/concrete operational thinking should be credited.
- AO2** Up to 2 marks for brief discussion. Possible content: criticisms of Piaget's assumptions in relation to the difference cited; evidence in the form of research findings to support Piaget's claim; counterevidence for Piaget's claims/alternative findings; methodological criticism of Piaget's work in relation to the concept under discussion.

Question 10

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

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

AO1 Up to 4 marks for knowledge of what can affect cognitive development (relevant psychological research and theory). Likely content: Vygotsky's work on the role of others - socio-cultural theory; internalisation; references to scaffolding; research eg Wood and Middleton (1975); guided participation (Rogoff (1995); ZPD; Bruner. Candidates should also be credited for knowledge of counter-perspectives eg nativism, Piaget's views on biological maturation (the lone scientist), Siegler and broader social learning theory concepts that could be relevant. Credit description of relevant evidence – 2 marks.

AO2 Up to 8 marks for discussion of the role of others in cognitive development. Likely content: discussion of contradictory views; supporting evidence; general evaluation of theories; cognitive development as due to an interaction between various factors. Credit use of relevant evidence. Credit evaluation of evidence where relevant to the question.

Mark Bands

10 -12 marks **Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of psychological theory/findings in relation to the role of others in cognitive 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 psychological theory/findings in relation to cognitive 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 psychological theory/findings in relation to cognitive 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 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**

Total AO1 marks for topic = 7

Total AO2 marks for topic = 10

Total AO3 marks for topic = 3

Total marks for topic = 20

Topic: Moral Development

Question 11

[AO3 = 2]

- AO3** Independent groups/unrelated – 1 mark.
Where different people/children/groups take part in each condition – 1 mark.
Where name repeated, other or no design can still gain outline mark.

Question 12

[AO3 = 1]

- AO3** 1 mark (AO3 = 1)
DV – whether participants cheated (or not) (accept the number who cheated in each condition)

Question 13

[AO1 = 3, AO2 = 2]

- AO1** Up to 3 marks for a description of one psychological theory which suggests that there are differences in moral understanding between males and females. Likely content: Kohlberg's stage theory which puts males at stage 4 (law and order) and females at stage 3 (good-boy, good-girl); Gilligan's theory of ethic of justice (males) versus ethic of care (females); psychodynamic explanations – Oedipus and Electra complexes, females as moral inferiors as a result of weaker identification. 1 mark for a very brief answer/named theory, 2 for a description of male/female differences within that theory, 3 for a fully elaborated description of differences or explanation eg why?
- AO2** Up to 2 marks for a brief discussion. Content will depend on which theory is described. Credit may be given for two separate brief points or for one point with some elaboration eg evidence in favour of Kohlberg; criticisms of psychodynamic explanation.

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), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.

AO1 Up to 4 marks for descriptions of two other ways of investigating moral development, usually 2 marks for each. Answers are most likely to be based on moral comparisons and moral dilemmas.

Moral comparison - where person listens to two short stories in which both consequence and intention are manipulated then has to decide who is the naughtier and why.

Moral dilemma - where person is interviewed about a hypothetical case in which a character is faced with choice of two options, each with a negative outcome.

Credit should also be given for other valid ways: prosocial dilemma; distributive justice studies on sharing; Gilligan's interviews with women deciding on abortions; Piaget's studies of lying and marble playing. Credit description of relevant evidence – up to 2 marks.

AO2 Up to 8 marks for discussion, usually 4 marks for each way. Possible content: Moral comparisons – cognitive demand – tests information processing ability rather than moral reasoning; manipulation of two variables; alternative findings that young children can reason by intention if intention is clear.

Moral dilemmas – hypothetical therefore lacks predictive validity; reliability of ratings; low ecological validity; male bias in content.

Prosocial dilemmas – realistic situation that child can easily understand.

Distributive justice – controlled studies; sharing is a realistic experience therefore good ecological validity.

Abortion interviews – high ecological validity; self-report.

Candidates may interpret 'ways' more generally eg interviews vs. telling stories.

Credit to candidate's best advantage.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented

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 studying moral development. Evaluation is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well balanced, 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 ways of studying moral development. Evaluation is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. An exceptional answer referring to one way may gain 7 marks in this 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 way(s) of studying moral development. 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 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

Total AO1 marks for topic = 7

Total AO2 marks for topic = 10

Total AO3 marks for topic = 3

Total marks for topic = 20

Section B Applied Options

Topic: Cognition and Law

Question 15

[AO1 = 2]

AO1 Up to 2 marks for an outline. Credit any relevant features outlined. Likely content: theory is top-down/concept driven suggesting recognition is driven by previously stored information; faces processed as a whole; semantic/contextual information is taken into account not just features; sequential model - sequence of stages (Bruce and Young 1986) structural encoding, FRU, PIN, name generation.

Question 16

[AO2 = 2]

AO2 Award 1 mark in each case for any valid link between the example and holistic theory. Possible answers:
Jeremy – shows that the process is sequential as he could recognise the man but could not access the name which is the final stage.
Anya – Taking longer to recognise her teacher in an unusual environment suggests that contextual information is important for recognition.

Question 17

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

AO1 Up to 2 marks for an outline of a relevant study. Award 1 mark for method and 1 mark for results/conclusion. For full marks there must be some information about the task participants had to perform.
Likely studies include: Young et al (1985) diary study; Young and Hay (1986) composite faces showing importance of configuration; Haig (1984) computerised alteration of spacing between features.

AO2 Up to 2 marks for brief evaluation. Content will depend on study. Credit each separate point but do not award marks for simply stating eg 'has low ecological validity'. Candidates may also receive full credit for one point fully elaborated.

Question 18

[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), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.

- AO1** Up to 4 marks for descriptions of sources of post-event contamination and for descriptions of evidence. Likely content: use of leading questions which suggest the expected answer/lead to insertion of non-existent items/ result in deletion or substitution; post-event discussion where witness goes over event with other people either fellow witnesses or other parties. Likely studies include: Loftus and Palmer (1974) car crash; Loftus and Zanni (1975) definite v indefinite article; Loftus (1975) the barn; Wright et al (2000) wallet stealing two witnesses discuss. Accept also studies of children as eye-witnesses that involve post-event contamination. Credit answers where candidate makes a case for context and/or emotion after the event influencing recall. Credit descriptions of relevant evidence – 2 marks.
- AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion. Candidates may explain the reasons why post-event contamination might affect recall; the significance of post-event contamination in relation to other factors affecting eye-witness accounts; criticisms of specific studies eg whether or not laboratory studies can be used to explain real-life witness behaviour; studies where misleading information is obviously incorrect; how post-event contamination is virtually unavoidable in real life witness cases; how post-event contamination might be reduced eg use of cognitive interview procedures; differences in fallibility between children and adults; general theoretical explanations of effect eg reconstructive memory (Bartlett 1932 – striving for meaning); the active nature of memory; confabulation. Credit use of relevant evidence. Credit evaluation of evidence where relevant to discussion.

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 effects of post-event contamination on eye-witness accounts. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to research are accurate and linked to the discussion. 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 effects of post-event contamination on eye-witness accounts. 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 there is relevant reference to research but this may not be linked so clearly to the evaluation as for the top band.

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

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

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of the effects of post-event contamination on eye-witness accounts. 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**

Total AO1 marks for topic = 8

Total AO2 marks for topic = 12

Total marks for topic = 20

Topic: Schizophrenia and Mood Disorders

Question 19

[AO1 = 4]

AO1 Award up to 4 marks for description of the psychodynamic theory of depression/mood disorders. Candidates may focus on one or two ideas in some detail or on several separate points in less detail. Likely content includes: childhood grief/loss leading to dependency; regression to the oral stage; overdependence due to oral fixation; introjection of hostility – negative feelings turned inwards; role of imagined or symbolic loss; post-Freudian views that depression is linked to mother-infant relationship; failure to meet parental expectation; links with low self-esteem.

Question 20

[AO2 = 4]

AO2 Up to 4 marks to be awarded for application of two different concepts or ideas from the cognitive explanation for depression to the novel situation. Many different aspects of cognitive theory can be applied here. Credit should be given for any valid application. Candidates may focus on just two concepts or ideas in some detail or on several separate points in less detail. Possible content will probably come from Beck's theory:

- cognitive triad - person will have negative thoughts about self, world, future eg I'm useless, the world is horrid, I'll never get a job
- the person may overgeneralise 'no-one wants me'
- person may show selective perception of negatives eg focus on loss of job and ignore the many good things in life
- person may magnify significance/catastrophise eg loss of job will take on extraordinary significance and will be seen as major disaster
- person makes negative attributions – person will blame themselves for loss of job and negate the influence of external factors eg world economy
- person shows absolutist thinking 'if I can't have that job then it's a disaster, no other job will do'.

Up to 2 marks if the explanation is relevant to depression but relevance to unemployment may not have been made explicit.

Maximum 2 marks if only one concept or idea is offered

Question 21

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

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

There are a number of different routes to answering this question. Candidates may focus solely on the effectiveness, strengths and limitations of medication or may take the opportunity to consider medication in relation to alternatives. They may also/alternatively focus on the issue of care context.

AO1 Award up to 4 marks for knowledge of treatments for schizophrenia and/or care options: traditional anti-psychotic dopamine blockers eg chlorpromazine; atypical anti-psychotics eg clozapine and risperidone; alternatives eg psychotherapies; community care as an alternative care option to hospitalisation. Credit descriptions of relevant evidence – 2 marks.

AO2 Award up to 8 marks for discussion of the views expressed in the statement. Candidates are expected to evaluate the use of medication and/or compare medication with alternative treatments. For full engagement with the question candidates should also consider the point about the need for treatment to take place in a controlled environment such as a hospital. Possible content: use of studies showing relative effectiveness; issue of side effects; patient as passive or active; need for combined approach ie drugs alongside other treatment; ethical issues; role of the family v role of institution; problems of institutionalisation; strengths/limitations of community care; issue of normalisation. Credit use of relevant evidence. Credit evaluation of evidence where relevant to discussion.

Mark Bands

10 - 12 marks **Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of treatment(s) and/or care options for schizophrenia. Discussion shows full engagement with the question and includes thoughtful analysis of both type of treatment and appropriate context for treatment. 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 treatment(s) and/or care options for schizophrenia. 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 treatment(s) and/or care options for schizophrenia. 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**

Total AO1 marks for topic = 8

Total AO2 marks for topic = 12

Total marks for topic = 20

Topic: Stress and Stress Management

Question 22

[AO1 = 4]

AO1 Award 1 mark for each mechanism outlined. Candidates are most likely to use the mechanisms on the specification as the basis for their answers:

- repression – unconsciously pushing memory of stressful event out of conscious awareness
- displacement – taking out emotion on a substitute object
- regression – reverting to childlike behaviour in time of stress
- rationalisation/intellectualisation – replacing the emotional feeling with logical analysis and quest for information

Credit any defence mechanism that can be sensibly linked to stress eg

- denial – refusing to believe a stressful event is happening.
- sublimation – working through stress by doing some socially acceptable activity.

Straightforward examples not creditworthy but examples may help towards clarifying an otherwise weak outline.

Maximum 1 mark for 2 or more defence mechanisms just named

Question 23

[AO2 = 4]

AO2 Award up to 4 marks for evaluation/discussion of emotion-focused strategies. Likely content: do not deal with the external source of stress; therefore unlikely to give a long-term solution; may even exacerbate the problem eg problem becomes more firmly established eg denying illness exists may mean person does not access treatment until too late; can lead to further emotional/psychological problems eg loss of touch with reality; comparison with problem-focused strategies; depends on nature of stressor eg some problems have no solution and therefore there is no alternative to emotion-focused; possible to combine emotion-focused and problem-focused strategies.

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), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.

AO1 Award up to 4 marks for knowledge of locus of control and hardiness, and for evidence. Usually award up to two marks for each concept. Likely content: hardiness (Kobasa 1979) a personality trait comprised of control (belief that one can influence events in one's life), commitment (involvement/ engagement with others and society) and challenge (viewing change as opportunity); locus of control (Rotter 1966) internal (can exert personal control over events in one's life) external (cannot exert control over events in one's life). Credit descriptions of relevant evidence up to 2 marks eg Frankenhauser (1975) saw mill, Kobasa (1982) middle and senior managers, Glass and Singer (1972) loud noise, Suls and Mullen (1981) childbirth.

AO2 Award up to 8 marks for discussion. Possible discussion points include: explanations of how/why these variables mediate the effects of stress; application to different stress situations; possible negative effects of high internal locus of control; ways in which these concepts have been measured/studied eg usually self-report measures and therefore may be problems with validity – need for more objective measures; evaluation of the locus of control scale; links with social support eg hardy people more engaged with others; lack of correlation between the three components of hardiness; gender differences eg hardiness more common in males; role of other mediating factors such as Type A personality. Credit use of relevant evidence. Credit evaluation of evidence where relevant to discussion.

Maximum 7 marks if only one concept presented

Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented

Mark Bands

10 -12 marks **Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of the role of hardiness and locus of control in mediating responses to stress. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to research are accurate and linked to the discussion. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks **Good answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of the role of hardiness and locus of control in mediating responses to stress. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. An exceptional answer dealing with just one aspect may gain 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 the role of hardiness and locus of control in mediating responses to stress. 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**

Total AO1 marks for topic = 8

Total AO2 marks for topic = 12

Total marks for topic = 20

Topic: Substance Abuse

Question 25

[AO1 = 2]

AO1 A chemical substance which increases physiological arousal (or similar) (1)
Plus 1 mark for example eg cocaine; ecstasy; mephedrone; caffeine, nicotine, amphetamines.

Question 26

[AO1 = 2]

AO1 1 mark each to be awarded for knowledge of each risk. Likely answers: toxicity due to impurities; sudden death; psychotic disturbances; damage to cardio-vascular system.
Naming two risks maximum 1 mark.

Question 27

[AO2 = 4]

AO2 Up to 4 marks for application of knowledge of social psychological factors to the example and for discussion. Award credit for the following explanations: conformity – young person will feel pressure to go along with the behaviour of others; difference between perceived and actual norms; reasons for pressure to conform in this situation eg normative influence – wants to be like other young people; type of conformity eg compliance (may not want to go along with them initially); cultural norms; SLT concepts eg modelling (of older peers) and identification with attractive/high status peers; positive reinforcement eg praise from other young people in the group; Reed & Rowntree's theory of social selection (1997) – young people may seek out a specific sub-culture for whom stimulant abuse is the norm.

Credit any relevant application of psychological concepts to the stem. Credit may be achieved for several points in brief or for a limited number of points in some detail. Credit also application of relevant evidence eg Garnier and Stein (2002) peer attitudes as predictors of behaviour.

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), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgment when annotating scripts.

AO1 Up to 4 marks for knowledge of fear-arousing appeals. Possible content: fear arousing appeal – use of some form of media to elicit fear by presentation of negative images associated with abused substance. Credit knowledge of alternative up to 2 marks, social inoculation – providing strategies for resisting peer pressure and enhancing personal efficacy/self-esteem; health promotion/education – specific examples of health promotion/education programmes. Credit description of relevant evidence up to 2 marks.

AO2 Up to 8 marks for evaluation and comparison with alternative technique. Possible content: theory of attitude change; factors affecting effectiveness of persuasion eg source, message etc. (Yale model of communication); role of cognitive dissonance – contradiction between knowledge and behaviour; inverted U effect; effectiveness of high versus low fear; extended parallel process model (White 1992); need for skills enhancement as opposed to just avoidance – comparison with social inoculation; role of information giving as opposed to just eliciting fear - comparison with health promotion programmes. Credit use of relevant evidence. Credit evaluation of evidence where relevant to discussion.

Maximum 8 marks if no reference to another technique

Mark Bands

10 -12 marks **Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of the use of fear-arousing appeals to prevent substance abuse and an alternative technique. Evaluation is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Comparison is accurate and linked to the evaluation. 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 use of fear-arousing appeals to prevent substance abuse. Evaluation 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 there is relevant reference to another technique but this may not be linked so clearly to the evaluation 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 the use of fear-arousing appeals to prevent substance abuse. 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 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**

Total AO1 marks for topic = 8

Total AO2 marks for topic = 12

Total marks for topic = 20

Topic: Forensic Psychology

Question 29

[AO1 = 2]

AO1 Up to 2 marks for relevant description of Eysenck's theory of the criminal personality. 1 mark for noting that the criminal personality is the neurotic-extravert type. Plus 1 further mark for any valid point eg type of nervous system that pre-disposes us to offend is inherited; trait of psychoticism (cold, unfeeling) was a later addition; neurotic = unstable and extravert = sensation-seeking/outgoing; extroverts have chronically under-aroused nervous system; extraverts do not condition easily.

Question 30

[AO2 = 4]

AO2 Up to 2 marks for each criticism explained. 1 mark for a brief point, 2 marks for a point that is elaborated/fully explained. Likely criticisms: oversimplification to say all offenders are of the same type - may be more than one type – Moffitt proposes at least 4 types of offender eg adolescent limited, adult starter etc; emphasises the importance of just two personality factors which conflicts with recent personality theory eg 5 factor model; inconsistent evidence that offenders have high E scores; high psychoticism not often correlated with high E and N scores; implications or saying criminality is innate.

Question 31

[AO1 = 2]

AO1 1 mark for each role outlined. Likely answers:

- deterrence – puts the offender off offending again, and also puts off other potential offenders
- retribution – a way for society to exact revenge/get its own back
- rehabilitation/reform – aims to make the offender into a better person.

1 mark for two named but not outlined.

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), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.

AO1 Up to 4 marks for knowledge of anger management. Credit any of the following: a type of cognitive therapy devised by Novaco (1975); involves three stages; cognitive preparation where offender learns to recognise anger and recognise triggers to anger; skills acquisition where techniques are learnt to control/reduce anger response eg self-talk, deep breathing etc; application practice where anger situations are role-played and new skills are used. Credit description of relevant evidence up to 2 marks. Possible studies include: Ireland (2000); Ireland (2004); Feindler (1984); Law (1997); Loza & Loza-Fanous (1999).

AO2 Up to 8 marks for evaluation. Possible content includes: effectiveness eg rates of improvement whilst in custody and/or effect on recidivism; appropriateness for different types of crime - offenders are not all angry; likelihood of generalisation outside controlled environment; only suitable for individuals who will maintain a level of effort and commitment – many will not; can only be used where trained specialists are available and they often are not; this type of treatment can be usefully continued outside of custody eg on probation; may result in enhanced personal effectiveness; comparison with other ways of dealing with offenders eg behaviour modification, restorative justice etc. Credit use of relevant evidence. Credit evaluation of evidence where relevant to discussion.

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 anger management as a treatment for offending. Evaluation is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to evidence are accurate and linked to the evaluation. 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 anger management as a treatment for offending. Evaluation 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 there is reference to evidence.

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 anger management as a treatment for offending. 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 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**

Total AO1 marks for topic = 8

Total AO2 marks for topic = 12

Total marks for topic = 20

Assessment Objectives

	A01	A02	A03
01			2
02			1
03	3		
04		2	
05	4	8	
06			2
07			1
08	2		
09	1	2	
10	4	8	
11			2
12			1
13	3	2	
14	4	8	
15	2		
16		2	
17	2	2	
18	4	8	
19	4		
20		4	
21	4	8	
22	4		
23		4	
24	4	8	
25	2		
26	2		
27		4	
28	4	8	
29	2		
30		4	
31	2		
32	4	8	

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion