



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

Psychology A

PSYA4

(Specification 2180)

**Unit 4: Psychopathology, Psychology in Action
and Research Methods**

Post-Standardisation

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

PSYA4: Psychopathology, Psychology in Action and Research Methods

SECTION A PSYCHOPATHOLOGY

Question 01

AO1 = 5 marks

Candidates are likely to describe symptoms included in the ICD or DSM manuals eg: thought control, delusions, hallucinatory voices, other persistent hallucinations, incoherent/irrelevant speech, catatonic behaviour, negative symptoms (such as lack of drive/motivation, flat affect, inappropriate emotional response and sudden mood swings). Clinical characteristics of schizophrenia could also legitimately include factors such as the prevalence, course and outcome of the disorder. However, causal explanations and evaluative commentary, for example, on the difficulty of diagnosis, are not creditworthy. Similarly, the identification of different types of schizophrenia is not creditworthy unless the characteristics of these different types are described.

Examiners should bear in mind that the allocation of marks for this question is only 5 and that it is unreasonable to expect very detailed and lengthy answers.

Breadth vs depth – candidates can get up to full marks with the characteristics of one type of schizophrenia, but there must be more than one characteristic.

AO1 Mark bands

5 - 4 marks Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent
3 - 2 marks Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent
1 mark Outline is weak and muddled or very limited.
0 marks No creditworthy material

Question 02

AO1 = 4 marks

Candidates are required to provide an outline of **one** psychological explanation of schizophrenia. Where candidates provide more than one explanation, examiners should credit the best account. Descriptions of biological explanations are not creditworthy. Socio-cultural explanations are included in the specification as examples of psychological explanations and are perfectly acceptable here. Answers are most likely to focus on one of the following explanations:

- psychodynamic (including family systems theory)
- cognitive
- behavioural

Candidates could also legitimately outline the role of expressed emotion in schizophrenia or refer to the social drift hypothesis. However, in both cases, they are more relevant to explaining the maintenance of schizophrenia rather than its origins so candidates might find it difficult to access full marks here.

An outline of the diathesis-stress explanation is acceptable provided the candidates emphasise the psychological aspect.

Evaluation of explanations receives no credit.

AO1 Mark bands

4 marks Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent
3 - 2 marks Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent
1 mark Outline is weak and muddled or very limited.
0 marks No creditworthy material

Question 03

AO2/AO3 = 16 marks

Candidates are required to provide an evaluation of psychological explanations of schizophrenia. The question refers to **explanations** in the plural since it could be difficult for candidates to provide sufficient evaluative material on a single psychological explanation for full marks. However, given that evaluative points are often relevant to more than one explanation, no partial performance criteria apply for this question.

Candidates can legitimately refer to biological explanations but answers will only gain credit where the material is clearly used to offer commentary on the worth of psychological explanations. Detailed descriptions of biological explanations cannot gain credit. Similarly, detailed descriptions of psychological explanations cannot gain credit – the focus in this part of the question is on evaluation.

The evaluation can be both positive and negative:

One criticism of psychodynamic theory, for example, is that it places responsibility on mothers. The behavioural explanation is criticised, for example, because it is hard to accept that the bizarre and complex patterns of behaviour seen in people with schizophrenia can be acquired through simple learning processes; the cognitive explanation can be criticised for being descriptive rather than explanatory.

More general evaluations that apply to most psychological explanations include the following: none of them can adequately account for the indisputable fact that schizophrenia runs in families and that the increased risk is directly associated with the degree of relatedness. There is a lack of strong empirical evidence to support the psychological explanations and there is also a problem of disentangling cause and effect (eg does faulty thinking cause schizophrenia or vice versa?). It is also legitimate to refer to therapies ie that treatments arising from psychodynamic and behavioural explanations appear to have little therapeutic effect in schizophrenia.

Another general point concerns the diversity of symptoms found in people diagnosed either with schizophrenia or a sub-type of schizophrenia – it may be the case, for example, that some explanations can account for certain symptoms better than others.

Candidates might also use the diathesis-stress model as a way of reconciling biological and psychological explanations.

AO2/AO3 Mark bands

16 - 13 marks Effective

Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding.
The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.
Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

12 - 9 marks Reasonable

Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding.
The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident.
Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

8-5 marks Basic

Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding.
The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration.
Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

4-1 marks Rudimentary

Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding.
The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and maybe mainly irrelevant.
Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

0 marks

No creditworthy material is presented.

Question 04

AO1 = 9 marks

Candidates are required to outline **at least two** psychological therapies for depression. They gain no credit for descriptions of biological therapies. Examiners should be mindful of a depth-breadth trade-off in answers. Answers focusing on two therapies require more depth than answers which outline three or more therapies.

Answers which outline only one therapy are subject to partial performance criteria.

Appropriate psychological therapies include:

- psychoanalysis
- behavioural therapy
- cognitive-behavioural therapy (it would be acceptable to outline two different types of CBT for full marks but there is a breadth/depth trade-off here)
- interpersonal therapy

AO2/AO3 = 16 marks

Candidates are required to evaluate at least two psychological therapies. Where only one is evaluated, partial performance criteria apply.

Evaluations will vary depending on the therapies chosen although some evaluations are relevant to more than one therapy. Generic evaluation of the underpinning theory is only creditworthy where the candidate makes it relevant to the therapy. Where no such link is made, it is rudimentary. Very limited statements such as 'Freud based his therapy on middle-class, Viennese women' are basic and do not show sound analysis or understanding.

Candidates are likely to evaluate therapies in terms of their appropriateness and effectiveness. Evaluation must be relevant to therapies in the context of depression.

Biological therapies are only creditworthy if used as part of a sustained commentary on the chosen psychological therapies.

Issues of appropriateness could include:

- factors affecting the choice of treatment e.g. financial constraints, availability/accessibility of appropriate therapist, accuracy of original diagnosis
- ethical issues e.g. possible harmful side-effects, issues of informed consent

Issues of effectiveness could include:

- problems of measuring effectiveness e.g. when to measure, how to measure, what criteria to choose
- wide range of symptoms/severity treatments might be effective for some types of depression but not others
- placebo effects

AO1 Mark bands

9 – 8 marks Sound	Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed. A good range of relevant material has been selected. There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent
7 - 5 marks Reasonable	Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed. A range of relevant material has been selected. There is evidence of breadth and/or depth Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent. <i>Partial performance is sound, accurate and well detailed</i> <i>N.B. (max. 6 marks)</i>
4 - 3 marks Basic	Knowledge and understanding are basic/relatively superficial. A restricted range of material has been presented. Organisation and structure of the answer are basic. <i>Partial performance is reasonable and generally accurate</i>
2 - 1 marks Rudimentary	Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be muddled and/or inaccurate. The material presented may be very brief or largely irrelevant. Lacks organisation and structure. <i>Partial performance is basic.</i>
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

AO2/AO3 Mark bands

16 - 13 marks Effective

Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding.
The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument.
Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

12 - 9 marks Reasonable

Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding.
The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident.
Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.
Partial performance demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. It is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument (max. 10 marks).

8 - 5 marks Basic

Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding.
The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration.
Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.
Partial performance demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. It is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident.

4-1 marks Rudimentary

Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding.
The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant.
Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.
Partial performance demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. It is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration.

0 marks

No creditworthy material is presented.

Question 05

AO1 = 5 marks

The outline might include:

- physiological, behavioural, emotional and cognitive signs/symptoms
- incidence and prevalence
- course and prognosis

Examiners should be mindful that this part of the question is only worth 5 marks and so candidates are not expected to cover all these points to access the top marks. However, top band answers should refer to some diagnostic criteria – in particular there must be some reference to the underlying anxiety that characterises these anxiety disorders. It is acceptable to refer to different types of phobia but these distinctions on their own are not creditworthy – they must be accompanied by a description of the characteristics of each type.

AO1 Mark bands

5 - 4 marks Outline is accurate and coherent
3 - 2 marks Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent
1 mark Outline is weak and muddled or very limited
0 marks No creditworthy material

Question 06

AO2/AO3 = 10 marks

There is a requirement for an explanation of at least two issues. Although some issues are relevant to all types of psychological disorder, candidates must explicitly address at least some of the issues in the context of an anxiety disorder to access the top mark band. Examiners should be mindful of a depth/breadth trade-off here.

Likely issues could include:

- classification systems are based on the medical model – leads to pathologizing of psychological disorders
- different classification systems have different criteria
- validity of diagnostic categories
- reliability of diagnosis across clinicians
- biases in diagnosis (e.g. gender, cultural)
- overlap with other disorders
- labelling and stigmatising

AO2/AO3 Mark bands

<p>10 – 9 marks Effective</p>	<p>Explanation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration and/or a clear line of argument. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</p>
<p>8 - 6 marks Reasonable</p>	<p>Explanation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration and/or a line of argument is evident. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning. <i>Partial performance is effective and demonstrates sound analysis and understanding (max 7 marks).</i></p>
<p>5 - 3 marks Basic</p>	<p>Explanation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive. <i>Partial performance is reasonable and demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding.</i></p>
<p>2 - 1 marks Rudimentary</p>	<p>Explanation is rudimentary demonstrating very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and incomplete. Material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive. <i>Partial performance demonstrates basic, superficial understanding.</i></p>
<p>0 marks</p>	<p>No creditworthy material is presented.</p>

Question 07

AO1 = 4 marks

Outline of one psychological explanation for either phobic disorder or OCD

Candidates are likely to describe psychoanalytic, behavioural, social learning or cognitive-behavioural explanations. Answers outlining preparedness theory are acceptable even though this theory has biological elements. Examiners should bear in mind that there are only 4 marks available for AO1 material in this part of the question.

Where candidates outline more than one explanation, both should be marked and the best account credited.

AO2/AO3 = 6 marks

The requirement in this question is to evaluate the explanation outlined for AO1 credit. Material on other explanations is only creditworthy if clearly used as commentary on the chosen explanation.

The nature of the evaluation depends on the chosen explanation but it is likely to focus on the quality of research evidence related to the explanation. Candidates might also consider whether some explanations (eg behavioural) might be better at explaining the maintenance rather than the origin of the disorder. A discussion of the effectiveness of an associated therapy could also be creditworthy if clearly linked to the underpinning explanation. Generic evaluation which is not clearly related to the particular disorder (eg Freud based his theory on middle class women) shows very limited understanding.

AO1 Mark bands

4 marks Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent
3 - 2 marks Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent
1 mark Outline is weak and muddled or very limited
0 marks No creditworthy material

AO2/AO3 Mark bands

6 marks Effective	Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. Application of knowledge is effective and shows coherent elaboration. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
5 - 4 marks Reasonable	Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. Application of knowledge is reasonably effective and shows some elaboration. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.
3 - 2 marks Basic	Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding. Application of knowledge is basic. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.
1 mark Rudimentary	Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding. Application of knowledge is weak, muddled and may be mainly irrelevant. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.
0 marks	No creditworthy material is presented.

SECTION B PSYCHOLOGY IN ACTION

Media Psychology

Question 08

AO1 = 4 marks for outline of one explanation

Any appropriate explanation can be credited. The most likely explanation is social modelling (SLT). This suggests that people use others as models to regulate their own behaviour and to learn new things. People (particularly children) imitate models that they see portrayed on television or in other forms of media. Imitation is more likely if the observer identifies with the model in some way, if the context in which the behaviour is observed is realistic and if the model is rewarded. Programmes such as Sesame Street include many situations and characters designed to provide pro-social models for children. Some text books refer to The General Learning Model (GLM) (Buckley and Anderson, 2006) so it is likely that some candidates will use this in their answer.

The question asks for an explanation not a theory or approach so answers which focus on factors such as empathy, parental support etc are perfectly acceptable provided the explanation is in the context of media influence.

This question refers to pro-social behaviour and requires an outline of an explanation rather than supporting studies. Straight descriptions of Bandura's Bobo doll study are, therefore, unlikely to attract credit.

AO1 Mark bands

4 marks Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent
3 - 2 marks Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent
1 mark Outline is weak and muddled or very limited
0 marks No creditworthy material

AO2/AO3 = 4 marks for evaluation of the explanation

The evaluation will obviously depend on the particular explanation chosen. Evaluation can be specific eg a criticism of SLT is that research has shown that exposure to filmed models has less effect than to real-life models and also that the effect is often not generalised to new settings. It is equally acceptable for the evaluation to be rather more general eg in terms of the practical and ethical problems of carrying out research to support the explanation.

There is no requirement for candidates to consider both strengths and limitations of the explanation.

AO2/AO3 Mark bands

4 marks Effective	Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
3 marks Reasonable	Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.
2 marks Basic	Evaluation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.
1 mark Rudimentary	Evaluation is rudimentary demonstrating very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and may be mainly irrelevant. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.
0 marks	No creditworthy material is presented.

Question 09

AO2/AO3 = 4 marks

2 marks for explanation of appropriate methodological issue

2 marks for explanation of appropriate ethical issue

Methodological issues are most likely to arise from the use of questionnaires eg their reliability/ validity, poor response rate associated with sending back questionnaires leading to biased sample, demand characteristics etc. Reference to problems with correlational research should be credited.

Ethical issues are most likely to surround confidentiality and consent. Protection from harm is also a possible issue in that this is a rather sensitive area and the results of the questionnaire could be distressing for the participants and they might need some support/ counselling.

Simply naming an issue is only credit worthy if the issue is made relevant to the study.

'Poor response rate' = 0 marks

'The use of questionnaires could cause problems in this study because people often do not send them back' = 1 mark

One problem with using questionnaires is that people often do not send them back. This means that the sample is biased.' = 2 marks

Question 10
AO1 = 5 marks

There are several ways to achieve AO1 marks. One is to take a theoretical approach so that candidates focus on one or more explanations of how television has influenced personal and social attitudes over time. Candidates who do this could offer an explanation such as uses and gratifications theory, cultivation theory, social learning theory. It is also likely that candidates will outline the Hovland-Yale model of persuasion or the elaboration likelihood model. Another legitimate approach is to take one aspect of television and explain how it works to persuade the viewer. In this case candidates are most likely to focus on the influence of television advertising, perhaps including behavioural and/or cognitive mechanisms.

Explanations of persuasion with no reference to television are 'weak and muddled' and can gain no more than one mark.

Examiners should bear in mind that this part of the question is only worth 5 marks so should not expect great length or detail.

AO1 Mark bands

5 – 4 marks Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent
3 - 2 marks Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent
1 mark Outline is weak and muddled or very limited
0 marks No creditworthy material

AO2/AO3 = 8 marks

Evaluation will depend on the explanation(s) outlined for AO1 marks. Evaluation can take the form of studies which relate to particular explanation; methodological/ ethical criticisms of studies; contrast/comparison of one explanation with another. Examiners should be prepared to credit any material which specifically evaluates explanations for the effectiveness of television in persuasion.

If evaluation is generic and not applied to TV then the answer would not rise above the basic band.

AO2/3 Mark bands

8-7 marks Effective

Evaluation demonstrates sound analysis and understanding.
Application of knowledge is effective and shows coherent elaboration.
Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

6-5 marks Reasonable

Evaluation demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding.
Application of knowledge is reasonably effective and shows some elaboration.
Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

4-3 marks Basic

Analysis and evaluation demonstrate basic, superficial understanding.
Application of knowledge is basic.
Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

2-1 mark Rudimentary

Analysis and evaluation is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding.
Application of knowledge is weak, muddled and may be mainly irrelevant.
Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

0 marks

No creditworthy material is presented.

Question 11

AO1 = 4 marks

Answers should focus clearly on **maintenance** of an identifiable addictive behaviour.
Candidates can interpret the biological model as an umbrella term or they can focus on one particular biological explanation of maintenance eg genetic or neurochemical ie they can choose to outline one in detail or more than one in less detail. Candidates who outline biological explanations of maintenance for more than one addictive behaviour should have the best one credited.

Answers that refer to addiction in general, maximum 3 marks.

AO1 Mark bands

4 marks

Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent

3 - 2 marks

Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent

1 mark

Outline is weak and muddled or very limited

0 marks

No creditworthy material

AO2/3 = 4 marks

Candidates may choose to evaluate specific explanations or offer a more general evaluation of biological explanations of the maintenance of an addictive behaviour. Answers need to relate to a particular addictive behaviour although reference to other behaviours is creditworthy if used as sustained commentary/comparison.

AO2 Mark bands

4 marks Answer demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding
3 - 2 marks Answer demonstrates basic analysis and understanding.
1 mark Answer is rudimentary demonstrating very limited understanding.
0 marks No creditworthy material

Question 12

AO2/3 = 4 marks

Candidates are likely to explain this in terms of social learning theory. For full marks, they need to explain why young people are likely to copy observed behaviour in films. For example, in terms of the attractiveness/likeability of the actors or the characters they play; positive outcomes etc.

Candidates might refer to research that has specifically focused on the influence of film eg Gunakesera et al (2005), Dalton et al (2003), Distefan et al (1999).

Answers which make no reference to psychological studies or theories cannot exceed 2 marks.

AO2 Mark bands

4 marks Answer demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding
3 - 2 marks Answer demonstrates basic analysis and understanding.
1 mark Answer is rudimentary demonstrating very limited understanding.
0 marks No creditworthy material

Question 13

AO1 = 5 marks

Types of intervention included on the specification are: Biological, psychological, public health interventions and legislation. It is acceptable for candidates to describe one type of intervention in a general way or in the context of a particular type of addiction eg smoking. Examiners should be mindful that there are only 5 AO1 marks available for this part of the question so should not expect too much detail. If candidates offer more than one intervention, credit the best one.

AO1 Mark bands

5 – 4 marks Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent
3 - 2 marks Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent
1 mark Outline is weak and muddled or very limited
0 marks No creditworthy material

AO2/3 = 8 marks

The evaluation/commentary depends on the type of intervention chosen. Candidates are likely to focus on the effectiveness of each type of intervention since this is required on the specification, but any appropriate commentary is creditworthy. Candidates can gain credit by referring to other types of intervention provided that they do so as part of a sustained commentary on their chosen intervention. They might also gain credit by considering some of the ethical and/or practical implications.

AO2/AO3 Mark band

8-7 marks Effective

Evaluation/discussion demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. The answer is well focused and shows coherent elaboration. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

6-5 marks Reasonable

Evaluation/discussion demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. The answer is generally focused and shows reasonable elaboration. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.

4-3 marks Basic

Discussion demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. The answer is sometimes focused and shows some evidence of elaboration. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.

2-1 mark Rudimentary

Discussion is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding. The answer is weak, muddled and may be mainly irrelevant. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.

0 marks

No creditworthy material is presented.

Question 14

AO1 = 5 marks

Candidates should refer to research findings/conclusions to access top marks. A straightforward list of relevant personality factors would be limited to 2 marks. However, candidates do not necessarily have to remember the names of the researchers attached to particular pieces of research. Although the question asks for research findings, candidates can access the top mark band by describing the findings from a single study provide there is sufficient detail. Candidates are likely to cite research outlined in the major A level text books. For example, Tobacyk et al (1988) have found a link between locus of control, superstitious behaviour and paranormal belief; Kumar et al (1993) found that sensation-seeking personality scores were related to both a greater paranormal belief and a greater number of reported paranormal experiences; Gianotti et al (2001) found a high positive correlation between belief in the paranormal and creative personality (specifically, they found that people with high paranormal belief generated more original words in word task than other people).

Fantasy proneness has been shown to correlate with paranormal belief (e.g. Irwin, 1991). Ramakrishna (2001), in a study of adolescents, found a link between certain personality characteristics and good performance on ESP tasks. Also, extroverts scored better at ESP than introverts.

A number of studies have shown a link between schizotypy and paranormal beliefs (eg Goulding 2005). It is arguable whether a psychological disorder can be regarded as a personality factor, but this research does appear in some textbooks under the heading of 'personality factors' so examiners should credit this.

AO1 Mark bands

5 – 4 marks Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent
3 - 2 marks Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent
1 mark Outline is weak and muddled or very limited
0 marks No creditworthy material

Question 15

AO2/3 = 3 marks

There is considerable evidence (eg review by French (1992) that belief in the paranormal is higher in people with some sort of 'cognitive deficit'. One particular cognitive ability to attract attention in this context is syllogistic reasoning (eg Wierzbicki (1985)). Although, findings are mixed, there has been general support for the idea that people who believe in the paranormal do worse on such tasks than other people. There is also some evidence that believers are less familiar with scientific principles and are less able to see the flaws in poorly designed experiments than others.

1 mark for a brief reference to relevant research. Two further marks for elaboration.

Question 16

AO2/3 = 2 + 2 marks

Two marks for an understanding of the concepts of 'a reliable and well-validated scale.
'It is a consistent scale' = 1 mark 'It measures what it says it is measuring' = 1 mark
'If the scale was given to the same group of people on another occasion, the results would be very similar. The scale measures what it says it measures' = 2 marks

Two marks for an explanation of why it is important. The concept of belief in the paranormal is not entirely clear and there is no obvious way of testing it. There is some evidence that the beliefs of the experimenter can be important in influencing the outcome of studies into the paranormal it is, therefore, important that measuring tools are independently assessed to apply a scientific approach to investigate an areas whose scientific status has been questioned. It is not necessary to address both reliability and validity in this part of the question

Question 17

AO2/3 = 3 marks

There are many cognitive factors that candidates could choose to use here, for example confirmation bias, causal attributions, false probability. Candidates do not have to link this factor to any particular anomalous belief, but in so far as doing so might clarify an explanation, they can receive credit for this.

1 mark for identification of a factor, 2 further marks for how it is linked.

Question 18

AO1 = 4 marks

The specification is clear in its requirement for candidates to have an understanding of methodological issues in the study of anomalous experience. A wide range of issues can be selected, for example, the problem of experimental control, the role of the experimenter (for, example, the problem of experimenter bias or psi inhibition), differences in analysis and reporting. It is important that examiners credit only those points that apply as methodological issues.

Although many issues are common and are, therefore acceptable, candidates should focus on issues which apply to psychokinesis rather than its related phenomenon, ESP. Issues that only relate to ESP are not creditworthy.

AO1 Mark bands

4 marks Outline is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent
3 - 2 marks Outline is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent
1 mark Outline is weak and muddled or very limited
0 marks No creditworthy material

AO2/3 = 6 marks

Candidates can address this aspect of the question in a number of ways. They can, for instance, consider the adequacy of attempts to deal with methodological issues, including examples of research, or even question the extreme methodological restraints placed on research in this area compared to other fields of psychological research.

There is no partial performance on this question – answers which only address one issue are likely to be limited and basic.

AO2/3 Mark bands

6 marks Effective	Commentary demonstrates sound analysis and understanding. Application of knowledge is effective and shows coherent elaboration. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology. Appropriate use of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
5 - 4 marks Reasonable	Commentary demonstrates reasonable analysis and understanding. Application of knowledge is reasonably effective and shows some elaboration. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology. Minor errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling only occasionally compromise meaning.
3 - 2 marks Basic	Commentary demonstrate basic, superficial understanding. Application of knowledge is basic. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are intrusive.
1 mark Rudimentary	Commentary is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding. Application of knowledge is weak, muddled and may be mainly irrelevant. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling are frequent and intrusive.
0 marks	No creditworthy material is presented.

SECTION C PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND SCIENTIFIC METHOD

Question Stem

A teacher has worked in the same primary school for two years. While chatting to the children, she is concerned to find that the majority of them come to school without having eaten a healthy breakfast. In her opinion, children who eat 'a decent breakfast' learn to read more quickly and are better behaved than children who do not. She now wants to set up a pre-school breakfast club for the children so that they can all have this beneficial start to the day. The local authority is not willing to spend money on this project purely on the basis of the teacher's opinion and insists on having scientific evidence for the claimed benefits of eating a healthy breakfast.

Question 19

AO2/3 = 6 marks

Candidates need to show that they understand what differentiates opinion from scientific evidence. They could mention some of the following:

- The teacher has only experienced one school in a particular catchment area so she has only observed a very limited number of 5 year-olds (issues of sampling and replicability).
- She has found out that children do not eat anything nourishing simply by chatting with the children. She has no corroborative evidence from eg parents (issues of objectivity).
- She uses vague phrases such as 'decent breakfast' without being clear what this means (operationalisation).
- She has generated a theory and made predictions based on flimsy evidence.
- She has not used any scientific method to lead to her conclusions eg a carefully controlled experiment, survey or observation.
- She has drawn conclusions about the effects of breakfast without considering other variables which might affect reading skills and behaviour.

AO2/3 Mark bands

6 marks Effective	Explanation demonstrates sound understanding. Application of knowledge is effective and shows coherent elaboration. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently. Consistently effective use of psychological terminology.
5 - 4 marks Reasonable	Explanation demonstrates reasonable understanding. Application of knowledge is reasonably effective and shows some elaboration. Most ideas appropriately structured and expressed clearly. Appropriate use of psychological terminology.
3 - 2 marks Basic	Explanation demonstrates basic, superficial understanding. Application of knowledge is basic. Expression of ideas lacks clarity. Limited use of psychological terminology.
1 mark Rudimentary	Explanation is rudimentary, demonstrating very limited understanding. Application of knowledge is weak, muddled and may be mainly irrelevant. Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity. The answer lacks structure, often merely a series of unconnected assertions.
0 marks	No creditworthy material is presented.

Question Stem

A psychologist at the local university agrees to carry out a study to investigate the claim that eating a healthy breakfast improves reading skills. He has access to 400 five-year-olds from ten local schools, and decides to use 100 children (50 in experimental group and 50 in the control group). Since the children are so young, he needs to obtain parental consent for them to take part in his study.

Question 20

AO2/3 =3 marks

In a random sample, every member of the identified population has an equal chance of selection. In this case, the sampling frame consists of the 400 five-year-old children attending ten local schools. In order to obtain a simple random sample, the researcher has to have the names of all 400 children and can then select using one of the following methods:

- **Random number tables** – random number tables are specially devised to meet the following criteria – they contain strings of numbers where each number has the same chance of being selected as any other and each number is independent of the others. Such tables are readily available in statistics text books etc or can be generated by the researcher using a computer program. The researcher assigns each child a number between 1 and 400. He enters the table at any place (he could close his eyes and point with a finger at a starting place) and then moves either horizontally or vertically to produce a string of random numbers. He records all the numbers which correspond to the 400 children until he has recorded a total of 100 non-duplicated numbers.
- **Computer selection** – This is a similar method where the computer does most of the work. A computer can generate an endless string of random numbers ie numbers which have no relationship to one another as a sequence. Each child's name is given a number and a random number generator program is used to produce the required sample size (in this case 100 participants).
- **Manual selection** - Using this method, the researcher has to put each name (or an assigned number) on a separate slip of paper and place them all in a container. The researcher then selects 100 slips from the container. The following conditions could apply: the container should be shaken between each draw; the slips of paper should all be the same size and folded in the same way so that one does not feel different from another; the selector draws 'blind' ie cannot see the actual slips of paper.

A simple definition of a random sample is not creditworthy since it offers no explanation. Similarly, answers which only use the word 'random' as an explanation cannot gain credit eg 'He would choose 100 participants at random from the children. One mark for a very basic method eg 'he would take names from a hat/ computer/ random number table'. Two further marks for elaboration.

Question 21

AO2/3 = 3 marks

Candidates could focus on:

- Even if a sample is random, it may not be truly representative of the population eg might all come from the same school, or be all boys or all girls.
- Practical limitations eg the time and effort needed to write out 400 slips for the manual method.
- Difficulties of obtaining a truly random sample eg even if the sample is selected randomly, parents might refuse to allow their children to participate.

Any plausible and appropriate answers should be credited.

Up to 2 marks for identification of limitations. For 3 marks, one or more limitations must be explained in reasonable detail.

Question 22

AO2/3 = 5 marks

There are two requirements to this question, **why** operationalising variables is important and **how** to operationalise the IV and the DV. If a candidate only explains **how/why**, maximum 3 marks.

The terms 'decent breakfast' and 'reading skills' are vague. It is important from the point of view of objectivity, replicability and control of extraneous variables to make sure that these terms are closely defined.

Suggestions as to how the psychologist might do this could include the following:

The researcher needs to specify the exact composition of the breakfast (possibly by doing a pilot study or a literature search to identify the components of breakfast most likely to bring about behavioural/cognitive change). He probably also needs to specify the time at which it is consumed. The researcher needs to use a standard reading test which should be administered to all the participants at the beginning of the study and at the end – the dependent variable is likely to be the improvement score.

Question 23

AO2/3 = 2 marks

Reasons are:

- a test of difference
- data (scores from a reading test) are at least ordinal, this would include ordinal/interval and/or ratio
- independent design

One mark for each appropriate reason (maximum 2 marks).

Question 24

AO2/3 = 2 marks

It would have been more difficult to use a matched-pairs design because of the number of relevant factors that would need to be controlled (eg gender, intelligence, parental attitudes/income/education, experience of pre-school education, number of siblings in family etc). There is a relatively small pool of children available (ie 400) and it could be difficult to match on all these factors. It would also be very time-consuming; it could be quite expensive to carry out the necessary surveys; it could be quite intrusive collecting such information from parents.

One mark for a basic explanation eg “Because it is difficult to match participants appropriately”.

One further mark for elaboration.

Question 25

AO2/3 = 2 marks

One mark for identifying an appropriate issue and second mark for explaining how it could be addressed.

The most likely issue is confidentiality which could be addressed by ensuring that all scores on reading scales and all personal information are anonymised.

There are also ethical problems involved in denying the control group breakfast although it is more difficult for candidates to suggest a way of addressing this – perhaps to put only those children into the control group who do not eat breakfast anyway, restricting the study length to a short period of time and, if the study results support the hypothesis, to provide free breakfasts to these children for the rest of the academic year.

Parental consent is excluded because it is given in the stem so answers which offer this as an issue cannot gain credit.

Question 26

AO3 = 12 marks

Question Stem

The psychologist asks some of his students to conduct a separate observational study at the same time on the same group of children. The aim of this observational study is to test the idea that eating a healthy breakfast affects behaviour.

Design should be written clearly, succinctly and with sufficient detail for reasonable replicability.

Candidates will not receive credit for details included in the stimulus material. These include using a random sample of 100 children, gaining parental consent and selection of a Mann Whitney test.

To access marks in the top band candidates must state an appropriate hypothesis in which “playground behaviour” is clearly operationalised. The hypothesis could be directional or non-directional.

Given the wording of the question, a correlational hypothesis is not credit worthy, however, the rest of the answer should be marked on its merits.

Likely aspects of “playground behaviour” would include activity levels, aggression, co-operative play etc.

An attempt to operationalise “a healthy breakfast” should be credited. However, candidates could assume this had already been done by the psychologist.

As this is an observational study any of the following, together with appropriate justification, would be credit-worthy:-

Is the observation covert or overt?

Where are observers positioned? (In playground, watching from window?)

Is a video recording of the children used? How will this be analysed (eg content analysis)?

Do the students who observe know what the children ate for breakfast?

At what times of day does the observation take place?

How many children are observed? (Candidates could justify using a smaller sub-sample of the 100 children in the original study)

How long does each observation last?

Will the observers use a behavioural check list/tally chart?

Will more than one observer observe each child? If so, what training will be given and what checks for inter-observer reliability will take place?

Reference to time sampling or event sampling.

Credit any other relevant material.

AO2/3 Mark bands

<p>12-10 marks Effective design A design that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of observational research. The selection and application of research techniques is appropriate. The description provides sufficient detail for most aspects of the study to be implemented. Some design decisions are justified effectively.</p>
<p>9-7 marks Reasonable design The design is reasonable and demonstrates knowledge and understanding of some aspects of observational research. The selection and application of research techniques is mostly appropriate. The description provides sufficient detail for some aspects of the study to be implemented. Some design decisions are justified.</p>
<p>6-4marks Basic design The design is basic and demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of aspects of observational research. The selection and application of research techniques are sometimes appropriate. Some basic design decisions/features of the study are described but there may be significant omissions, lack of clarity and possibly some implausible suggestions that severely limit implementation. Justifications of the design are limited.</p>
<p>3-1 marks Rudimentary design The design is rudimentary. Design decisions are muddled and or mostly inappropriate and are not justified. Description lacks clarity. The study could not be implemented.</p>
<p>0 marks No creditworthy material.</p>

Mark bands should be used on the basis of 'best fit'.