



**General Certificate of Education**

**Psychology PSYB3**  
*Specification B*

**Unit 3 (PSYB3) Child Development and  
Applied Options**

**Specimen mark scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards**  
This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#)

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2009 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

---

## SECTION A CHILD DEVELOPMENT

### Social Development

Total for this question: 20 marks

- |  |
|--|
| <b>01</b> Suggest <b>three</b> behavioural categories that could be used by researchers in an observational study of friendship in children aged four years. (3 marks) |
|--|

[A03 = 3]

**A03** Award one mark for each appropriate category up to a maximum of three. Categories must refer to specific behaviour, eg do not accept 'being friendly' or 'being nice'. Likely categories: sharing toys; holding hands; smiling; being in proximity; sitting next to, etc.

- |  |
|--|
| <b>02</b> Describe and briefly evaluate <b>one</b> psychological explanation of why a young child might be rejected by his or her peers. (5 marks) |
|--|

[AO1 = 3, A02 = 2]

**AO1** Up to three marks for description of a valid explanation depending on detail. One mark for a valid explanation identified, two for a valid explanation with some expansion, three for a valid explanation clearly described using appropriate terminology.

Likely answers: poor early attachments (leading to lack of an internal working model); poor social skills (with examples).

**A02** Up to two marks for discussion of the explanation given for AO1. Candidates might consider the validity of the explanation they have given, present relevant evidence, or compare briefly with other explanations. One mark for each valid point or two marks for one point clearly explained.

- |   |
|---|
| <b>03</b> Describe and evaluate Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation. (12 marks) |
|---|

[AO1 = 4, A02 = 8]

**AO1** Up to four marks for knowledge of Bowlby's work on maternal deprivation. Candidates will usually refer to the maternal deprivation theory and how evidence was used to formate this theory. Likely content: critical period for attachment, monotropy and likely negative outcomes such as delinquency, affectionless psychopathy, low IQ, etc. Evidence to support Bowlby's theory, eg (Bowlby 1946, Goldfarb 1943), and contradictory evidence, eg (Rutter 1970, Schaffer and Emerson 1964, Freud and Dann 1951, etc).

**A02** Up to 8 marks for evaluation of Bowlby's work. Candidates should be credited for evaluation of both theory and evidence for and against. They might refer to the need to differentiate between privation and deprivation, the need for a single relationship, the critical period. Credit may also be given for wider issues such as the implications of Bowlby's WHO report for individuals and for child-care policy and practice. Credit use of relevant evidence.

## Synopticity

In order to access the higher bands, candidates should demonstrate an understanding of the role of evidence in formulating psychological theory and how psychological theory provides a basis for further hypothesis testing. They should show an awareness of issues relating to validity, reliability and ethics, in relation to concepts, theory and individual pieces of research, and an understanding of the impact of psychological research, in this instance, on childcare provision and practice.

## Mark Bands

### 12 -10 marks **Excellent answers**

Bowlby's theory is thoroughly described, showing sound and accurate knowledge and understanding. Evaluation is full and well balanced with appropriate analysis. Any references to research are accurate. Evaluative comment is not simply stated but is presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well focused, organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured, 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.

### 9 - 7 marks **Good to average answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of Bowlby's theory and there is an attempt to present a balanced evaluation. Some analysis is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. Any 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.

### 6 - 4 marks **Average to poor answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of the area. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band are likely to be mostly descriptive and there is likely to be irrelevance and/or inaccuracy. Answers constituting reasonable description with minimal focus on the question are likely to be in this band.

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

3 - 1 marks **Poor answers**

Answer must have some relevant content, perhaps fair description related to the question. There are probably substantial inaccuracies and/or irrelevance. A valid but extremely brief, perhaps unfinished answer will come into this band.

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

0 marks      **No relevant content**

Total AO1 marks for topic: 7

Total AO2 marks for topic: 10

Total AO3 marks for topic: 3

**Total marks for topic: 20**

**Cognitive Development**

**Total for this question: 20 marks**

**04** Explain why the researchers chose to categorise the responses as shown in **Table 1** above. (3 marks)

**[A03 = 3,**

**A03** Award any 3 marks as follows:

- the research is about egocentrism (1)
- the ability to decentre is thought to arise at around 7 years (1)
- so need to compare target group with younger (and older) to compare (as controls) (1)
- categorising data in a table this way allows for ease of comparison/analysis (1).

**05** Describe what Piaget meant by *class inclusion*. (3 marks)

**[AO1 = 3,**

**A01** Up to three marks for a description of class inclusion. For a full-mark answer, expect reference to the following: the ability to classify objects; incorporating an understanding that the same object can at the same time; be a member of a sub-ordinate and a super-ordinate class; definitions of sub-ordinate and super-ordinate class. Accept alternative wording and answers implicit in examples.

**06** Briefly evaluate **one** way in which class inclusion has been investigated. (2 marks)

**[A02 = 2,**

**A02** Up to 2 marks for evaluation of method used to investigate class inclusion, dependent on detail. Candidates will usually refer to either Piaget's work (brown and white beads) or the revised method used by McGarrigle (the cows). Credit references to: the complexity of Piaget's task and how that might have affected the validity of his interpretation; the ways in which the task lacks 'human sense' and how this might have affected the outcome. (Or opposite points if candidate uses McGarrigle).

**07** Describe and evaluate Vygotsky's approach to cognitive development. (12 marks)

**[AO1 = 4, A02 = 8,**

**A01** Up to four marks for Vygotsky's approach described. Likely content would include: emphasis on social factors, particularly parental input; internalisation of adult world; importance/role of language; Vygotsky's consideration of ZPD; child as apprentice and importance of peer tutoring; role of the expert; stages of concept formation. Credit description of relevant evidence, one mark.

**AO2** Up to eight marks for evaluation. Candidates may choose to focus on a limited number of issues and explore them thoroughly, or more briefly consider several points. Candidates are expected to offer evaluation and analysis of Vygotsky's approach, either per se, or in comparison to alternative approaches, specifically those of Piaget. Credit use of relevant evidence, for example Wood and Middleton's research into the effectiveness of scaffolding.

### Synopticity

In order to access the higher bands, candidates must demonstrate an understanding the processes involved in formulating psychological theory and how psychological theory provides a basis for the generation of further hypotheses. They should show an awareness of issues relating to validity and reliability, in relation to concepts, theory and individual pieces of research and an understanding of the impact of psychological research, in this instance, on educational practices.

### Mark Bands

#### 12 -10 marks **Excellent answers**

Vygotsky's theory is thoroughly described, showing sound and accurate knowledge and understanding. Evaluation is full and well balanced with appropriate analysis. Any references to research are accurate. Evaluative comment is not simply stated but is presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well focused, organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured, 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.

#### 9 - 7 marks **Good to average answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of Vygotsky's theory and there is an attempt to present a balanced evaluation. Some analysis is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. Any 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.

6 - 4 marks **Average to poor answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of the area. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band are likely to be mostly descriptive and there is likely to be irrelevance and/or inaccuracy. Answers constituting reasonable description with minimal focus on the question are likely to be in this band.

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

3 - 1 marks **Poor answers**

Answer must have some relevant content, perhaps fair description related to the question. There are probably substantial inaccuracies and/or irrelevance. A valid but extremely brief, perhaps unfinished, answer will come into this band.

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

0 marks            **No relevant content**

Total AO1 marks for topic: 7

Total AO2 marks for topic: 10

Total AO3 marks for topic: 3

**Total marks for topic: 20**



**Moral Development**

**Total for this question: 20 marks**

**08** Explain how distributive justice might occur when a group of young children are rewarded with a box of sweets for helping at a family party. (2 marks)

[A01 = 1, A02 = 1,

**A01** One mark for knowledge of distributive justice. Likely answer: moral decision-making based on sharing of assets. Credit similar answers.

**A02** One mark for application to the example in the stem. Eg children might decide that the sweets should be shared out according to who had helped the most.

**09** Piaget used stories to investigate moral understanding in children. A child would listen to a story and then be asked a question. The answer to the question was taken as an indication of the child's level of moral understanding.

Create **your own** brief moral comparison story and question suitable for studying moral development in 10-year-old children. (3 marks)

[A03 = 3,

**A03** Up to two marks for the story. For two marks, the story must refer to two actors who each carry out some misdeed. In one case, the consequences should be small, but with implied bad intent; in the other case, the consequences should be greater, but with no implied bad intent.

One mark for an appropriate question, eg who is the naughtier?

Candidates who simply paraphrase the John and Henry story should gain a maximum of one mark for this question.

**10** Explain **at least one** problem that might arise when using moral comparison stories to investigate moral development. (3 marks)

[A01 = 2, A02 = 1,

**A01** One mark for identifying a problem, plus one further mark for expanded description. Likely problems: cognitively demanding; hypothetical; investigates moral reasoning rather than behaviour; lack of replication e.g. where intention is made clear (Nelson).

**A02** One mark for analysis of how or why it is a problem, or for the consequences in relation to the outcome of the research. Credit use of evidence as analysis

**11** Describe and evaluate a psychodynamic explanation for moral development. (12 marks)

[A01 = 4, A02 = 8,

**A01** Up to four marks for knowledge and understanding of a psychodynamic explanation of moral development: role of the superego as moderator of the id; advent of morality around age of 4/5 years; as a consequence of identification with same-sex parent in the Phallic stage; Oedipus/Electra complex; Blackburn's references to the weak, over-harsh or deviant superego. Although the question refers to a single psychodynamic explanation candidates referring to more than one psychodynamic explanation should be credited. Credit descriptions of relevant evidence up to two marks.

**AO2** Up to eight marks for evaluation of a psychodynamic explanation. Candidates will be likely to refer to some of the following: the lack of evidence, eg that males are more moral than females, as Freudian theory would predict; evidence to the contrary, ie evidence for guilt in pre-Phallic stage children; neglect of environmental influences such as conditioning and modelling; the existence of moral reasoning in children who do not have a same-sex parent with whom to identify; the discounting of other explanations, eg cognitive; comparison with other explanations; focus on emotion (guilt) as opposed to moral behaviour or moral reasoning. Credit use of relevant evidence.

### Synopticity

In order to access the higher bands, candidates must demonstrate an understanding the processes involved in formulating psychological explanations, including the role of evidence, and how psychological theory provides a basis for the generation of further hypotheses. They should show an awareness of issues relating to validity and reliability, in relation to concepts, theory and individual pieces of research and an understanding of the impact of psychological findings, in this instance, on issues surrounding moral responsibility

### Mark Bands

#### 12 -10 marks **Excellent answers**

A psychodynamic explanation is thoroughly described, showing sound and accurate knowledge and understanding. Evaluation is full and well balanced, with appropriate analysis. Any references to research are accurate. Evaluative comment is not simply stated but is presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well focused, organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured, 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.

#### 9 - 7 marks **Good to average answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of a psychodynamic explanation and there is an attempt to present an organised evaluation. Some analysis is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. Any 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.

**6 - 4 marks Average to poor answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of the area. Answers in this band are likely to be mostly descriptive and there is likely to be irrelevance and/or inaccuracy. Answers constituting reasonable description with minimal focus on the question are likely to be in this band. For 5/6 marks there must be some evaluation.

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

**3 - 1 marks Poor answers**

Answer must have some relevant content, perhaps fair description related to the question. There are probably substantial inaccuracies and/or irrelevance. A valid but extremely brief, perhaps unfinished, answer will come into this band.

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

0 marks      **No relevant content**

Total AO1 marks for topic: 7

Total AO2 marks for topic: 10

Total AO3 marks for topic: 3

**Total marks for topic: 20**

## SECTION B APPLIED OPTIONS

### Cognition and Law

Total for this question: 20 marks

- |   |
|---|
| <b>12</b> Briefly outline <b>two</b> types of line-up identification procedure and briefly explain the effect of <b>each</b> type on the process of identification. <span style="float: right;"><i>(4 marks)</i></span> |
|---|

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** One mark for each type of identification line-up procedure briefly outlined.

Simultaneous - conventional method where witness views all members at once.

Sequential - witness is shown members one at a time and must decide whether or not each is the culprit before being allowed to proceed to the next member.

**AO2** Up to two marks for explanation of how the two different types are thought to affect judgement. Answers may refer to the effects on reasoning and/or outcomes as follows: simultaneous allows for comparison and therefore encourages a relative judgement; sequential forces the witness to make an absolute judgement comparing each member with his/her memory. Findings in relation to accuracy of the two methods: similar rates of identification in culprit-present line-ups, rate of false identification much lower in sequential line-ups.

- |  |
|--|
| <b>13</b> Explain how the cognitive interview can be used to improve eye-witness recall. <span style="float: right;"><i>(4 marks)</i></span> |
|--|

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** Up to two marks for knowledge of the cognitive interview. Credit references to any of the following: restoring the context; recalling events in a different order; recalling from a different perspective; recalling all details, even apparently inconsequential information.

**AO2** Up to two marks for explaining the effect of elements of the cognitive interview procedure on eye-witness recall. Candidates may refer to any of the following: reference to context acts as a cue which can then trigger other detail; apparently inconsequential details may trigger key information (feature overlap); cognitive interview elicits more detail; cognitive interview reduces susceptibility to misleading information; some studies, not all, show an increase in the amount of false information; some aspects, eg 'context reinstatement' and 'report everything' instruction have been widely adopted, 'perspective change' and 'reverse order' have not. Credit reference to specific studies.

<b>14</b> Describe the debate surrounding false and recovered memories. Evaluate this debate with reference to psychological evidence. <span style="float: right;"><i>(12 marks)</i></span>
---

**[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8,**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of the debate, ie the two explanations (ie repression and implanted false memories). Repression - a defence mechanism (Freud) designed to protect the conscious self from memories of unpleasant events; motivated forgetting. A false memory: memory for an event that never occurred but is believed to be true. Up to two marks available for descriptions of relevant evidence, eg Williams 1986; Loftus & Ketcham 1984; Mazonni et al 1999.

**AO2** Up to eight marks for evaluation. Candidates are likely to discuss the following issues: methodological difficulties involved in establishing reliability and validity of such memories; the ethical implications, probably with reference to the sensitive subject matter and outcomes for accusers and accused; theoretical implications, eg support or otherwise for Freud's theory of unconscious defence mechanisms and support or otherwise for the implantation theory and for the existence of false memories; the legal status of supposed recovered memories; the British Psychological Society position; use of techniques to recover memory.

Synopticity

In order to access the higher bands, candidates must demonstrate an understanding of the processes involved in formulating psychological theory, including the role of evidence, and how psychological theory provides a basis for the generation of further hypotheses. They should show an awareness of issues relating to validity, reliability and ethics, in relation to concepts, theory and individual pieces of research, and an understanding of the impact of psychological research, in this instance, in relation to the law.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence given**

**Mark Bands**

12 -10 marks **Excellent answers**

The debate is fully described, showing sound knowledge and understanding of the key concepts of repression, recovered memory, implanted memories and false memories. Evaluation/analysis of the controversy is balanced. Evidence is clear and accurate. Points are presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well focused, organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured, 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.

**9 - 7 marks Good to average answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of the debate and relevant key concepts. There is an attempt to present a balanced evaluation/analysis of the debate. The answer is mostly focused on the question although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. Must include some evidence for 9 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.

**6 - 4 marks Average to poor answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of the debate and key concepts. Answers in this band are likely to be mostly descriptive with some irrelevance and/or inaccuracy. Answers constituting reasonable description with minimal focus on the question are likely to be in this band. Must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks.

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

**3 - 1 marks Poor answers**

Answer must have some relevant content, perhaps fair description related to the question. There are probably substantial inaccuracies and/or irrelevance. A valid but extremely brief answer will come into this band.

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

0 marks            **No relevant content**

Total AO1 marks for topic: 8

Total AO2 marks for topic: 12

**Total marks for topic: 20**

**Schizophrenia and Mood Disorders**

**Total for this question: 20 marks**

**15** Bernie spends hours in the same position, apparently unaware of what is going on around him. Occasionally, he will become extremely agitated and have brief periods of excitable and exaggerated movement before returning to his immobile state.

Veronica is convinced that there are people under the floorboards in her house and that they are listening to everything she says and does. Sometimes she can hear them talking about her and how they will hurt her when she is asleep at night.

With reference to the two cases above, outline what is meant by *classification of schizophrenia*. (4 marks)

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** Up to two marks for an outline. There are several valid approaches to this question. Most candidates are likely to refer to sub-categories and symptomatic distinctions between the sub-types, eg schizophrenia is not a unitary phenomenon; there is more than one type of schizophrenia; knowledge of the different sub-types. Candidates taking an historical approach might gain up to two marks for knowledge of the development of schizophrenia as a category of mental disorder distinct from other disorders - Bleuler, Kraepelin, etc. Alternatively, candidates might gain up to one mark for general understanding of classification systems.

**AO2** One mark each for linking the content of AO1 to the descriptions in the stem. For example, Bernie might be identified as a case of catatonic schizophrenia and Veronica as a case of paranoid schizophrenia. If AO1 content is rather more general, then AO2 marks could come from recognition that both are suffering from the same disorder but with very different symptoms, and therefore likely to be separate sub-types.

**16** Briefly discuss the family dysfunction explanation of schizophrenia. (4 marks)

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** Up to two marks for knowledge of a family dysfunction explanation, eg communication problems (Mintz 1988); the schizophrenogenic mother; Bateson (1956) the double bind; high expressed emotion (Brown 1966). Vague or very brief description one mark, full description two marks. Alternatively, candidates may get full marks for a briefer mention of two explanations.

**AO2** Up to two marks for discussion of the explanation/s given. Valid comment would include 'blaming' the parents, de-medicalisation, neglecting biological evidence, possibility of change, etc.

**17** Describe and evaluate **at least one** biological explanation of schizophrenia. Refer to empirical evidence in your answer. (12 marks)

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**AO1** Up to four marks for knowledge of at least one biological explanation of schizophrenia. Candidates may focus just on one biological explanation or may refer

to more than one in less depth. Likely content: heredity and genetics - concordance in twins and adoption studies; biochemical - the dopamine hypothesis; neurophysiological differences - decrease in frontal lobe activity; enlarged ventricles, etc; the viral hypothesis - links with flu virus in second trimester. Credit description of relevant evidence, one mark.

**AO2** Up to eight marks for evaluation of the explanation/s and for evidence to support argument. Candidates might offer the Gottesman (1972) concordance evidence with evaluation/problems of twin studies, eg reliability of zygosity in early studies, sample size etc. Heston (1966) adoption evidence indicates some genetic component but modified by environment - diathesis/stress model. Dopamine evidence - post-mortems (Iversen 1979) animal studies, L-Dopa mirror (Davidson 1987), chlorpromazine (Creese 1976) but is high dopamine cause or effect? Neurophysiological studies - Gershon & Rieder (1992) CT scans and MRI scans but cause or effect? Viral hypothesis - schizo-virus (Torrey 1991), pre-natal exposure (Cannon 1991). In addition to specific criticisms, candidates may well offer alternative explanations as part of their discussion. Credit use of relevant evidence.

### Synopticity

In order to access the higher bands, candidates must demonstrate an understanding of the processes involved in formulating psychological theory, including the role of evidence, and how psychological theory provides a basis for the generation of further hypotheses. They should show an awareness of issues relating to validity, reliability and ethics, in relation to concepts, theory and individual pieces of research, and an understanding of the impact of psychological research, in this instance, in relation to clinical understanding.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence given**

### Mark Bands

12 -10 marks **Excellent answers**

At least one biological explanation is fully described, showing sound knowledge and understanding. Evaluation/analysis of the explanation/s is balanced. Evidence is clear and accurate. Points are presented in the context of the evaluation as a whole. The answer is well focused, organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured, 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.



**9 - 7 marks Good to average answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of at least one biological explanation. There is an attempt to present a balanced evaluation/analysis of the explanation/s. The answer is mostly focused on the question although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. Must include some evidence for 9 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.

**6 - 4 marks Average to poor answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of biological explanation/s. Answers in this band are likely to be mostly descriptive with some irrelevance and/or inaccuracy. Answers constituting reasonable description with minimal focus on the question are likely to be in this band. Must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks.

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

**3 - 1 marks Poor answers**

Answer must have some relevant content, perhaps fair description related to the question. There are probably substantial inaccuracies and/or irrelevance. A valid but extremely brief answer will come into this band.

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

0 marks      **No relevant content**

Total AO1 marks for topic: 8

Total AO2 marks for topic: 12

**Total marks for topic: 20**

**Stress and Stress Management**

**Total for this question: 20 marks**

**18** Explain **one** method the psychologist might use to measure Jayne's stress.  
(3 marks)

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 1,

**AO1** One mark for method identified plus one mark for further description of the method.  
Acceptable answers: physiological measures, eg hormone analysis via blood or urine samples, polygraph measure of arousal; self-report, eg SRRS (Homes and Rahe 1967) Life Events Scale or the Daily Hassles Scale (Kanner 1981), Life Events and Difficulties Schedule (Harris 1997); behavioural measures, eg insomnia, avoidance of stressful situation, eg absences from work, forgetfulness, making mistakes, etc.

**AO2** One mark for an explanation of how the measure used assesses stress. For example, the SRRS measures stress by self-report of experiences; physiological measures assess bodily changes that might occur with immediate or prolonged exposure to stressful situations.

**19** Distinguish between *problem-focused* and *emotion-focused* strategies for coping with stress. Give **one** example of **each** strategy that Jayne could use to help her deal with her stress at work.  
(5 marks)

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 3,

**AO1** One mark each for knowledge of terms. Problem focused - where strategy is aimed at changing situation that is causing the problem or controlling the stressor.  
Emotion focused - where strategy is aimed at managing the stress/distress rather than changing the situation, ie controlling the emotional response.

**AO2** One mark for clear distinction between the two strategies, ie one internal (emotion-focused) and one is both external and internal (problem-focused). Plus one mark each for a relevant example. Examples of problem-focused include: changing work routine; reducing work hours; monitoring own stress. Examples of emotion-focused include: use of humour to alleviate tension; going to the gym; relaxation techniques; taking medication.

**20** Describe and evaluate the role of social support in mediating responses to stress. Refer to evidence in your answer.  
(12 marks)

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8,

**AO1** Up to four marks for describing the role of social support in mediation of stress. Answers should demonstrate knowledge of models of social support: the main effect model refers to large social networks and structures, eg communities, marriage, family, membership of organisations, social roles, etc; the buffering model refers to interpersonal resources enabling functional support. Examples of buffering would include: provision of direct aid, eg loan, services etc (instrumental support); advice, feedback etc (informational support); a sense of self-worth through reassurance of others (esteem support). Credit description of relevant evidence one mark.

**AO2** Up to eight marks for evaluation. Answers should focus on the benefits or otherwise of social support and include use of evidence. Whilst several studies demonstrate the benefits of social support (eg Berkman and Syme 1979, Sosa et al 1980), some research suggests it can be negative, eg Kulik and Mahler 1989 showed faster recovery in heart patients who were unmarried compared to married patients whose spouses did not visit. More general issues include: quality as opposed to number of relationships; negative stresses of being exposed to problems of others in a support network; relationship between social support and other factors such as mastery (perception of own effectiveness) and intimacy. Credit discussion of gender differences (eg the tend and befriend response Taylor 2000) and cultural differences. Credit use of relevant evidence.

### Synopticity

In order to access the higher bands, candidates must demonstrate an understanding of the processes involved in formulating psychological theory, including the role of evidence, and how psychological theory provides a basis for the generation of further hypotheses. They should show an awareness of issues relating to validity, reliability and ethics, in relation to concepts, theory and individual pieces of research, and an understanding of the impact of psychological research, in this instance, in relation to coping with stress.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

### Mark Bands

#### 12 -10 marks **Excellent answers**

The role of social support is fully described, showing sound knowledge and understanding. Evaluation/analysis is balanced. Evidence is clear and accurate. Points are presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well focused, organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured, 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.

#### 9 - 7 marks **Good to average answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of the role of social support. There is an attempt to present a balanced evaluation/analysis. The answer is mostly focused on the question although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. Must include some evidence for 9 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.

6 - 4 marks **Average to poor answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of the role of social support. Answers in this band are likely to be mostly descriptive with some irrelevance and/or inaccuracy. Answers constituting reasonable description with minimal focus on the question are likely to be in this band. Must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks.

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

3 - 1 marks **Poor answers**

Answer must have some relevant content, perhaps fair description related to the question. There are probably substantial inaccuracies and/or irrelevance. A valid but extremely brief answer will come into this band.

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

0 marks **No relevant content**

Total AO1 marks for topic: 8

Total AO2 marks for topic: 12

**Total marks for topic: 20**

**Substance Abuse**

**Total for this question: 20 marks**

**21** Marsha knows she needs to give up smoking. She has been trying to smoke fewer cigarettes than usual for a number of weeks. Yesterday she did not have a single cigarette.

Outline the Prochaska model of behaviour change. Refer to Marsha in your answer.  
*(4 marks)*

**[AOI = 2, A02 = 2]**

**AOI** Up to two marks for knowledge of the Prochaska model. Credit reference to any of the following: spiral model allowing for relapse, includes five stages; pre-contemplation stage; contemplation stage; preparation stage; action stage; maintenance stage.

**A02** Up to two marks for linking the model to the stem. Accept any of the following up to two marks:

- she knows she needs to give up - contemplation stage
- she has been cutting down on cigarettes for a while - preparation stage
- she has not had a cigarette for a whole day - action stage.

**22** Briefly discuss aversion therapy as a treatment for substance abuse. *(4 marks)*

**[AOI = 2, A02 = 2]**

**AOI** Up to two marks for knowledge of aversion therapy. Credit any of the following: based on classical conditioning; involves pairing of an unpleasant stimulus with the undesired behaviour; leading to a learned avoidance of the undesired behaviour.

**A02** Up to two marks for discussion. Relevant points include: based on sound scientific principles; based on work with animals therefore generalisation may not be appropriate; beneficial effects are not always long-lasting; references to supporting or contradicting evidence. Candidates may gain full marks by reference to one of the above points or by brief mention of two points.

**23** Describe and evaluate **at least one** explanation for substance abuse. Refer to evidence in your answer. *(12 marks)*

**[AOI = 4, A02 = 8]**

**AOI** Up to four marks for knowledge of at least one explanation. Relevant explanations include: neurochemical explanations, eg the dopamine reward system, endogenous opioids; genetic factors; personality-based explanations, eg sensation seeking; social factors, eg peers and family influences. Credit descriptions of relevant evidence up to one mark.

**A02** Up to eight marks for evaluation and analysis. Relevant points will depend on explanation/s given but might include: reductionism of the biological explanations; the issue of determinism versus free will; scientific basis for the explanation; difficulty establishing cause and effect; the issue of nature-nurture; use of alternative explanations for comparison and evaluation; criticisms of methodology, eg use of twin studies/concordance studies. Credit use of relevant evidence.

## Synopticity

In order to access the higher bands, candidates must demonstrate an understanding of the processes involved in formulating psychological theory, including the role of evidence, and how psychological theory provides a basis for the generation of further hypotheses. They should show an awareness of issues relating to validity, reliability and ethics, in relation to concepts, theory and individual pieces of research, and an understanding of the impact of psychological research, in this instance, in relation to substance abuse.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

## Mark Bands

### 12 -10 marks **Excellent answers**

At least one explanation for substance abuse is fully described, showing sound knowledge and understanding. Evaluation/analysis is balanced. Evidence is clear and accurate. Points are presented in the context of the evaluation as a whole. The answer is well focused, organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured, 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.

### 9 - 7 marks **Good to average answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of at least one explanation for substance abuse. There is an attempt to present a balanced evaluation/analysis. The answer is mostly focused on the question although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. Must include some evidence for 9 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.

### 6 - 4 marks **Average to poor answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of at least one explanation for substance abuse. Answers in this band are likely to be mostly descriptive with some irrelevance and/or inaccuracy. Answers constituting reasonable description with minimal focus on the question are likely to be in this band. Must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks.

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

3 - 1 marks **Poor answers**

Answer must have some relevant content, perhaps fair description related to the question. There are probably substantial inaccuracies and/or irrelevance. A valid but extremely brief answer will come into this band.

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

0 marks            **No relevant content**

Total AO1 marks for topic: 8

Total AO2 marks for topic: 12

**Total marks for topic: 20**

**Forensic Psychology**

**Total for this question: 20 marks**

**24** Identify **two** methods which have been used to measure crime and give **one** limitation of each method. **(4 marks)**

**[AO1 = 2, A02 = 2]**

**AO1** Award one mark for each relevant method that is clearly identified. Likely answers: self-report studies, victimisation studies (surveys) and official statistics. Credit specific examples, such as the BCS (British Crime Survey).

**A02** One further mark each for a limitation of each method identified. Possible answers: self-report studies and victim surveys rely on accurate recall and honesty. Official statistics do not take account of crime that is not reported or not recorded.

**25** Briefly discuss **one** limitation of biological explanations of crime. **(4 marks)**

**[AO1 = 2, A02 = 2]**

**AO1** Award one mark for merely identifying a relevant limitation associated with biological explanations of crime. This could be a specific problem such as Lombroso's lack of a control group, or a general problem such as failure to recognise contribution of learning, implications for free-will, etc. Additional mark for outline of the problem cited.

**A02** Up to two marks for analysis/discussion of problem, eg Lombroso's research lacking scientific credibility, flawed methodologically, analysis of relevance/necessity of a control group for purposes of comparison, etc. For general problems, some discussion/explanation should be offered, eg problems with separating genetic contribution from that of environment.

**26** Mark has been in prison for five years. His criminal record shows several incidents of violent and aggressive behaviour. The prison authorities would like to identify strategies that might reduce or eliminate his antisocial behaviour.

Describe and evaluate **two** psychological treatment programmes which might be used with violent offenders. Refer to evidence in your answer. **(12 marks)**

**[AO1 = 4, A02 = 8]**

**AO1** Award one mark each for naming two relevant psychological treatment programmes (such as behaviour therapy, social skills training, anger management) and one additional mark each for providing a description of the technique. Alternatively, credit description of relevant evidence up to one mark.

**A02** Up to eight marks for application and analysis. This may include reference to broader issues of research in this area such as generalising techniques acquired to everyday situations, ethical aspects of behaviour modification, need for confidentiality, etc. May include criticism/evaluation of specific evidence, eg Hobbs and Holt's study of token economies and extent to which effects continue over time (once programme ends). Credit use of relevant evidence.



## Synopticity

In order to access the higher bands, candidates must demonstrate an understanding of the processes involved in formulating psychological treatment programmes and how psychological theory and evidence provides a basis for psychological practices in the field. They should show an awareness of issues relating to validity, reliability and ethics, in relation to concepts, theory, psychological practice and individual pieces of research, and an understanding of the impact of psychological research, in this instance, in relation to treating offending.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

**Maximum 7 marks if only one programme presented**

## Mark Bands

### 12 -10 marks **Excellent answers**

Two relevant psychological treatment programmes are thoroughly described. Evaluation is clearly demonstrated throughout the answer. The answer contains accurate and detailed reference to evidence. There is a well-focused and coherent argument and a good balance between the two techniques. Most of the answer is relevant with little misunderstanding.

The candidate expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured, 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.

### 9 - 7 marks **Good to average answers**

At the top end of this band, two psychological treatment programmes are presented and evaluated. For 9 marks, evidence must be presented. Answers at the bottom end of the band may be unbalanced, including any answers restricted to only one programme (max 7 marks). Most of the answer will present a focused evaluation, although there may be some irrelevancies or misunderstandings.

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.

### 6 - 4 marks **Average to poor answers**

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of the area. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band are likely to be mostly descriptive and there is likely to be irrelevance and/or inaccuracy. Answers constituting reasonable description with minimal focus on the question are likely to be in this band.

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

3 - 1 marks **Poor answers**

Answer must have some relevant content, perhaps fair description related to the question. There are probably substantial inaccuracies and/or irrelevance. A valid but extremely brief, perhaps unfinished answer will come into this band.

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

0 marks            **No relevant content**

Total AO1 marks for topic: 8

Total AO2 marks for topic: 12

**Total marks for topic: 20**

**Specimen Paper**  
**Revised Specification PYB**  
**PSYB3**

**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE GRID**

<b>Question</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>	<b>Total</b>
01			3	
02	3	2		
03	4	8		20
04			3	
05	3			
06		2		
07	4	8		20
08	1	1		
09			3	
10	2	1		
11	4	8		20
12	2	2		
13	2	2		
14	4	8		20
15	2	2		
16	2	2		
17	4	8		20
18	2	1		
19	2	3		
20	4	8		20
21	2	2		
22	2	2		
23	4	8		20
24	2	2		
25	2	2		
26	4	8		20
QWC				3
Total				63