AQA

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

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 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   Child Development

Topic: Social Development

Question 01
[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1   Up to two marks for knowledge of a valid sex difference in children's friendships. Award one mark for a very brief valid difference and two marks for a difference that includes full description of the difference in relation to both boys' and girls' behaviour. Likely answers include: size of friendship networks as extensive (males in larger groups) v intensive (females in dyads or cliques); focus on shared activities (males) v focus on emotions (females); awareness of fragility of friendships/worrying about friendships (females) v less concern/awareness about fragility/disagreements (males).

AO2   Up to two marks for discussion of the difference. Likely issues include: explanations for the difference, consequences of the difference or use of supporting evidence. Explanations - evolutionary - males prefer groups as way to express dominance; behaviourist – different patterns of reinforcement; SLT - behaviour learnt from models; psychodynamic theory – differences in identification (Chodorow, 1978). Accept answers based on biological differences.
Consequences – perpetuation of sex differences; stereotyped behaviours; implications for child rearing/occupations etc.
Use of evidence – credit use of studies supporting existence of sex difference eg Lever (1976), Benenson (1990), Rose and Rudolph (2006).

For two marks the discussion should be based in psychological theory/evidence.

Question 02
[AO3 = 3 marks]

AO3   1 mark – credit description of how any design (repeated, independent or matched) could be used.
1 mark – both IV & DV: interesting v uninteresting toy and measure of popularity
3rd mark – for appropriate expansion/elaboration of how the experiment would be conducted eg more detail of variables (eg old ball vs new computer game; rating on a popularity scale 1-10 or number of children in the class who name each boy as preferred play partner/friend) or of the design.

Example answer: repeated design: same participants judge a boy with an interesting toy and a boy with an uninteresting toy (this is the IV) and decides which of them is their preferred play partner/friend, or rates both on popularity scale 1-10 (this is the DV).

Question 03
[AO1 = 1 mark]

AO1   Credit any relevant cause outlined (not just named). Likely causes include: poor social skills/social inadequacy; aggressive or disruptive behaviour; low level of attractiveness; deviant behaviour/being different or unusual; poor or lacking internal working model.

Question 04
[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]

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 and description of function(s) of attachment. Credit any of the following points: evolutionary - genes passed on to future generations are safeguarded; aid to survival – maintaining proximity to mother ensures child is safe/cared for etc; psychological welfare is ensured – child does not suffer the consequences of maternal deprivation (Bowlby) ie affectionless behaviour, delinquency, low IQ etc; provides an internal working model of relationships which acts as a basis for all future relationships; attachment figure provides child with security and a means of communication; Bowlby's idea of homeostatic mechanism involved in preservation of feelings of security. Credit should also be given for reference to older theories of attachment eg cupboard love theory.
Credit description of relevant evidence up to 2 marks.

AO2   Up to 8 marks for discussion of the function(s) given. Likely discussion points include: validity of the evolutionary explanation eg preference for a single attachment figure coincides with increasing mobility; alternative interpretations eg in some circumstances it may be evolutionary advantageous to have insecure attachments and not be totally dependent on a single figure (Belsky, 1991); use of supporting/contradictory evidence eg Harlow's research (1959) supports the provision of security explanation and contradicts cupboard love theory; links with broader psychological approaches eg cupboard love theory as positive reinforcement/operant conditioning; links with broader psychological concepts eg proximity seeking as a form of imprinting; correlation between infant attachment types and adult relationships (Hazan and Shaver, 1987) general related issues eg the concept of a critical period – attachment function is impaired if attachment is delayed. Credit recognition that some of these explanations are compatible because they are at 'different levels'.
Credit use of relevant evidence eg Bowlby (1946).
Credit evaluation of evidence only if used to discuss functions of attachment.

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 function(s) of attachment. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to evidence are accurate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks   Good answers

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of function(s) of attachment. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. References to research are relevant but are perhaps not linked so clearly to the discussion as for the top band.

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

4 - 6 marks   Average to weak answers

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

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers

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

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Total AO1 marks = 7
Total AO2 marks = 10
Total AO3 marks = 3
Total marks for this topic = 20 marks

Topic: Cognitive Development

Question 05
[AO1 = 3 marks]

AO1   Up to three marks for knowledge of one study carried out by Siegler.
One mark is available for the method and one mark for the conclusion based on findings. Third mark for either elaboration of method or for further linking the results to the conclusion. Candidates are likely to use either the balance scale study (Siegler, 1976 – one conclusion was that problem solving strategies improve with age; another conclusion was that practice and feedback encourages use of more effective strategies) or the min strategy study (Siegler and Jenkins, 1989 – key conclusion was that children try a range of available strategies before settling on the most effective).

Question 06
[AO2 = 2 marks]

AO2   Up to two marks for explanation of one strength as follows: one mark for a relevant strength briefly noted; two marks for a relevant strength with full explanation of how or why it is a strength. Answers may be based on Siegler's work or relate to the information processing approach in general. Likely answers: methods are rigorous, systematic and controlled; findings can be used in education to help children learning; information processing findings can be correlated with neurological information; the overlapping waves model can be applied to many different problem-solving contexts; information processing provides models of cognitive processes which can then be tested in experiments. Credit also comparison with Piaget.

Question 07
[AO3 = 3 marks]

AO3   1 mark – credit description of how any design (repeated, independent or matched) could be used.
1 mark – both IV & DV: whether or not child receives scaffolding and jigsaw success
3rd mark – for appropriate expansion/elaboration of how the experiment would be conducted eg more detail of variables (eg adult encouragement in form of 'well done' for placing a piece correctly; time taken to complete a 15-piece jigsaw or the number of pieces correctly positioned in ten minutes) or of the design.

Example answer: independent design: one group of children solves jigsaw puzzles with an adult giving encouragement the other group has an adult present but there is no encouragement (the IV). The psychologist would measure the time taken to complete the jigsaw (the DV).

Question 08
[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]

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 an outline of how schema develop. Candidates should outline relevant concepts: schema is a unit of knowledge/cognitive structure; through experience/interaction with the physical world the child's knowledge adapts; schema can be extended via assimilation/accommodation; assimilation - adding information to an existing schema/applying a schema to a new situation; accommodation - forming a new schema/where an existing schema has to change because incoming information conflicts with what is already known (ie disequilibrium); equilibration - where there is a mental balance/cognitive harmony between what is already known and incoming information. Credit reference to Piaget's stages only if focused on the question ie development of schema. Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.

AO2   Up to 8 marks for discussion and application via examples. Likely content: discussion of Piagetian concepts: the general notion of constructivism; existence of hypothetical structures and processes as a way of explaining the cognitive processes involved; falsifiability issues in relation to hypothetical structures/processes; biological basis – parallels in cognitive neuroscience; comparison with Nativist view that certain abilities are innate and therefore do not need to be constructed through experience (the work of Baillargeon); the importance of discovery learning and 'action on the world' for adaptation/disequilibrium; implications for education eg how teachers provide opportunities for equilibration and consequent development of new schema/altered schema and extension of knowledge; alternative explanations for cognitive development – whether the notion of schema is compatible with Vygotsky's view about the importance of the social world.

    Up to two marks are reserved for examples to illustrate the concepts under discussion.
    Credit use of relevant evidence.
    Credit evaluation of evidence only where used to discuss schema development.

Mark Bands

10 -12 marks   Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of Piaget's explanation of the processes involved in schema development. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. At the top of the band references to examples are appropriate and effective. 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 Piaget's explanation of the processes involved in schema development. Discussion (not just examples) must be evident. 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 Piaget's explanation of the processes involved in schema development. There must be some discussion/application via examples for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers

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

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Total AO1 marks = 7
Total AO2 marks = 10
Total AO3 marks = 3
Total marks for this topic = 20 marks

Topic: Moral Development

Question 09
[AO1 = 3 marks]

AO1   Up to three marks for an outline which can include any of the following:
- occurs at the Phallic stage of psychosexual development
- arises through identification with same-sex parent
- and internalisation of his/her moral standards
- via resolution of Oedipus/Electra complex
- part of the tripartite personality

A full-mark answer must include reference to **identification** and **internalisation**. Although unlikely, candidates should be credited for other psychodynamic explanations.

Question 10
[AO2 = 2 marks]

AO2   Up to two marks for application of knowledge of the role of the superego in moral behaviour to the example of Jackie. For full marks the answer should refer to: the unconscious conflict between the id impulses - Jackie desires the top; the demanding, threatening superego (Jackie does not steal the top (or pays for it at the till) because of guilt even at the possibility of wrong-doing). Can also give full credit to a discussion where superego fails to stop Jackie stealing the t-shirt or where the ego ideal operates to reward good behaviour ie not stealing. For full marks candidate should explain the internal/unconscious conflict between two parts of the personality and make explicit application.

Question 11
[AO3 = 3 marks]

AO3   1 mark – credit description of how named design could be used. Candidates are likely to propose an independent (or matched) design. Note: it is unlikely that candidates would use repeated measures here, but a case could be made for a repeated design if explained as a longitudinal study.
1 mark – for both IV and DV: age and type of reasoning (Note that the DV must relate to moral comparison stories.)
3rd mark for appropriate expansion/elaboration of how the experiment would be conducted eg more detail of variables (whether child is 6 years or 12 years; which person the child thinks is naughtier) or design.

Example answer: independent design: performance of a group of young children is compared with performance of a group of older children. eg child is 6 or 12 years old (IV) and child has to say which person is naughtier/whether the child thinks that person who causes the most damage or the person with the bad intention is naughtier (DV).

Question 12
[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]

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 four marks for outlines of the research studies of Damon and Eisenberg, usually two marks for each. Note that the question asks about research so answers should consist of descriptions of studies and/or findings of studies. Likely content:
Damon (1977) investigated distributive justice using interviews with children of different ages about hypothetical situations (how to share money from sale of drawings between members of a group) and in real-life group situations (how to share candy bars earned by making bracelets between members of a group (Gershon and Damon, 1978)); Damon's findings showed that distributive reasoning became more sophisticated with age (self-oriented, arbitrary justification, equal shares, individual merit and need).
Eisenberg (1987) carried out longitudinal investigations of prosocial reasoning using hypothetical dilemmas where personal interest conflicted with the chance to help others (altruistic behaviour) eg the Birthday Party (Mary) dilemma. Same participants were interviewed every two years between ages of 4 and 12 years. Findings showed a gradual shift from self-interest (hedonistic reasoning) to empathic reasoning. In further research she assessed the role of emotional and cognitive factors in prosocial reasoning (Eisenberg, 2001). Credit descriptions of relevant evidence up to 4 marks.

AO2   Up to 8 marks for evaluation of the research studies of Damon and Eisenberg. Candidates may focus on each researcher individually or may make general points that could apply to both. Likely content: validity issues eg use of hypothetical dilemmas and how far hypothetical reasoning reflects real-life reasoning; differences in level of reasoning shown in real and hypothetical situations both Damon's and Eisenberg's situations are within the realm of children's experience (unlike other research eg Kohlberg); prosocial and distributive justice reasoning are better measures of individual morality than traditional dilemma-based research as there are no laws about what is acceptable in the situations used by Eisenberg and Damon; cross-cultural support for Eisenberg's findings (Boehnke, 1989); cross-cultural support for Damon's findings (Enright, 1980, 1984); comparison with the research of others eg Kohlberg and Piaget; Eisenberg's later work throws light on the processes involved in prosocial reasoning. Credit use of relevant evidence.

Maximum 7 marks if only one researcher is presented.

Mark Bands

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

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

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

7 - 9 marks Good answers

At the top of the band the answer shows knowledge and understanding of the research studies of both Damon and Eisenberg. Evaluation is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. References to research are relevant. An excellent answer based on the work of just one researcher 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 research studies of both Damon and/or Eisenberg. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks Poor answers

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

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

0 marks No relevant content

Total AO1 marks = 7
Total AO2 marks = 10
Total AO3 marks = 3
Total marks for this topic = 20 marks

Section B   Applied Options

Topic: Cognition and Law

Question 13
[AO1 = 3 marks]

AO1   Up to three marks for knowledge of one study of face recognition. One mark for method. One mark for conclusion based on findings. Third mark for either elaboration of method or further linking the results to conclusion. Likely studies include: Shepherd, Davies and Ellis (1981); Sergent (1984); Tanaka and Farah (1993); Woodhead (1979); Young (1985); Young and Hay (1986).

Question 14
[AO2 = 1 mark]

AO2   One mark for brief explanation of a valid criticism. Content will depend upon the study used in answer to 13. Note that the criticism must be explained in the context of the study, it is not sufficient to simply state a criticism eg the study has low ecological validity. Accept also positive criticisms eg high ecological validity of the diary study.

Question 15
[AO1 = 1 mark, AO2 = 3 marks]

AO1   One mark is to be awarded for knowledge of the two types of line-up procedures ie simultaneous means suspect and foils are all seen at the same time and sequential means that suspect and foils are seen one after another and are not visible at the same time. Note this knowledge may be implicit in the discussion.

AO2   Up to 3 marks for a brief discussion as to why sequential line-ups lead to more accurate identification. Likely content: in simultaneous line-ups witnesses compare all the faces and go for the one that is most like the face they remember – this is a relative judgement; in sequential line-ups there is no possibility of a relative judgement as witness has to make a definite decision on each face before moving on so the decision has to be absolute; a positive absolute decision requires greater certainty – witness must be sure the face matches that in their memory; whereas a relative decision only requires witness to know that one person is a better match to their memory than all the others; in simultaneous line-ups there is a greater chance of false positives.
Credit use of relevant evidence as part of the discussion.

Question 16
[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]

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 two psychological explanations for difficulty recalling events, usually two marks for each explanation. Given the examples, the most likely explanations are: post-event contamination, including post-event discussion and leading questions; repression and implanting of false memories. Candidates choosing to answer using other factors affecting eye-witness reliability eg emotion, expectation and stereotypes, context effects, age of eye-witness can still gain full credit for AO1. Credit description of relevant evidence up to 2 marks. Accept other plausible explanations founded in psychological theory/evidence.

AO2   Up to 8 marks for discussion of the two psychological explanations and application to the examples. Likely discussion points: use of evidence to support or refute the explanation; problems with determining whether or not memories of childhood events are accurate; controversial issues re existence of false memories eg credit ethics where linked to explanation; explanations as to why given factors affect accuracy of EW accounts. Application: allow up to 2 marks for linking the explanations to the case/s given - explanations contextualised (Angela's recall of the robbery may have been contaminated by discussion with husband or by leading question used by the police. Danielle has probably repressed memories of unpleasant events or is confused about what may or may not have happened because somehow false memories have been implanted). Candidates may use the same person for both explanations or a different person for each. Accept other plausible applications founded in psychological theory/evidence. Credit use of relevant evidence. Credit evaluation of evidence only where used to discuss explanation.

Maximum 7 marks if only one explanation presented.

Mark Bands

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of two psychological explanations for people's difficulty in recalling events. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. At the top of the band (11/12) application to each example is appropriate and effective. 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

At the top of the band the answer shows knowledge and understanding of two psychological explanations for people's difficulty in recalling events. Discussion and/or application 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 only one explanation 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 two psychological explanations for people's difficulty in recalling events. There must be some discussion/application for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers

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

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Total AO1 marks = 8
Total AO2 marks = 12
Total marks for this topic = 20 marks

Topic: Schizophrenia and Mood Disorders

Question 17
[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1   Up to two marks for knowledge of one or more types of family dysfunction. Likely answers: double-bind; the schizophrenogenic mother; family schism and skew; communication difficulties; interpersonal conflict; high expressed emotion. Credit should be awarded for one type in some detail or for two (or more) done briefly. Candidates who simply name two types of dysfunction - credit one mark. No marks for simply naming one type.

AO2   Up to two marks for explanation of how the type(s) of dysfunction might be involved in schizophrenia. Candidates might consider the way in which the dysfunction could lead to the development of schizophrenia or might consider the possibility that schizophrenia in a child might lead to the family dysfunction.

Question 18
[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1   Up to two marks for the outline of a relevant study. Credit should be given for knowledge of the method (1) and the results/conclusion (1). For credit of the method the type of therapy and groups/conditions should be clear. Likely studies: Hogarty et al (1986) family therapy; Paul and Lentz (1977), token economy; Tarrier et al (1993), coping strategy enhancement. Maximum 1 mark for very general descriptions.

AO2   Up to two marks for evaluation of the study outlined. Candidates may choose to expand upon one issue or present two issues in less detail. Note that stated criticisms (eg low ecological validity) without any explanation of the issue are not creditworthy. Likely issues: use of controls to enable measurement of the effectiveness; whether the study looked at long-term effectiveness or was merely a short-term evaluation; discussion of the implications of the findings eg for health policy; limited sample size and how this could affect generalisation of findings.

Question 19
[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]

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 two explanations of mood disorders, usually two marks for each disorder. Likely explanations: Biological explanation: depression is inherited, passed on through the generations; role of the SERT gene (Wilhelm, 2006); due to low levels/low levels of activity of the neurotransmitters serotonin and norepinephrine at the synapse; structural abnormalities in the frontal lobe.
Cognitive explanations: Beck's cognitive triad (self, world, future); negative cognitive set – magnification, overgeneralisation etc; learned helplessness/hopelessness (Seligman/Abramson); the role of attributions – internal, stable, global attributions for negative events.
Psychodynamic explanations: depression as grief/loss; introjection of hostility; failure to meet parental demands; regression to childhood dependency.
Can accept two explanations of the same type eg two biological. Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.

AO2   Up to 8 marks for evaluation and for application to Belinda. Likely discussion points: use of evidence to support or refute the explanations; problems with determining whether or not atypical biological status is a cause or an effect of the disorder; controversial issues re implications of accepting an explanation eg implications if mood disorders are genetic; discussion of blame; focus on one aspect of the disorder rather than the disorder as a whole eg cognitive explanation focuses on the disordered thinking but not so much on cause; comparison between explanations.
Application – allow 2 marks for explanations contextualised (Belinda's father suffered from depression so perhaps there is a genetic predisposition; Belinda feels guilty about parents so perhaps she is turning her anger at loss inwards and punishing herself; Belinda's references to hopelessness and life as a disaster reflect her negative thinking). References to the text need not be so explicit.
Credit use of relevant evidence.
Credit evaluation of evidence only where used to evaluate the explanations.

Maximum 7 marks if only one explanation presented.

Mark Bands

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of two explanations for mood disorders. Evaluation is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Application for each explanation is appropriate and effective at the top of the band (11/12 marks). 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

At the top of the band the answer shows knowledge and understanding of two explanations for mood disorders. 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 only one explanation 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 two explanations for mood disorders. There must be some evaluation/application for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers

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

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Total AO1 marks = 8
Total AO2 marks = 12
Total marks for this topic = 20 marks

Topic: Stress and Stress Management

Question 20
[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1   One mark for each named type of social support outlined.
Appraisal: supporter helps person understand/evaluate their stressors/situation/difficulty.
Emotional: supporter empathises, understands, offers opportunity for emotional release.
Esteem: supporter helps to build person's confidence and bolsters self-esteem
Informational: supporter informs person, gives advice, guidance, feedback on progress.
Instrumental: supporter offers practical assistance in coping.

AO2   One mark each for an explanation of how the two named types of support might help someone who is having relationship problems e.g. esteem support – friend might suggest how a new haircut looks good to help person feel more attractive.
The explanation must go further than a repeat of the outline given for AO1 ie must include a concrete example of how the support is given/experienced. Credit also analysis of why named type of social support would be helpful.

Question 21
[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO2 marks are for brief evaluation/use of evidence and AO1 marks for knowledge of evidence.

AO2   Up to 2 marks for brief evaluation of social support as a way of coping with stress. Candidates may use the evidence by discussing how findings either support the effectiveness of social support or illustrate the problems with social support. Credit may also be given for more general evaluation points.

AO1   Up to two marks for knowledge of a relevant study/relevant studies. Likely studies include: Berkman and Syme (1979) longitudinal study over 9 years using questionnaires – social support related to death rates; La Rocco et al (1980) 2000 men – correlation between social support and psychological strain; Fleming et al (1982) residents living close to nuclear power accident – emotional support and cognitive harm; Sosa et al (1980) controlled experiment instrumental support during childbirth – effects of experience of labour – shorter and more positive.

Question 22
[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]

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 and description of at least two ways of measuring stress. For credit the named way must be described. Likely ways include: behavioural measures eg observation of non-verbal behaviour, frequency of speech hesitations, rapidity of speech, speech errors; physiological measures eg blood or urine to measure hormone levels (cortisol) heart rate, galvanic skin response/polygraph to measure arousal; self-report measures eg questionnaires such as the Hassles and Uplifts Scale (Kanner, 1981) and the Social Readjustment Rating Scale to measure life events (Holmes and Rahe, 1967).
Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.

AO2   Up to 8 marks for discussion and application to the text. Likely points include: objectivity of physiological and behavioural measures; subjectivity of self-report measures; issues of reliability eg test-retest reliability and inter-rater reliability; issues of validity eg physiological measures measure arousal which might be positive rather than negative; importance of considering context in which stress is being measured – generalisation issues; qualitative v quantitative issues eg ease of analysis v meaningfulness; practical issues eg training and specialist materials; usefulness of combining different types of measure; ethical issues as long as they affect measurement of stress. Allow 2 marks for application to the comments made by Jack and Ravi eg Jack prefers to use self-report measures/dislikes use of physiological measures and Ravi prefers to use behavioural measures.
 Credit use of evidence to discuss ways of measuring stress.
 Credit evaluation of evidence only where used to discuss ways of measuring stress.

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 at least two ways of measuring stress. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. At the top of the band there is sound application. Any references to research are accurate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks   Good answers

At the top of the band the answer shows knowledge and understanding of at least two ways of measuring stress. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. An excellent answer based on just one way 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 at least two ways of measuring stress. There must be some discussion/application for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers

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

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Total AO1 marks = 8
Total AO2 marks = 12
Total marks for this topic = 20 marks

Topic: Substance Abuse

Question 23
[AO1 = 1 mark]

AO1 One mark for a valid definition of tolerance eg where an increased amount of the substance is required in order to experience the same effect.

Question 24
[AO1 = 1 mark]

AO1 One mark for a valid definition of psychological dependence eg mental and emotional compulsion to keep taking the substance/belief that the substance needs to be taken. For credit the answer must contain reference to a cognitive element ie belief or mental drive/compulsion.

Question 25
[AO2 = 2 marks]

AO2 Unpleasant effects will follow if the person suddenly stops drinking alcohol. (1) Plus one mark for two or more effects of alcohol withdrawal eg shaking, sweating, anxiety, stomach cramps, nausea, seizure, convulsion, hallucination, temperature, irregular heart rate. Accept also wider social effects.

Question 26
[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1 Up to 2 marks for knowledge of one social factor in substance abuse. Possible content: peer influences eg identification with role models eg older siblings, parents, media personalities; social learning theory; peer pressure eg conformity-based explanations eg normative; types of conformity eg compliance. For the full two marks there must be psychological terminology.

AO2 Up to 2 marks for a brief discussion of the factor presented. Likely content: why/how the social factor influences behaviour eg how we tend to conform to expectations of peers and peer group norms; how identification leads to imitation and modelling; effects of conformity eg we start to abuse substance because everyone else is; role of compliance eg we start to abuse substances even though we don't really like it because we don't want to be different; relative importance of the social factor in relation to other factors; effect of social selection as a stronger influence; cross cultural findings re social norms; the difference between actual and perceived norms; use of relevant evidence to support argument. Comparison with other explanations. Candidates may achieve full credit for one point in some detail or for more than one point in less detail.

Question 27
[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]

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 one prevention technique and one psychological treatment, usually 2 marks for each.
Likely prevention techniques: fear-arousal appeals (levels of fear, the inverted U effect); social inoculation (training in resistance to persuasion – 4 factors – knowledge, discussion, skill development, public commitment); identification of risk groups (those in poor housing, unemployed, socially isolated, certain cultures more vulnerable, those with family history) who can then be targeted by drugs prevention teams.
Likely treatments: aversion therapy (classical conditioning procedure, covert sensitisation); self-management programmes (self-monitoring and insight eg AA).
Credit relevant evidence up to 2 marks.

AO2   Up to 8 marks for discussion of the prevention technique and psychological treatment. Content will vary dependent on the technique and treatment chosen but may include the following: data re effectiveness; use of evidence in relation to effectiveness; long-term v short-term effectiveness; effect on behaviour v cognitive effect; suitability for particular groups and substances; side effects; ethical issues; need to combine different treatments; issue of prevention rather than treatment; practical implications eg wider society, resources, health policy etc.
Credit use of relevant evidence.
Credit evaluation of evidence only where used to discuss technique/treatment.

Maximum 7 marks if only treatment or only prevention presented.

Mark Bands

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of one prevention technique used to prevent substance abuse and one psychological treatment of substance abuse. Discussion is full, includes thoughtful analysis and is well balanced. Any references to research are accurate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks   Good answers

At the top of the band the answer shows knowledge and understanding of one prevention technique used to prevent substance abuse and one psychological treatment of substance abuse. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. An excellent answer based on 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 research of one prevention technique used to prevent substance abuse and one psychological treatment of substance abuse. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers

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

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Total AO1 marks = 8
Total AO2 marks = 12
Total marks for this topic = 20 marks

Topic: Forensic Psychology

Question 28
[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1   Up to 2 marks for a biological explanation for offending. Likely content: genetics/heritability – DNA, probands, concordance rates, degrees of relatedness, evidence eg twin/adoption studies; atavistic form – offenders as genetic throwbacks; somatotype theory – the mesomorph characteristics; neurological explanations – role of the limbic system and amygdala; the maturation retardation hypothesis; reduced prefrontal lobe volume; chromosomal explanation – XYY theory and testosterone.
One mark for a brief outline (not just naming).
Two marks for an elaborated outline.

Question 29
[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1   Up to two marks for an outline of the typology approach as follows: offenders can be <u>categorised</u> as either the organised or the disorganised type (accept other types) (1); the crime/crime scene characteristics indicate the offender's lifestyle and/or personality characteristics (1)

Question 30
[AO2 = 4 marks]

AO2   Up to 4 marks for evaluation of the typology approach, usually two marks for each issue explained. Likely issues: reliability of categorisation; validity of the two types; possibility of a third type (Douglas, 1992); foundation for the category system (36 convicted sex offenders in USA); evidence for organised type but not for disorganised type (Canter, 2004), alternative classification systems (Jenkins, 1988). For each issue award one mark for a brief outline of the issue and two marks for an issue explored in more detail e.g. explanation of how/why it is an issue/strength/limitation.

Question 31
[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]

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 to be awarded for knowledge of recidivism and ways of dealing with recidivism. Credit any of the following: information about recidivism rates/recidivism data; custodial sentencing and its aims; alternatives to custodial sentencing eg restorative justice programmes, tagging, community service etc; treatments for offending eg anger management, behaviour modification etc.
Credit knowledge of relevant evidence up to 2 marks eg anger management (Feindler et al 1984; Ireland, 2000) and behaviour modification (Hobbs and Holt, 1976; Cohen and Filipczak, 1971; Cullen and Seddon, 1981); studies of effects of custodial sentencing (Zimbardo (1971,1973); alternatives to custodial sentencing eg restorative justice (Sherman and Strang, 2007; and tagging (Cassidy et al, 2005).

AO2   Up to 8 marks are to be awarded for discussion of ways of dealing with recidivism and engagement with the issues raised in the stem. Content will vary according to information used for AO1 but may include issues such as the following: effectiveness of custodial v non custodial approach; strengths and limitations of custodial and non-custodial approaches; treatment generalisability beyond the treatment situation; ethical issues eg treatment as control rather than reform; suitability and appropriateness of the treatment/method of dealing with for varying types of offender; how well the treatment or way of dealing with the offender meets the aims of punishment (ie reform, deterrence, retribution, incapacitation); discussion of the needs of the individual and the needs of wider society; use of recidivism statistics; practical implications such as the need for/availability of trained personnel; use of evidence; comparison between the different strategies for dealing with offenders.
Credit use of relevant evidence.
Credit evaluation of evidence only where used to discuss ways of dealing with recidivism.

Mark Bands

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding specific to the problem of recidivism. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Answers in this band should show full engagement with the issues in the stem and maintain focus on issue of recidivism. Any references to evidence are accurate. 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 ways of dealing with offending, with some focus on the problem of recidivism. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the issues raised in the stem, although the discussion is not as wide-ranging or as detailed as for the top band. 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 ways of dealing with offending. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive or quite narrowly focused. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks Poor answers

Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information. 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 = 8
Total AO2 marks = 12
Total marks for this topic = 20 marks

Assessment Objectives Grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3
Social Development - Total for topic = 20			
01	2	2	
02			3
03	1		
04	4	8	
Cognitive Development - Total for topic = 20			
05	3		
06		2	
07			3
08	4	8	
Moral Development – Total for topic = 20			
09	3		
10		2	
11			3
12	4	8	
Cognition and Law – Total for topic = 20			
13	3		
14		1	
15	1	3	
16	4	8	
Schizophrenia and Mood Disorders – Total for topic = 20			
17	2	2	
18	2	2	
19	4	8	
Stress and Stress Management – Total for topic = 20			
20	2	2	
21	2	2	
22	4	8	
Substance Abuse – Total for topic = 20			
23	1		
24	1		
25		2	
26	2	2	
27	4	8	
Forensic Psychology – Total for topic = 20			
28	2		
29	2		
30		4	
31	4	8	