



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

Psychology B

PSYB2

(Specification 2185)

**Unit 2: Individual Differences, Social
Psychology and Cognitive Psychology**

Final

Mark Scheme

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

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

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

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Section A Social Psychology

Topic: Social Influence

Question 01 [AO3 = 3]

One mark for identifying independent measures/groups/samples/unrelated design.

Up to 2 marks for an explanation of any relevant advantage of using this design in this study.
1 mark for an advantage, 1 mark for application to the study.

Possible answer:

As participants will either be approached by a confederate wearing uniform or a confederate in everyday clothing/as participants only take part in one condition (1), they are unlikely to guess the aim of the study/there are no order effects (1).

One mark can be awarded for an advantage that corresponds to an incorrectly identified design.

Question 02 [AO3 = 2]

Independent variable: whether the researcher was dressed in everyday clothing or a uniform/type of clothing.

Dependent variable: whether participants pick up litter/obey (or not) / the number of people who picked up a piece of litter.

No credit for “obedience” or “level of obedience” or “amount of obedience”.

- Award both marks for correct IV and DV that are not labelled but are in the order of the question.
- Award 1 mark for correct IV and DV that are not labelled and are not in the order of the question ie DV then IV.
- No credit for either IV or DV **alone** (if not labelled).

Question 03 [AO1 = 1, AO2 = 2]

AO1 1 mark for knowledge of likely outcome:
More people will pick up litter in Condition B than in Condition A / fewer people will pick up litter in Condition A than in Condition B.

AO2 2 marks for an explanation of the results based on application of obedience research to the scenario.

Possible answer: the confederate’s uniform (1), increased the legitimacy/authority/status of the demands or order given (1) or similar. Credit use of evidence as part of the explanation eg Bickman, Milgram.

Question 04

[AO2 = 1, AO3 = 1]

AO2 1 mark for plausible application of the issue to the study.

AO3 1 mark for knowledge/identification of a relevant ethical issue. Likely issues: (lack of) consent, opportunity to withdraw, deception, treating people with respect, protection from harm, confidentiality, debriefing.

Possible answer: An ethical issue in the study is lack of consent (1) because the researcher did not ask the participants if they wanted to be in the study (1).

Question 05

[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

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

AO1 Up to 5 marks for elaboration (not naming/identification) of factors. Likely factors: group size, unanimity / size of majority, task difficulty, presence of another dissenter, presence of another dissenter who then begins to conform, opinion expressed in public (rather than in private), fear of ridicule, perceived competence of other members, personality of individual, self-esteem, culture, gender. Credit description of effect of factors on conformity levels – 1 mark per factor.
Maximum of 1 mark for a list of factors only.
Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks (both marks may be awarded for accurate detail of one study).
Likely studies: Sherif (1935), Asch (1951), Crutchfield (1954).

AO2 Up to 5 marks for discussion of the factors. Explanation of why factor increases or decreases conformity eg increased/decreased normative pressure/likelihood of compliance, increased/decreased likelihood of informational influence/internalisation; the implications of evidence / use of evidence specifically to support or refute influence of stated factors eg detail of Asch variations. Discussion of the wider implications of the factors eg in real life conforming situations (maximum 1 mark per factor). Comparison of relative power of factors. Credit evaluation of the methodology of studies only when made relevant to discussion of the factors.

Maximum 6 marks – only one factor

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of at least two factors that affect conformity. The discussion/analysis is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum 6 marks if no evidence and/or only one factor. The answer is well-structured with effective use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are few errors of spelling and punctuation.

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of at least one factor that affects conformity although some detail may be lacking. Discussion/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. The answer has some structure with appropriate use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are some errors of spelling and punctuation.

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of factor(s) that affect conformity and/or basic/limited discussion/analysis. There may be exceptional description for 5 marks with no discussion of the factors described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. Some basic ideas are expressed adequately though the answer may lack structure. Psychological terminology may be missing or used inappropriately. There may be intrusive errors of grammar, spelling and punctuation.

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/discussion of factor(s) that affect conformity, but there must be some relevance. Basic ideas are poorly expressed. There is little evidence of structure, ideas may be listed rather than expanded. There may be significant errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation.

0 marks No relevant content.

Topic: Social Cognition

Question 06

[AO3 = 1]

One mark for identification of laboratory experiment.

Question 07

[AO3 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for an explanation of an advantage of a laboratory experiment.

Possible answer: As the research takes part in a controlled environment, the researcher can eliminate the possible effect of extraneous variables.

Answers are likely to focus on advantages based on increased control of variables / increased causality / replicability.

The advantage can be credited if it corresponds with the answer in 6.

Question 08

[AO3 = 2]

Independent variable: whether the list of points was positive then negative or negative then positive / the order of the points / information. Answer must imply that there is more than one condition.

Dependent variable: whether (or not) they said Alex was 'friendly' / the number of participants who said Alex was 'friendly' / number of 'friendly' responses.

No credit for 'level of friendliness'.

- Award both marks for correct IV and DV that are not labelled but are in the order of the question.
- Award 1 mark for correct IV and DV that are not labelled and are not in the order of the question ie DV then IV.
- No credit for either IV or DV **alone** (if not labelled).

Question 09

[AO3 = 1]

One mark for identifying independent measures / groups / samples / unrelated design.

Question 10

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 2]

- AO1** 1 mark for knowledge of likely outcome:
More responses will be 'friendly' in Condition A than in Condition B / fewer responses will be 'friendly' in Condition B than Condition A.
- AO2** 2 marks for an explanation of the results based on application of primacy effect research results to the scenario.
This is an example of the primacy effect because earlier information about 'Alex' would have more influence (1) than later information (on the overall impression formed) (1). Credit use of evidence as part of the discussion eg Asch, Luchins.

Question 11

[AO2 = 1]

- AO2** 1 mark for a work related example of a stereotype eg all nurses are caring / all politicians are untrustworthy / all mechanics are men / all nurses are female.

Question 12

[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

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

AO1 Maximum of 3 marks for any one explanation.

Likely explanations include Social Identity Theory within which the world is divided into us/them - social categorisation; the enhancement of ingroup over outgroup - social comparison; to boost self-esteem.

Competition for Resources or Relative Deprivation Hypothesis/Realistic Conflict Theory in which resources such as housing/land/employment are scarce and groups develop negative attitudes and prejudice towards each other.

The Authoritarian Personality in which those of a particular personality type exhibit prejudice and discrimination towards groups who are different; roots in Freudian theory; characterised by blind obedience to authority, submissive to superiors, etc; measured by F scale; the result of strict/harsh upbringing; displacement; reaction formation.

Other relevant answers, such as acquisition of attitudes/stereotypes through social learning and conformity, scapegoating and frustration – aggression hypothesis should also be credited. Maximum 1 mark for simply identifying two explanations of prejudice only.

Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks.

AO2 5 marks for discussion of the explanations which might include:

Evaluation: relevant positive and negative points of each explanation: Social identity theory may not apply to all cultural groups and people belong to many groups so the research has simplified human behaviour; however, much evidence supports the behaviours demonstrated both in research and real world relationships; there is evidence that competition for resources does tend to demonstrate self-interest overrides the needs of others; however it has been demonstrated that prejudice arises without competition, merely through categorisation; criticism of the Authoritarian personality explanation as unlikely to explain prejudices shared by most members of a group; lack of education or response bias to the F-scale may be more convincing explanations. Specifically applying an explanation to an example such as how members are identified as an in-group or as competitors (maximum 1 mark per explanation). Credit evaluation of the methodology of studies only when made relevant to the discussion of the explanations.

Credit use of evidence.

Likely studies:

Sherif (1961), Tajfel (1971), Adorno et al (1950)

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Maximum 6 marks – only one explanation

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of at least two explanations of prejudice. The discussion/analysis is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of at least one explanation of prejudice although some detail may be lacking. Discussion/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum 6 marks if no evidence and/or only one explanation.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of explanation(s) of prejudice and/or basic/limited discussion/analysis. There may be exceptional description for 5 marks with no discussion of the explanations described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/discussion of explanation(s) of prejudice, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content

Section B Cognitive Psychology

Topic: Remembering and Forgetting

Question 13

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 1]

AO1 One mark each for:

An example of semantic memory – knowing that Paris is the capital of France or a hawk is a bird of prey.

An example of episodic memory – remembering a conversation we had yesterday or our 10th birthday party. Example must be personalised to get credit.

AO2 One mark for a distinction point. Likely points: semantic memories are general knowledge about the world, but episodic memories are memories of our personal experiences. Or, we may not recall when and where we learned /encoded our semantic memories but we do recall this for our episodic memories. Evidence suggests they are located in different areas of the brain.

Question 14

[AO1 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for knowledge of interference as an explanation of forgetting.

Likely points: the theory suggests that forgetting is a result of disruption / confusion of one memory by other information (1); more likely to occur when memories are similar (1). There are two types – **retroactive** where recent information learned disrupts recall of previously stored information (1) and **proactive** where what we have already stored disrupts current learning (1). Credit explanation if embedded within an example. One mark for naming two types only.

Credit other valid points.

Question 15

[AO1 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for a description of the procedure / method of a relevant study. This must include detail of the conditions / variables / task.

Likely studies: Schmidt et al 2000 (street names and house moves) Baddeley & Hitch 1977 (rugby players, injury and number of teams played), Keppel and Underwood 1962 (trigrams), Jenkins and Dallenbach 1924 (recall after period of being awake/asleep).

Question 16

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 2]

AO1 1 mark for a limitation of the interference theory of forgetting. Likely answers: many of the studies on which the theory is based are laboratory based. Difficulty of distinguishing effects of interference from other forms of forgetting. Unsure of the mechanisms involved in interference / how and why it occurs.

AO2 Up to 2 marks for discussion of the limitation identified.

Possible answer: studies that support interference tend to laboratory based (1) where participants are required to learn similar material in a very short time-frame (1) making it more likely that interference will occur (1).

Question 17

[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

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

AO1 Up to 5 marks for accurate description of the model including information about the characteristics (duration, capacity and coding) of each store; linear/information processing model; related types of forgetting; transfer from sensory to STM via attention; description of rehearsal loop. Up to 2 of these marks can be credited for the same information conveyed by an accurately labelled diagram if there is no other creditworthy information provided. 1 mark only for naming three stores.
Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks.

AO2 Up to 5 marks for analysis which might include discussion of the issue of rehearsal as a requirement for transfer of information to LTM; criticisms of aspects of the model by comparison with other models, such as arguments that the STS and LTS are not unitary stores; explanation of primacy and recency effects in serial position studies; coding confusion in STM; discussion of the nature of deficits in case studies of neurological damage. Credit evaluation of the methodology of studies only when made relevant to the discussion of the model.
Credit use of evidence.

Likely studies include: Murdock (1962) Glanzer and Cunitz (1966), Peterson and Peterson (1959) Craik and Watkins (1973) , Conrad (1963/4), Baddeley (1966), Milner et al (1978), Blakemore (1988) Craik and Tulving (1975), Hyde and Jenkins (1973), and Working Memory studies such as Baddeley, Thomson and Buchanan (1975), Hoosain and Salili (1988).

Maximum 6 marks if no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of the model. The evaluation/analysis is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of the model although some detail may be lacking. Evaluation/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum 6 marks if no evidence.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of the model and/or basic/limited discussion/analysis. There may be exceptional description for 5 marks with no evaluation of the features/components described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/evaluation the model, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content

Topic: Perceptual Processes

Question 18

[AO1 = 2]

One mark each for naming two monocular depth cues – height in plane, relative size, linear perspective / converging lines, superimposition / occlusion / overlap, texture gradient.

Question 19

[AO2 =2]

Size constancy/constancy scaling enables us to perceive objects that are the same size as each other as being the same size / constant size (1) despite differences in the size of the retinal image / changes in distance (1).

Question 20

[AO1 = 3]

1 mark for identification of either retinal disparity or convergence.
Up to 2 marks for explanation.

Retinal disparity. Likely points: each eye receives a slightly different view of objects / the world; the nearer the object, the greater the difference in the views received; the brain uses the amount of difference to calculate how far away an object is / stereopsis.

Convergence. Likely points: this is a cue from the eye muscles about distance of objects; the harder the muscles work to turn the eyes the nearer the object is; the brain uses information about the amount of work to calculate the distance of the object.

Question 21

[AO1 = 2, AO2 =1]

AO1 1 mark for identification / drawing of a distortion illusion – Muller-Lyer, Ponzo, Ebbinghaus / Titchener circles, moon illusion.
1 mark for giving the effect of the illusion.

AO2 1 mark for explaining why the effect occurs eg misapplied size constancy; carpentered world hypothesis (for Muller-Lyer); depth cues.

Question 22

[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

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

AO1 Up to 5 marks for description. Likely points include: the theory proposes that perception is a top-down/concept-driven/indirect process in which prior knowledge/experience is combined with often incomplete sensory information to construct hypotheses about the world. It emphasises the role of inference. The relevance of set and illusions such as the Muller-Lyer or Ponzo figures. Description of misapplied size constancy.
Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks.

AO2 Up to 5 marks for evaluation of Gregory's theory. Likely points include: Application of knowledge of the theory – the theory explains how illusions/set operate. A logical explanation of the process – we are aware that past experience affects present understanding. The use of studies to support the theory, such as set/context/cross-cultural. Limitations of the theory, comparison with Gibson and infant studies which indicate some abilities are present at birth. Discussion of the idea that it is not sufficient as a single explanation of human perception. Credit evaluation of the methodology of studies only when made relevant to discussion of the theory. Credit use of evidence.

Likely studies include: Lieberman (1963), Deregowski (1972), Bruner and Postman (1949), McGinnies (1949), Bruner and Minturn (1951).

Maximum 6 marks if no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of Gregory's theory. The evaluation/analysis is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. The answer is well-structured with effective use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are few errors of spelling and punctuation.

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of Gregory's theory although some detail may be lacking. Evaluation / analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum 6 marks if no evidence. The answer has some structure with appropriate use of paragraphs, sentences and psychological terminology. There are some errors of spelling and punctuation.

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of Gregory's theory and /or basic / limited discussion / analysis. There may be exceptional description for 5 marks with no evaluation of the theory described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and /or irrelevance. Some basic ideas are expressed adequately though the answer may lack structure. Psychological terminology may be missing or used inappropriately. There may be intrusive errors of grammar, spelling and punctuation.

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/evaluation of Gregory's theory but there must be some relevance. Basic ideas are poorly expressed. There is little evidence of structure, ideas may be listed rather than expanded. There may be significant errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation.

0 marks No relevant content

Section C Individual Differences

Topic: Anxiety Disorders

Question 23

[AO1 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for a description of features of a phobia.

Likely points:

An extreme fear of an object/situation/activity (1)

An irrational fear (1)

Fear that is disproportionate (to the actual danger) (1)

A fear that leads to avoidance (1)

A fear that is disruptive to everyday life / maladaptive (1)

For two marks there must be some reference to fear.

Question 24

[AO1 = 2]

Up to 2 marks for knowledge of a psychodynamic explanation for phobias. Likely points:

The ego is threatened by unconscious/repressed/latent conflict (1) the true source of anxiety (1) is displaced onto something external/substitute/symbolic object (1).

Accept alternative explanations for other phobias such as agoraphobia.

Credit relevant explanation which is embedded within an example eg, Little Hans.

Question 25

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 2]

AO1 1 mark for a limitation of the psychodynamic explanation relevant to phobias. Likely answers: difficulty of testing the explanation; unscientific/unfalsifiable; limited evidence / evidence from case studies; premise that phobias only occur due to repressed (sexual) experiences.

Note that some of these explanations may overlap.

AO2 Up to 2 marks for discussion of the limitation given which might include analysis of the issue; counterargument; use of evidence; reference to alternative approaches / explanations.

Possible answer: The psychodynamic explanation of phobias is based on a limited number of case studies (1) which rely on the interpretation of the researcher (1). For instance according to Behaviourists, Little Hans' phobia could also be explained by a learnt association (1).

Question 26
[AO2 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for explaining how a cognitive therapist might treat Anita's obsession with security.

Likely points:

Identifying/describing catastrophic thoughts; challenging distorted thinking with counter statements; cognitive restructuring/'thought stopping'; cognitive rehearsal; testing the reality of negative expectations; habituation training; keeping records of unwelcome thoughts.

Maximum 1 mark for just naming one or more techniques..

Maximum 2 marks if no explicit application of cognitive strategy to Anita.

Possible applications: an example of a self-statement Anita might make such as 'I can leave the door unlocked if I am in the house'; collecting evidence of her successes such as a reduction in the number of times she checks the locks; mental rehearsal or her leaving the door unlocked.

Question 27
[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

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

AO1 Up to 5 marks for description of **two** explanations. Maximum of 3 marks for any one explanation. Likely explanations: Biological – genetic, biochemical or neurophysiological factors; cognitive – undesirable thoughts /catastrophic misinterpretations / hypervigilant attentional system / poor memory / paradoxical effect / thought-action fusion. Credit reference to alternative explanations eg behavioural; psychodynamic.

Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks.

Likely studies include: Bellodi et al (2001), Mackeon and Murray (1987), Rapoport and Wise (1988), Insel (1991), Aylward (1996), Rachman and Hodgson (1980), Trevidi (1996), Rachman (1997) and (2004).

AO2 Up to 5 marks for analysis and evaluation of the two explanations. Likely points: how well each explanation accounts for the behaviours seen in the disorder. Use of examples to illustrate the explanations up to 1 mark. Lack of evidence to support theoretical explanations. Strengths and limitations of explanations. Comparison of the two explanations with each other and further explanations. Credit discussion of the effectiveness of therapies if explicitly linked to the explanations. Credit evaluation of the methodology of studies only when made relevant to discussion of the explanations.

Credit use of evidence.

Note: two explanations from the same category eg two biological or two cognitive, can gain full credit.

Maximum 6 marks – only one explanation
Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

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

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of two explanations (for 7/8 marks) or at least one explanation of OCD (for 6 marks) although some detail may be lacking. Discussion/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum 6 marks if no evidence.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of explanation(s) of OCD and/or basic/limited discussion/analysis. There may be exceptional description for 5 marks with no discussion of the explanations described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/discussion of explanation(s) of OCD, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content

Topic: Autism

Question 28

[AO1 = 2]

One mark each for the following points: reference to putting a pencil in the tube rather than smarties (1); reference to asking what another child would think is in the tube (1).

Question 29

[AO1 = 2]

One mark for each symptom.

Likely symptoms: lack of pretend / imaginative play; lack of responding to others; lack of social interaction; lack of communication / language / lack of joint attention- focus on same object (lack of pointing / sharing / showing / co-ordination of gaze) / stereotypical/repetitive behaviour / preference for routine / hypersensitivity / hyposensitivity / islets of ability.

Only 1 mark for a symptom and an example of that symptom eg repetitive behaviour and hand flapping.

Accept other valid answers.

Question 30

[AO2 = 3]

Up to 3 marks for an explanation of a symptom of autism based on cognitive theory. Candidates may focus on one specific explanation for full credit or offer a number of alternatives in less depth.

Likely information:

Failure of executive functioning as (lack of) ability to switch attention and initiate new behaviours; repetitive behaviours.

Central coherence deficit as (in)ability to process information in general; elaboration of 'coherence' or wholeness; savant behaviours.

Theory of mind (lack of) as (in)ability to understand the world from another person's point of view; literalism; lack of joint attention; lack of empathy.

Give credit for the following information:

Examples of the behaviours (absent behaviours) explained by the theory. How the explanation might attempt to deal with the deficits and /or exceptional skills seen in people with autism. Use of evidence to illustrate the explanation.

Maximum 1 mark for just naming one or more explanations.

Question 31

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 2]

AO1 1 mark for a limitation of the genetic explanation for autism. Likely answers: shared environment as a confounding factor in twin studies; lack of 100% concordance in twin studies; reductionist; deterministic; ethical implications of genetic research/pre-natal screening.

Accept that some of these limitations may overlap.

AO2 Up to 2 marks for discussion of the limitation given which might include analysis of the issue; counterargument; use of evidence; reference to alternative approaches / explanations.

Possible answers: concordance rates in twin studies of autism tend not to be 100% (1) which suggests other factors may account for the disorder (1). However, in one study Rivto found 96% concordance for MZ twins which strongly suggests a genetic basis (1).

Question 32

[AO1 = 5, AO2 = 5]

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

AO1 Up to 5 marks for description of **two** therapeutic programmes (maximum 3 marks for each programme). Likely programmes: Behaviour modification – based on operant conditioning and reinforcement and shaping, Lovaas technique (including language training), ABA approaches. Parental involvement techniques – consistency in reinforcement and reward of adaptive behaviours. Drug therapy – for example, the use of antipsychotics and antidepressants for repetitive behaviours; stimulants eg ritalin to reduce hyperactivity.

Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks.

Likely studies: Wolf et al (1964), Lovaas (1977), and (1987), Cohen et al (2006), Sallows and Graupner (2005), Koegal et al (1982/86), McCracken et al (2002).

AO2 Up to 5 marks for analysis and evaluation of the two programmes. Likely points include the success of the programmes as measured by changes in behaviour and the interactions of people with autism. Discussion of the negative effects reported in some cases. Comparison of the programmes. Discussion of the ethical implications of some programmes. Credit evaluation of the methodology of studies only when made relevant to discussion of the therapeutic programmes.

Credit use of evidence.

Note: two therapies from one category eg two behavioural therapies, can get full credit.

Maximum 6 marks – only one programme

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of two therapeutic programmes for autism. The evaluation/analysis is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of two programmes (for 7/8 marks) or at least one therapeutic programme (for 6 marks) for autism although some detail may be lacking. Evaluation/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum 6 marks if no evidence.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of therapeutic programme(s) for autism and/or basic/limited evaluation/analysis. There may be exceptional description for 5 marks with no discussion of the programmes described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/evaluation of explanation(s) of OCD, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content

Assessment Objectives

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