AQA

**General Certificate of Education (A-level)
January 2013**

Psychology B **PSYB2**

(Specification 2185)

Unit 2: Social Psychology, Cognitive Psychology and Individual Differences

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 students' 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 students' 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 students' 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.

Section A Social Psychology

Topic: Social Influence

Question 01
[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1   Award two marks for two causes of arousal that have been identified by social psychologists. These may be named or described.
Likely answers: evaluation apprehension; distraction/distraction-conflict.
Accept other valid answers eg task difficulty/unfamiliarity/novelty; presence of an audience; presence of a co-actor.
Do not credit effects on performance that may be caused by arousal eg social facilitation/inhibition; dominant response.

Question 02
[AO2 = 2 marks]

AO2   Award up to two marks for an example of how one of the causes suggested in 01 might affect performance of a specific task.
Award one mark for illustration of the cause through use of a concrete example and one mark for the effect on performance.
Possible answer: Evaluation apprehension – a footballer may be concerned during training that his/her performance will be judged by the manager (1), and make more misplaced passes as a result (1).
The effect on performance must be made explicit ie whether performance improves/gets worse/is facilitated/inhibited as a result of arousal – not just 'performance is affected'.
Examples of tasks/activities may be sport or non-sport related. Credit description of studies as examples.
0 marks without an example of a specific task.
Can credit 02 even if 01 is incorrect or missing.

Question 03
[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1   Award up to two marks for an outline of the Authoritarian Personality as an explanation for obedience to authority.
Likely points: a collection of traits/dispositions; developed from strict/rigid parenting; conformist/conventional/dogmatic; obedient/servile towards people perceived as having higher status/harsh towards people perceived as having lower status; reference to F-scale as a way of measuring personality type.
One mark only for a list of traits.
Accept other valid answers.
0 marks for simply saying 'obedience is more likely'.

AO2   Award up to two marks for discussion which may be for two brief points or a single point that is elaborated.
Likely points: measurement of authoritarianism relies on self-report (F-scale) data which may be unreliable; contrast with situational factors (Milgram) eg proximity of authority figure, may have greater influence on obedience levels; difficulty in establishing cause and effect between authoritarianism/parenting style and obedience; explanation cannot easily account for obedience of entire social groups/societies.

Credit use of evidence as part of the discussion.

Question 04
[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1 Award up to two marks for an outline of one psychological explanation for defiance. Award one mark for identification/brief outline of a relevant explanation and one mark for elaboration/expansion which could be through an example.
Likely explanations: the influence of disobedient role models/social support; being in an autonomous state; past experience; opportunity to question the motives of the authority figure; personal conviction.
Also credit the inverse of factors/explanations usually used to explain obedience to authority eg (lack of) proximity of authority figure; proximity of victim; (lack of) legitimacy of authority figure/uniform/setting.
Credit descriptions of evidence used as elaboration/expansion eg detail of Milgram`s variations that led to an increase in defiance.

Do not credit reference to increase in defiance/decrease in obedience alone.

Question 05
[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]

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

AO1 Up to five marks for description of ethical issues that have arisen in social influence research. Likely issues include protection from harm/participant embarrassment/stress; deception; right to withdraw; informed consent; confidentiality. Description of relevant evidence to illustrate specific issues eg how Milgram deceived participants, how Asch caused participants stress/embarrassment, etc.
Credit description of relevant evidence (which does not include specific reference to ethical issues) up to one mark.
Maximum of one mark for simply listing or naming ethical issues.
Likely studies include Milgram 1963, 1974, Sherif 1936, Asch 1951,1956, Bickman 1974, Hofling 1966. Crutchfield 1955, Michaels 1982, Zimbardo 1971.

AO2 Up to five marks for discussion of ethical issues in social influence research. Likely points include: counter arguments such as why deception or other unethical procedures were necessary - to reduce/prevent demand characteristics, and thus increase validity. Discussion of procedures that were designed to address/resolve ethical issues eg use of debriefing/retrospective consent. Contradictory evidence eg many of Milgram`s participants claimed they were happy to have been involved when questioned. Cost-benefit analyses of ethical concerns set against the relative merits/importance of the findings. Credit discussion about when BPS/APS guidelines were set up and why.

Maximum 6 marks if only one issue
Maximum 6 marks if no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks **Very good answers**

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of ethical issues in social influence research. The discussion is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.
The answer is well-structured with effective use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are few errors of spelling and punctuation.

6 - 8 marks **Good answers**

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of ethical issues in social influence research although some detail may be lacking. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum six marks if only one issue and/or there is no reference to evidence.
The answer has some structure with appropriate use of paragraphs,sentences and psychological terminology. There are some errors of spelling and punctuation.

3 – 5 marks **Average to weak answers**

There is some knowledge of ethical issues in social influence research and/or basic/limited discussion. There may be exceptional description for five marks with no discussion of the issues described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.
Some basic ideas are expressed adequately though the answer may lack structure. Psychological terminology may be missing or used inappropriately. There may be intrusive errors of grammar, spelling and punctuation.

1 – 2 marks **Poor answers**

There is very limited knowledge/discussion of ethical issues in social influence research, but there must be some relevance.
Basic ideas are poorly expressed. There is little evidence of structure, ideas may be listed rather than expanded. There may be significant errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation.

0 marks **No relevant content**

Topic: Social Cognition

Question 06
[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1   Award two marks for two factors that have been found to affect impression formation. These may be named or described.
Likely answers: central traits; primacy effect; recency effect; stereotyping; social schema.
1 mark only for 'primacy-recency effect' presented as a single factor.
0 marks for 'schema' alone.

Question 07
[AO2 = 2marks]

AO2   Award up to two marks for an example of how, in a specific situation, one of the factors identified in question 06 might affect our impression of someone we have just met.
Award one mark for illustration of the factor through use of a concrete example and one mark for how our impression might be affected.
Possible answer: Primacy effect – on a blind date, if the other person spills a drink in the first few minutes (1), we will form an impression of them as clumsy (1).
The effect on impression formation must be made explicit ie not just, 'this will affect the impression formed'.
0 marks without an example of a specific situation.
Can credit 07 even if 06 is incorrect or missing.

Question 08
[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1   Award up to two marks for an outline of the Authoritarian Personality as an explanation of prejudice.
Likely points: a collection of traits/dispositions; developed from strict/rigid parenting; conformist/conventional/servility towards those perceived to be of higher status/dogmatic; displacement of aggression/frustration; prejudice is directed towards those perceived to be of lower status/'weaker' groups; reference to F-scale as a way of measuring personality type.
One mark only for a list of traits.
Accept other valid answers.
0 marks for simply saying 'prejudice is more likely'.

AO2   Award up to two marks for discussion which may be awarded for two brief points or a single point that is elaborated.
Likely points: measurement of authoritarianism relies on self-report (F-scale) data which may be unreliable; explanation cannot easily account for prejudice within entire social groups/societies; difficulty in establishing cause and effect between authoritarianism/parenting style and prejudice.
Credit use of evidence as part of the discussion. Credit critical comparison with alternative explanations.

Question 09
[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1   Award up to two marks for an outline of one other psychological explanation of prejudice. Award one mark for identification/brief outline of a relevant explanation and one mark for elaboration/expansion which could be through an example.
Likely explanations: competition for resources/realistic conflict theory/relative deprivation hypothesis; social identity theory. Accept alternative explanations eg frustration-aggression hypothesis; social learning theory; conformity.
Likely answers: Competition for resources - resources such as housing/land/employment are scarce; competing groups develop negative attitudes and prejudice towards each other.
Social identity theory - the world is divided into us/them (social categorisation); the enhancement of in-group over out-group (social comparison).

Question 10
[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]

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

AO1   Up to five marks for description of at least two functions of attitudes. Likely points include: Knowledge function: attitudes help us make sense of the world by making it predictable. An explanation of eg stereotyping.
Adaptive function: attitudes help us gain social approval/acceptance/goals when we display generally-accepted attitudes. We avoid punishment by displaying these attitudes. An explanation of conformity in attitudes.
Ego/self-expressive function: attitudes help us to establish identity when we express our own values and opinions. This function represents the fact that we are social beings who need to communicate with others. An explanation of unusually strongly-held or idiosyncratic beliefs.
Ego-defensive function: protecting the individual from recognising personal deficiencies or inferiority. This function can protect our self-esteem and promote a positive self image to others. Freudian roots.
Accept social adjustment function: this helps a person to manage social situations and create harmony in a social group by communicating attitudes that impress others.

Maximum of one mark for simply listing or naming functions.
Credit description of evidence up to one mark. Likely studies: Razran (1950), Martin (1987), Tajfel et al (1971), Han and Shavitt (1993), Herek (1987).

AO2   Up to five marks for discussion of the functions.
Likely points include: discussion of the disadvantages that might arise from these functions eg stereotyping/prejudice/discrimination as a result of the knowledge function when information is ignored or rejected; dogmatism/inflexibility as a result of the ego-expressive function. Cultural differences in functions.
The use of examples to illustrate the functions (up to 2 marks, one per function).
Recognition that one attitude might serve more than one function so the divisions are simplistic. The use of the functional approach as a way of understanding how attitudes might be changed, or why they might be resistant to change.
Credit use of evidence.

Maximun 6 marks if only one function

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of at least two functions of attitudes. The discussion is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 - 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of at least two functions of attitudes although some detail may be lacking. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum six marks if only one function.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of functions of attitudes. There may be exceptional description for five marks with no discussion of the functions described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/discussion of functions of attitudes, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content

Section B Cognitive Psychology

Topic: Remembering and Forgetting

Question 11
[AO1 =2 marks]

AO1 Award up to two marks for an outline of one limitation of motivated forgetting/repression as an explanation of forgetting. Award one mark for the identification of a limitation and one mark for elaboration/expansion.
Likely answers: unscientific nature of the explanation (eg use of case studies); difficulty of testing the unconscious mind; ethical issues involved in experimental testing; contradictory evidence eg victims of post-traumatic stress disorder; difficulty in verifying `recovered` memories/the false memory debate; does not explain why all types of memories are forgotten as it only applies to unpleasant events.
Note that some of these points may overlap. Accept other valid answers.
Credit evidence used to illustrate limitation.

Question 12
[AO3 = 1 mark]

AO3 One mark for the independent variable.
Likely answers: the context of <u>recall</u> / whether participants recalled the words in the same room or a different room / the classroom or the school hall.
Reference to both conditions might be implicit rather than clearly stated.

Question 13
[AO3 = 1 mark, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO3 Award one mark for stating the likely outcome.
Likely answers: Participants who learned and recalled in the same context are likely to recall more words than those who learned and recalled in different contexts / there will be a higher mean number of words recalled in Condition 1 than Condition 2.
Accept alternative wording.

AO2 Award up to two marks for explanation of the likely outcome based on knowledge of retrieval failure as an explanation for forgetting. Credit reference to environmental cues/context triggering recall; the absence of cues/context in Condition 2.

For two AO2 marks there must be some reference to condition two's participants failing to retrieve/recall information.
Credit use of evidence and/or use of an example as part of the discussion.

Question 14
[AO3 = 2 marks]

AO3   Award up to two marks for an explanation of how random allocation to one of the two conditions might have been carried out. Two marks for a full explanation, one mark for a brief/vague answer.
Possible answer: All participants' names/numbers are placed into a hat/lottery system/computer (1) the first name drawn is assigned to condition one, the next to condition two/the first twenty are allocated to condition one, the second twenty to condition two(1).

Question 15
[AO3 = 2 marks]

AO3   Award up to two marks for an explanation of how participants could be matched and then allocated to the two conditions for a matched pairs design.
Possible answer: Participants are paired on some relevant variable (eg memory ability, IQ, age, etc.), (1) and then one from each pair is allocated to each condition (1).
Answers based on the use of identical twins can get full marks as long as there is some reference to the idea that twins are likely to have a similar level of recall.

Question 16
[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]

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

AO1 Up to five marks for description of features of the Multi-store model and Levels of Processing (award a maximum of three marks for any one model).

MSM: accurate description of information about the characteristics (duration, capacity and coding) of each store; linear/information processing; transfer from sensory to STM via attention; description of rehearsal loop.
One mark if candidate only names the three separate stores.

LOP: knowledge of the three levels: structural/orthographic/shallow/visual; acoustic/phonetic/intermediate/phonological; semantic/deep; the idea that deep processing leads to better recall.
One mark if candidate only lists the levels.

Credit description of evidence up to two marks. Likely studies: Craik and Tulving (1975), Murdock (1962), Glanzer and Cunitz (1966), Peterson and Peterson (1959), Conrad (1963/4), Baddeley (1966), Milner et al (1978), Blakemore (1988).

AO2 Up to five marks for discussion of the models of memory which should include evaluation of each model, as well as application to the characters in the stem.

MSM: explanation of primacy and recency effects in serial position studies; discussion of the nature of deficits in case studies of neurological damage; criticisms of aspects of the model such as arguments that STM and LTM are not unitary stores; rehearsal is not a complete explanation of transfer to LTM.

LOP: the problems/tautology involved in trying to measure depth of processing; the difficulty of controlling how participants process stimulus material within experimental studies; recent updates of the model – the importance of factors such as effort, relevance, distinctiveness, etc. in processing.

Up to two marks should be reserved for application of features/implications of the models to the characters in the stem. Possible applications: analysis of the distinction between maintenance/rote rehearsal (MSM – Ross) and elaborative rehearsal (LOP – Dale); the implications of each model in relation to the scenario i.e. according to LOP, Dale may perform better in the exam as he is processing information at a deep level (semantically), unlike Ross who is processing information at a shallow level (structurally); according to the MSM, Ross` revision strategy will ensure that information is transferred from STM to LTM, and should therefore be effective.

Application must illustrate some feature of one or both models ie do not credit 'Ross is using the multi-store model, Dale is using levels of processing'.

Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 6 marks if only one model of memory
Maximum 8 marks if no application to the stem

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks **Very good answers**

There is accurate and well-organised description of both models of memory. The discussion is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. There is effective application to both characters in the stem. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.
The answer is well-structured with effective use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are few errors of spelling and punctuation.

6 - 8 marks **Good answers**

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of both models of memory. Discussion may be present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. At the top of the band there may be answers that describe and discuss both models in detail but contain no application to the characters in the stem. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum six marks if only one model of memory.
The answer has some structure with appropriate use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are some errors of spelling and punctuation.

3 – 5 marks **Average to weak answers**

There is some knowledge of one or both models of memory. There may be exceptional description for five marks with no discussion/application present. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. Some basic ideas are expressed adequately though the answer may lack structure. Psychological terminology may be missing or used inappropriately. There may be intrusive errors of grammar, spelling and punctuation.

1 – 2 marks **Poor answers**

There is very limited knowledge/discussion/application of either model of memory, but there must be some relevance.
Basic ideas are poorly expressed. There is little evidence of structure, ideas may be listed rather than expanded. There may be significant errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation.

0 marks **No relevant content**

Topic: Perceptual Processes

Question 17
[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1   Award up to two marks for an outline of what is meant by shape constancy in visual perception.
Possible answer: The tendency to see/perceive objects as the same shape (1) despite changes in the angle at which we see them/the shape of the retinal image (1). Alternatively, one of these marks may be gained through an appropriate example/diagram.

Question 18
[AO3 = 1 mark]

AO3   One mark for the independent variable.
Likely answers: whether participants see a series of pictures of vases or a series of pictures of faces / the types of pictures participants see.
Reference to both conditions might be implicit rather than clearly stated.
No credit for 'the pictures'.

Question 19
[AO3 = 2 marks]

AO3   Award up to two marks for an explanation of how random allocation to one of the two conditions might have been carried out. Two marks for a full explanation, one mark for a brief/vague answer.
Possible answer: All participants' names/numbers are placed into a hat/lottery system/computer (1). The first name drawn is assigned to condition one, the next to condition two/the first twenty are allocated to condition one, the second twenty to condition two (1).

Question 20
[AO3 = 2 marks]

AO3   Award up to two marks for explaining why using a repeated measures design in this study would have confounded the results.
Possible answer: The participants` expectation relies on them being naïve (1) and they will no longer be naïve if they see both series of pictures (1).
Answers based on the increased likelihood of demand characteristics or order/practice effects are also acceptable.
For 2 marks there must be some explicit link to the study or task described.
1 mark only for a generic disadvantage of repeated measures design.

Question 21
[AO3 = 1 mark, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO3   Award one mark for stating the likely outcome.
Likely answers: Participants who see a series of pictures of vases are more likely to perceive the ambiguous figure as a vase/participants who see a series of pictures of faces are more likely to perceive the ambiguous figure as two faces/there will be a higher number of vases reported in Condition 1/there will be a higher number of faces reported in Condition 2.
Accept alternative wording.

AO2   Award up to two marks for explanation of the likely outcome based on knowledge of perceptual set.
Possible answer: Participants in both conditions are more likely to see what they expect to see (1) based on their previous experience/immediate context/a tendency to notice particular aspects of sensory data (1).

Credit use of evidence and/or use of an example as part of the discussion.

Question 22
[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]

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

AO1   Up to five marks for description of features of Gibson`s and Gregory`s theories of visual perception (award a maximum of three marks for any one theory).

Gibson: almost all the information needed to perceive the world comes directly from our senses; an ecological theory that emphasises the importance of cues within the environment; bottom-up/data driven/direct process, not concept-driven; the importance of texture gradient; concept of affordances; the importance of movement – the optic flow.

Gregory: perception is a top-down/concept-driven process in which prior knowledge/experience is combined with often incomplete sensory information to construct hypotheses about the world; emphasises the role of inference; the relevance of illusions, such as the Muller-Lyer or Ponzo figures.

Credit description of evidence up to two marks. Likely studies: Gibson and Walk (1960), Lee and Lishman (1975), Lieberman (1963), Deregowski (1972), Bruner and Postman (1949), McGinnies (1949), Bruner and Minturn (1951).

AO2   Up to five marks for discussion of the theories which should include general evaluation of each model, as well as application to the characters in the stem.

Gibson: application of knowledge of the theory to examples eg face recognition, flying planes, long jumping; theory is not laboratory-based therefore more ecologically valid; difficulty explaining illusions; support from infant studies.

Gregory: the theory explains how illusions operate, however these lack real-world validity; analysis of how Gregory's theory can account for factors affecting perception such as motivation, culture, etc.; top-down processing is logical – we are aware that past experience affects present understanding; support from studies of illusions/perceptual set. The Neisser compromise.

Up to two marks should be reserved for application of features/implications of the theories to the characters in the stem. Possible applications: that Aisha's comments relate to bottom-up/innate perception (Gibson) and Safia's to top-down perception based on past experience/stored information (Gregory).

Credit comparison between theories via general discussion and/or application to the characters in the stem.
Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 6 marks if only one theory
Maximum 8 marks if no application to the stem

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate and well-organised description of both theories of visual perception. The discussion is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. There is effective application to both characters in the stem. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 - 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of both theories of visual perception although application may be lacking. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. At the top of the band there may be answers that describe and discuss both models in detail but contain no application to the characters in the stem. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum six marks if only one theory.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of one or both models of theories of visual perception. There may be exceptional description for five marks with no discussion/application present. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/discussion/application of either theory of visual perception, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content

Section C Individual Differences

Topic: Anxiety Disorders

Question 23
[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1   Award up to two marks for briefly outlining what is meant by agoraphobia and social phobia.
Likely answers: agoraphobia – fear of crowds/public places/places of assembly/open spaces/going outside (1).
Social phobia – fear of humiliation/embarrassment/being judged in social situations (1).
No credit for 'fear of social situations' only.
No credit for examples without further expansion.

Question 24
[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1   Award up to two marks for an outline of a behavioural explanation of phobias.
Likely content: the idea that phobias are learnt through classical conditioning; fear is acquired when a neutral stimulus becomes associated with a frightening event; description of the two-process theory; reference to avoidance learning; reference to generalisation.
Credit descriptions based on social learning theory.
Both of these marks may be awarded for an accurately labelled 'Pavlovian' diagram of how a phobia might develop.
Maximum 1 mark if outline does not refer to fear/phobias.

Question 25
[AO1 = 1 mark, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1   One mark for identifying an appropriate limitation.
Likely answers: not all phobias are triggered by a traumatic experience; explanation cannot account for all phobias; fails to account for evidence that phobias may have a biological basis; difficulty explaining why some phobias are more common than others; the idea that the explanation can better account for specific phobias.

AO2   Up to 2 marks for discussion of the limitation which might include analysis/expansion; counter-argument; use of evidence; reference to alternative explanations.
Possible answer: Not all phobias are triggered by a traumatic experience (1), where the initial association (between the phobic object/situation and fear) is formed (1), which suggests that alternative explanations are needed (1).

Accept limitations based on the methodology of individual studies eg Little Albert, but for full marks, these should be made relevant to discussion of the explanation.

Question 26
[AO2 = 3 marks]

AO2 Up to 3 marks for explaining how a psychodynamic therapist would attempt to treat Lily's phobia of cars. Credit should be awarded for detail of psychoanalytic techniques such as free association, dream analysis, etc.
1 mark for naming/describing a technique or techniques. 1 mark for explaining how this technique/techniques would be applied to Lily's phobia. 1 mark for reference to the fact that the psychodynamic therapist would try to uncover the true source of the phobia/that Lily's phobia of cars is symbolic of a deeper unconscious fear.

Question 27
[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]

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

AO1 Up to five marks for description of biological explanations of OCD. Credit can be awarded for any or all of the following explanations:
Genetic explanation - some people are predisposed to develop the disorder as a result of inherited familial influence.
Biochemical explanation – low levels of serotonin associated with anxiety; high levels of dopamine linked to compulsive behaviour/stereotypical movements.
Physiological explanation - basal ganglia in the brain responsible for psychomotor functions, hypersensitivity of the basal ganglia may result in repetitive movements; linked to abnormality/excessive activity in the orbital frontal cortex.
Maximum 1 mark for simply naming/listing explanations.
Credit description of evidence up to two marks.
Likely studies: McKeown and Murray (1987), Bellodi et al. (2001), Pauls et al. (1995), Rapoport and Wise (1988), Aylward et al. (1996).

AO2 Up to five marks for discussion of biological explanations of OCD. Likely points include: the effectiveness of biological/drug therapies and how this supports the (biochemical) explanation eg anti-depressants that increase serotonin levels reduce OCD symptoms in many patients; problem that not all sufferers respond to drug treatment; issue of causation; treatment fallacy; contradictory evidence in brain scan studies; alternative explanations for findings from family/twin studies such as shared environments; brain structural accounts tend to explain repetitive behaviour but not obsessional thoughts.
Credit discussion of broader issues such as reductionism, determinism etc.
Credit reasoned comparison with alternative explanations e.g. cognitive. Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanation.
Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 6 marks if no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of biological explanations of OCD. Discussion is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 - 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of the biological explanations of OCD. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum of six marks if no evidence.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of biological explanations of OCD and/or basic/limited evaluation. There may be exceptional description for five marks with no discussion of the explanations described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/discussion of biological explanations of OCD, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content

Topic: Autism

Question 28
[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1   Award up to two marks for an outline of what is meant by lack of joint attention as a symptom of autism. Possible answer: joint attention is behaviour in which two people (the child and another) focus on the same object (1). This behaviour is absent in children with autism (1).
To gain both marks, the answer must convey the idea that joint attention is missing/absent/lacking in children with autism.

Question 29
[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1   Award up to two marks for an outline of the neurological correlates explanation of autism.
Possible answer: This explanation suggests that there is a relationship/correlation/match/link between the symptoms of autism/triad of impairments (1) and brain damage/structural abnormalities (1).

Question 30
[AO1 = 1 mark, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1   One mark for identifying an appropriate limitation.
Likely answers: issue of cause and effect; poor control of confounding factors in supporting studies; theory does not account for the full range of autistic symptoms.

AO2   Up to 2 marks for discussion of the limitation which might include analysis/expansion; counter-argument; use of evidence; reference to alternative explanations.
Possible answer: There is an issue cause and effect (1). It is not known if the neurological damage causes the behavioural deficit (1) or whether it is an effect of the disorder (1).

Accept answers based on methodological problems associated with techniques used to study structural damage in the brain eg post-mortems, scans, but for full marks, these should be linked to discussion of the explanation.

Question 31
[AO2 = 3 marks]

AO2   Up to 3 marks for explaining how the Lovaas technique might be used as a therapy for Aaron's communication difficulties.
Likely points: aims to improve language/communication through the use of operant conditioning techniques; the target behaviour is specified; behaviour is broken down into steps/increments; any behavioural response in the desired direction is reinforced; behaviour is shaped so that selected responses are strengthened/successive approximation.
Maximum of 2 marks if no explicit application to Aaron's communication.
Possible applications: identifying Aaron's target behaviour as more frequent communication with members of his family for instance; suitable reinforcement that would appeal to a six-year old eg a sweet, use of a toy; examples of Aaron's behaviour that would be successively shaped/reinforced eg making a sound, forming a word, etc.

Question 32
[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]

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

AO1 Up to five marks for description of at least two of the named studies. This may include descriptive detail of methods/procedures/controls, etc. as well as the results/findings (up to a maximum of three marks for any one study).
Award credit for the following: Sally-Anne experiment – description of the sequence of events involving 'Sally' and 'Anne'; details of sample/control groups; critical question, 'Where will Sally look for her ball?' and control questions; number/percentage of correct answers within each group.
'Smartie-tube' test – description of task and critical question, 'What will Tom think is in the tube?'; comparison of age groups; number/percentage of correct answers.
Comic strip stories – description of stories: mechanical, behavioural and mentalistic; details of task and different groups; description of results – that many children with autism had difficulty ordering the mentalistic stories and failed to understand the motives of the characters.

AO2 Up to five marks for evaluation of two or more of the named studies. Possible content: evaluation of the methodology/procedures such as the use of matched controls increasing validity of findings; cognitive demands involved in the tasks; artificiality of procedures eg use of dolls, comic strips; sample sizes. Analysis of the implications of findings – namely, how failure to succeed at the given tasks can be explained by a lack of theory of mind/inability to understand the perspective of others/ 'mind-blindness'/misinterpretation of false belief. Ethical issues could be made relevant. Credit use of alternative theories to explain the results of the studies eg central coherence deficit, failure of executive functioning.
Credit use of evidence to support discussion eg Lewis and Osbourne (1990).

Maximum 6 marks if only one study

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of at least two of the named studies. The evaluation is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 - 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of at least two of the named studies although some detail may be lacking. Evaluation is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum six marks if only one study.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of one or more studies and/or basic/limited discussion. There may be exceptional description for five marks with no evaluation present. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/evaluation of one or two studies, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Assessment Objectives Grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3
Social Influence			
1	2		
2		2	
3	2	2	
4	2		
5	5	5	
Total	**11**	**9**	
Social Cognition			
6	2		
7		2	
8	2	2	
9	2		
10	5	5	
Total	**11**	**9**	
Memory			
11	2		
12			1
13		2	1
14			2
15			2
16	5	5	
Total	**7**	**7**	**6**
Perception			
17	2		
18			1
19			2
20			2
21		2	1
22	5	5	
Total	**7**	**7**	**6**
Anxiety Disorders			
23	2		
24	2		
25	1	2	
26		3	
27	5	5	
Total	**10**	**10**	
Autism			
28	2		
29	2		
30	1	2	
31		3	
32	5	5	
Total	**10**	**10**	

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