

v1.0.



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

**Psychology B**

**PSYB3**

**(Specification 2185)**

**Unit 3: Child Development and Applied Options**

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

---

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from: [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**Copyright**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges 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

### Topic Social Development

#### Question 01

[AO1 = 3]

**AO1** Up to 3 marks for description of a valid way, one mark for each relevant detail. Full mark answers should refer to the method and DV/what was being measured (do not credit aims/conclusion). Likely answers include: studies of imitation, eg Melzoff and Moore (1977); studies of interactional synchrony, eg Condon and Sander, Murray and Trevarthen (1985); studies of skin-to-skin contact, eg Klaus and Kennell (1976); studies of sensitive responsiveness and the Strange Situation, eg Ainsworth et al (1978), De Wolff and van Ijzendoorn (1997).  
More generic methodological answers which cannot be identified as a specific study (either by name or description) may gain a maximum of two marks.  
No credit for animal studies.

#### Question 02

[AO3 = 3]

**AO3** Up to 3 marks for evaluation of the way described in 01. Students who present an inappropriate study or no study in 01 may still gain marks for 02 where it becomes clear that a specific study/way of investigating caregiver-infant interaction is being evaluated. Students may choose to elaborate on one issue or may mention more than one issue in less detail. Evaluative points will vary according to the method described but likely issues, include: usefulness of controlled experimentation in researching social relationships eg artificiality v cause and effect; usefulness of combining data from several studies as in meta-analysis; inferences based on findings, eg studies of imitation and the issue of intentionality; short-term v long-term effects.

For full marks evaluative point(s) must be fully applied to the study of caregiver-infant interaction. One mark only for a totally generic yet valid response.

#### Question 03

[AO2 = 2]

**AO2** One mark for each brief outline of an explanation linked to Aaron's rejection. Likely causes include:

- being deviant or different – Aaron does not have a uniform like the other boys
- not having a good internal working model of relationships – he has had a succession of foster parents
- having poor social skills – Aaron doesn't know how to join in
- aggressiveness - Aaron gets into lots of fights.

Can award one mark if candidate correctly identifies two relevant psychological explanations, eg 'Aaron is deviant and has poor social skills'.

## Question 04

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of the consequences of privation and/or deprivation and for knowledge of relevant research. Likely consequences include: effects identified by Bowlby (1946), eg affectionless psychopathy, delinquency, low IQ; effects identified in privation studies, eg Harlow's findings of delinquency, affectionless behaviour, ERA findings of quasi-autistic symptoms in Romanian orphans, impaired language and social skills (Genie - Curtiss, 1977); short-term deprivation consequences identified by Robertson (1952) – sequence of anger, despair, detachment.  
Award 1 mark only for a list of consequences.  
Credit description of relevant evidence up to 2 marks.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion/analysis/evaluation of the consequences described. Likely issues include: the way some researchers confused privation and deprivation; contradictory findings; issue of whether or not the effects are reversible and the possibility of reversibility, eg later work by Suomi and Harlow (1972) – monkey therapists, Koluchova (1976) - favourable outcomes after years of privation; problem of inferring cause and effect, eg Rutter's findings (1970, 1981) – deprivation *per se* is not the cause of delinquency and that stress may be a more important determinant of negative outcomes; the question of a critical period, eg late adoption research by Tizard and Hodges (1989); criticisms of inferences on the basis of early research, eg problems with Bowlby's study of juvenile thieves. Credit evaluation of studies where used to discuss consequences.  
Credit use of relevant evidence.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

### Mark Bands

#### 10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of the consequences of privation and/or deprivation.

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

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

**7 - 9 marks    Good answers**

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

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

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

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

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

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

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

The student 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**

## Topic Cognitive Development

### Question 05

[AO1 = 3]

**AO1** Up to 3 marks for description of a valid way, one mark for each relevant detail. Full mark answers should refer to the method and DV/what was being measured (do not credit aims/conclusions). Likely answers include: studies object permanence/concept, eg Piaget's (1951) study of Jacqueline's responses to taking the toy, the A not B error extension of this study; Bower and Wishart's infra-red camera studies (1972); Meltzoff and Borton (1979) cross-modal integration research; Baillargeon's impossible event studies (carrot, truck, cube); Bower (1970) looming studies.  
More generic methodological answers which cannot be identified as a specific study (either by name or description) may gain a maximum of two marks.

### Question 06

[AO3 = 3]

**AO3** Up to 3 marks for evaluation of the way described in 05. Students who present an inappropriate study or no study in 05 may still gain marks in 06 where it becomes clear that a specific study/way of investigating infant cognitive abilities is being evaluated. Students may choose to elaborate on one issue or may mention more than one issue in less detail. Evaluative points will vary according to the method described but likely issues include: usefulness of controlled experimentation in researching infant abilities – reliability issues; inferences based on findings, eg validity of surprise/looking time as a dependent variable to infer the existence of object concept.

For full marks evaluative point(s) must be fully applied to the study of early infant abilities. One mark only for a totally generic but valid response.

### Question 07

[AO2 = 2]

**AO2** Up to two marks for application of knowledge of Piaget's theory of cognitive development to Amy's behaviour as follows:  
Amy is showing egocentrism/cannot decentre/cannot understand that other people's view is different. (1)  
She is unable to see her brother, and therefore she does not understand that her brother can see her. (1)

### Question 08

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of Vygotsky's theory of cognitive development and for knowledge of relevant research. Likely content includes: the importance of social and cultural factors in cognitive development; development of the tools of a culture including language; scaffolding and the role of instruction/guidance; the zone of proximal development – difference between actual and potential; child as an apprentice to a more knowledgeable other; internalisation of the world view of others via means of social interaction; guided participation as a specific kind of scaffolding relating to cultural traditions.  
Credit description of relevant evidence - 1 mark.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion/evaluation/analysis of Vygotsky's theory. Likely issues include: Vygotsky's theory and possible acceleration of cognitive development and the contrast with Piaget's notion of readiness; stance on the role of language versus Piaget's view that language is a by-product; comparison with nativism; over-instruction possibly stifling inquisitiveness and desire to learn; other possible negative influences of instruction and guidance; comparison with information processing theories which place less emphasis on role of others and more on processing strategies; scaffolding as more appropriate for the acquisition of some cognitive abilities than others; use of evidence in relation to the role of others, eg Wood and Middleton's study of scaffolding (1975), Rogoff's (1995) study of guided participation; application of Vygotsky's theory to education eg group activities, peer tutoring, community of inquiry (Elbers and Streefland (2000)).  
Credit evaluation of studies where used to discuss theory.  
Credit use of relevant evidence.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

### Mark Bands

#### 10 - 12 marks **Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of Vygotsky's theory. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to evidence are accurate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

**7 - 9 marks    Good answers**

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

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

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

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

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

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

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

The student 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**

## Topic Moral Development

### Question 09

[AO1 = 3]

**AO1** Up to 3 marks for description of a valid way, one mark for each relevant detail. Full mark answers should refer to the method and DV/what was being measured (do not credit aims/conclusions). Likely answers include: Damon's (1975) study of hypothetical distribution from sale of drawings; McGillicuddy- De Lisa – hypothetical allocation of 9 dollars to three characters for artwork; Enright et al (1984) controlled procedure with hypothetical fixed choices of how to share; Gershon and Damon (1978) real-life distribution of proceeds (sweets) from making bracelets. More generic methodological answers which cannot be identified as a specific study (either by name or description) only award a maximum of two marks.

### Question 10

[AO3 = 3]

**AO3** Up to 3 marks for evaluation of the method described in 09. Students who present an inappropriate study or no study in 09 may still gain marks in 10 where it becomes clear that a specific study/way of investigating distributive justice is being evaluated. Students may choose to elaborate on one issue or may mention more than one issue in less detail. Evaluative points will vary according to the method described but likely issues include: usefulness of clinical interview in researching moral understanding, eg validity – whether choice reflects moral understanding; predictive validity – does hypothetical choice allow us to predict real-life choice; demand characteristics and social desirability; inferences based on findings – age differences versus individual differences.

For full marks evaluative point(s) must be fully applied to the study of distributive justice. One mark only for a totally generic but valid response.

### Question 11

[AO2 = 2]

**AO2** One mark for stating that the psychologist is investigating prosocial development/ understanding.  
One mark for an explanation, eg Freddie has to choose between pleasing himself/own satisfaction (watching TV) or helping another person (mum in the kitchen).

Full marks can also be gained for answers focussing on relevant stages of prosocial reasoning, ie hedonistic (watching TV) versus empathic (helping mum); good boy, good girl (wanting to please mum).

### Question 12

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of Kohlberg's theory of moral development. Students should be credited for description of Kohlberg's levels (pre-conventional, conventional, post-conventional) and stages (reward/heteronomous, punishment/instrumental, good-boy good-girl, law and order/conscience, social contract, universal ethical principles) and for more general knowledge of the theory, eg gradual progression from self-centred focus to empathy and focus on the wider good. Maximum 1 mark for listing/naming stages/levels.

Likely evidence: Kohlberg (1963); Kohlberg and Kramer (1969); Walker (1989)

Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion/analysis/evaluation. Likely issues include: Kohlberg's theory as an extension of Piaget's work; focus on male morality and comparisons with Gilligan; stage versus non-stage approach to moral development – Turiel (1978) sees moral development as a continuum - overlap of stages leading to questionable validity; issues of invariance and reversibility of stages; emphasis on Western values, eg cultural relevance, eg Tietjen and Walker (1985) some cultures place more importance on collective responsibility; stage 6 as hypothetical; assumption that morality is a single phenomenon versus Turiel's ideas of moral domains; lack of consistency between moral understanding and moral behaviour. Credit evaluation of evidence where used to discuss theory.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

### **Mark Bands**

#### **10 - 12 marks Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of Kohlberg's theory of moral development. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to evidence are accurate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

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

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

The student expresses most ideas clearly and makes some appropriate use of psychological terminology. The answer is organised, using sentences and

paragraphs. Errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling may be present but are mostly minor, such that they obscure meaning only occasionally.

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

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

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

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

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

The student 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**

## Topic Cognition and Law

### Question 13

[AO1 = 1]

**AO1** One mark for simultaneous line-up.

### Question 14

[AO1 = 1]

**AO1** One mark for sequential line-up. Accept VIPER.

### Question 15

[AO2 = 2]

**AO2** Up to two marks for explanation of one advantage linked to the situation. Credit any of the following points: evidence suggests that sequential line-ups lead to greater reliability of eye-witness identifications; because the witness is compelled to make an absolute judgement rather than a relative judgement (of who is the most likely suspect in relation to other members of the line-up); computerised display systems allow for greater control (foils can be controlled for similarity) and convenience (avoiding no-shows). Credit evidence which demonstrates an advantage. Note some of these advantages overlap so award credit to the student's best advantage.

### Question 16

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** Up to two marks for knowledge of way(s) of improving accuracy of eye-witness accounts. Students may focus on one way/strategy/technique in detail or more than one in less detail. Most answers will be based on the cognitive interview and elements within the cognitive interview, eg report everything, different perspective, different order, context reinstatement. Credit also other relevant ways/techniques/strategies such as: avoiding post-event contamination through discussion; avoiding leading questions, etc.

**AO2** Up to two marks for brief discussion/comment. Salient discussion points include: use of evidence, psychological explanations of how the way/strategy/technique might operate to enhance recall, limitations, usefulness/application related to different situations; age as a mediating variable.

### Question 17

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of relevant terms and concepts and for evidence relevant to the false memory debate. Relevant terms and concepts include: false memory, recovered memory, implanted memory, confabulation, reconstruction. Likely studies include: evidence that memories can be implanted, eg Loftus (1975) smashed - hit; Loftus and Ketcham (1994) lost in a shopping mall; Deese (1959) recall on non-presented words; Loftus, Feldman and Dashell (1995) lost in supermarket; Mazzoni and Memon (2003) fictitious medical procedure; Lindsay et al (2004) photographs as trigger to false memory; Mazzoni et al (1999) suggestion; Bartlett (1932) war of the ghosts. Credit also knowledge of the counter-evidence that memories can be repressed, for example: Levinger and Clark (1961) emotionally negative words; Williams (1994) childhood abuse.  
Credit description of relevant evidence – up to 2 marks.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion/evaluation/analysis. Possible issues include: different sides of the debate; implications of the debate – practical, theoretical and ethical; analysis of the worth of evidence in favour and against the statement, considering issues such as reliability, validity, sampling, generalisability to different situations/contexts. For example, many studies are carried out in controlled conditions covering a short time span which is not equivalent to circumstances in which 'false memories' would normally arise. Similarly, the event to be recalled in studies is not similar to the types of events involved in cases of 'false memory' which are usually more significant and traumatic; broader discussion may include historical underpinnings of the theory eg Bartlett's reconstruction theory of 'effort after meaning'; schema theory; the role of stereotyping and expectation in memory; counter theory includes discussion of Freudian repression as a possible explanation for memories which are, in fact, real. Credit evaluation of evidence where used to discuss the debate  
Credit use of real-life examples to support discussion (1 mark).  
Credit use of relevant evidence.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

### Mark Bands

#### 10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of issues and evidence related to the false memory debate. Discussion is full, well-balanced and includes thoughtful analysis. References to evidence are accurate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The student expresses most ideas clearly and fluently, with effective use of psychological terminology. Arguments are well structured and coherent, with appropriate use of sentences and paragraphs. There are few, if any, minor

errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The overall quality of language is such that meaning is rarely, if ever, obscured.

**7 - 9 marks Good answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of issues related to the false memory debate. Discussion is evident, with some evidence of balance. The answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. At the top of the band, references to evidence are relevant but are perhaps not linked so clearly to the discussion as for the top band.

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

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

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of issues related to the false memory debate. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive or limited to just one side of the debate. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

**1 - 3 marks Poor answers**

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

The student 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**

## Topic Schizophrenia and Mood Disorders

### Question 18

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

- AO1** Up to two marks for an outline of one explanation for mood disorders. Award one mark for a very basic outline and two marks for an elaborated outline. Likely explanations include: biological, eg genes, serotonin); cognitive, eg Beck's negative schema; triad; Ellis's irrational thinking; psychodynamic, eg oral dependency; loss; introjection. Credit also explanations for bipolar disorder and SAD. No credit for just naming an approach (biological, cognitive, psychodynamic).
- AO2** Up to two marks for brief evaluation. Content will depend upon the chosen explanation but credit should be given for any relevant issue. Full credit can be given for one point elaborated or two points in less detail.

### Question 19

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 1]

- AO1** One mark for knowledge of the key difference: unipolar = extreme mood at **one end** of the mood continuum and bipolar = **alternating** extreme high and low.
- AO2** One mark for application to Lola: the symptoms described indicate Lola is experiencing unipolar depression (there is no mention of extreme elation, etc).

### Question 20

AO1 = 1, AO2 = 1

- AO1** One mark for brief outline of a relevant treatment for unipolar disorder. Students are likely to refer to either drug treatment or cognitive treatment, eg CBT, RET or SIT but any other form of treatment that could be applicable should be credited.
- AO2** One mark for a brief explanation of how the treatment outlined might help in Lola's case. Examples: SSRIs would help because they would raise levels of serotonin which would raise her mood; CBT would help because Lola would learn to replace negative thoughts of worthlessness with more positive ones.

## Question 21

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for outlines of two treatments for schizophrenia, usually 2 marks for each treatment (3 marks for one very well done). It is acceptable to outline two different drug treatments although most students are likely to focus on anti-psychotic drugs and a form of psychotherapy (ie a non-biological treatment).  
Antipsychotic drugs include traditional neuroleptics which block dopamine, eg chlorpromazine and more recently introduced atypical anti-psychotics, eg clozapine and risperidone which act on dopamine and serotonin.  
Psychotherapies include: cognitive behaviour therapy to give coping strategies to gain control of the hallucinations and delusions; cognitive therapy involving reality testing and challenge; behaviour therapy, eg token economies used in institutions; family therapy to increase tolerance and reduce negative attitudes; milieu therapy to enhance normalisation. Credit use of psychodynamic therapy if student makes a case for its use.  
Note that community care in itself is not a treatment therefore not appropriate.  
Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for comparison and evaluation of the two treatments. Six of these marks must be for comparison. Comparison points will vary according to the treatments used but should include discussion of relative effectiveness. Further comparison points might include: use of evidence to support claims of effectiveness; durability of effect over the long-term; suitability for different sub-types/symptoms; comparison of side-effects, either physical or other unintended outcomes; differences in attitudes towards the two types of treatment, either patient attitudes or more widely; preference for combination treatments; individual differences in preference and responsiveness; role of patient, ie passive/active; discussion of the usefulness of specific treatments in the context of institutionalisation v community care can also be credited. Credit evaluation of evidence where used in comparison/discussion.  
Credit use of relevant evidence.

**Maximum of 6 marks if no comparison.**

### 10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of two treatments for schizophrenia. Comparison is full and includes thoughtful analysis and reference to effectiveness. Most comparison points are well developed and presented in the context of the answer as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

**7 - 9 marks    Good answers**

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of two treatments for schizophrenia. Comparison is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

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

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

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

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

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

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

The student 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**

## Topic Stress and Stress Management

### Question 22

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** Up to two marks for a brief description of the role of the endocrine system in mediating and responding to stress. Credit: release of adrenalin and noradrenaline from the adrenal medulla, hypothalamic production of CRF and the release of ACTH from the pituitary leading to production of corticosteroids (cortisol) from the adrenal cortex.

**AO2** Up to two marks for application of knowledge of the role of the endocrine system to Mannie and Jilly. It is likely that students will focus on the differing susceptibility to illness and the role of cortisol. In Mannie's case the prolonged stress reaction leads to heightened cortisol levels which, over time, lower the immunity and hence make her susceptible to colds. Jilly responds to stress in the immediate term but then her endocrine system activity returns to normal. Credit references to GAS.

### Question 23

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** Up to two marks for an outline of relevant personal variables. Students are likely to choose one of the following variables:

- Type A personality versus Type B/C – Type A's show time urgency, competitiveness and are more prone to illness especially CHD
- Hardiness – hardy characters see stress as challenge, show commitment to society, work, relationships, etc, feel in control of own life
- Locus of control – having an internal locus of control tends to offer defence against the effects of stress.

One mark for a brief outline of a relevant variable. Two marks for an outline with some expansion/detail.

**AO2** Up to two marks for discussion of how the variable (personality type, hardiness or locus of control) might explain the different responses of Mannie **and** Jilly. Example: Mannie is probably a Type A personality which means that she tries to be over-controlling at work, cannot delegate responsibility to others and becomes easily angered and hostile – her personality leads her to experience more stress than Jilly who is probably a Type B (or C) who is less driven and less controlling and therefore less affected by stressful situations.

For full marks expect reference to both characters and the work context.

## Question 24

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of emotion-focused and problem-focused strategies in general, and for specific examples. Likely content includes: definitions of each type - emotion-focused strategies are aimed at dealing with the reaction to the stressor rather than changing the stressor itself – problem-focused strategies are aimed at addressing the problem which is causing the stress; examples of each type of strategy: problem-focused includes planful problem solving, ie developing and executing a practical plan to reduce source of stress, confronting, ie tackling the problem head-on; emotion-focused includes distancing, eg use of humour to make problem less immediately threatening, positive reappraisal, eg looking on the bright side, and use of Freudian defence mechanisms. For full AO1 marks the answer must demonstrate clear understanding of the basic difference between the two strategies. Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for evaluation of each type of strategy and for application to the scenario. Normally 4 marks should be awarded for each type of strategy. Possible content: many (not all) emotion-focused strategies tend to alleviate stress in the immediate term but may actually exacerbate the situation because the source of the stress may become worse; problem-focused strategies are perhaps more difficult to initiate but mean that the issue is not deferred and therefore problems do not continue to accumulate; sex differences in use of the two types, eg Billings and Moos (1981) - women use emotion-focused more than men; nature of the stressor – some stressors cannot be directly addressed, eg illness, bereavement, etc; factors affecting choice of coping strategy, eg whether person is a repressor or ruminator; consequences of using each type of strategy, eg link between type of strategy used and mental disorders; use of combination of strategies; other mediating factors, eg level of available social support. Two marks should be reserved for application to the scenario, ie work-related stress. Example: Mannie could use a problem-focused approach by asking to see her boss and devolving some of her work; Mannie could take an emotion-focused approach by going out with friends and making jokes about her work. Credit evaluation of evidence where used to evaluate a strategy. Credit use of relevant evidence.

**Maximum 7 marks for answers dealing with only one type of strategy**

## Mark Bands

### 10 - 12 marks **Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of emotion-focused and problem-focused strategies. Evaluation is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. At the top of the band there is clear and appropriate application. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

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

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of emotion-focused and problem-focused strategies. Evaluation is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

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

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

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of emotion-focused and problem-focused strategies. There must be some evaluation/application for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

### 1 - 3 marks **Poor answers**

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

The student 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**

## Topic Substance Abuse

### Question 25

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

- AO1** Up to 2 marks for outline of self-management as a way of dealing with substance abuse. Credit any of the following details: self-help in the context of a group of similar abusers; assuming personal responsibility; focus on monitoring of intake, eg written record; focus on awareness of reasons for abuse, eg childhood issues; focus on consequences, eg for family; reference to specific programmes, eg AA 12-step or Botvin et al (2001) binge-drinking.
- AO2** Up to two marks for a brief evaluation. Students may gain full marks for a brief outline of two separate issues or for one issue in slightly more detail. Likely issues: assuming responsibility acts a key motivator; self-help groups offer emotional and social support (eg via a sponsor) at times when formal services may not be available; relapse rates suggest variable effectiveness; additional benefits, eg enhancement of self-esteem and opportunity for training in resisting group pressure; links with religion; self-management in the context of the Prochaska model, eg self-management is most useful at the maintenance stage and in preventing relapse; cognitive self-management therapy such as behavioural self-control training. Credit use of evidence in relation to effectiveness, eg Moos and Moos (2004).

### Question 26

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

- AO1** Up to two marks for an outline of the processes involved in social inoculation. Credit one mark for any two of the following points: training in resistance through four methods; giving knowledge about negative effects; discussion about peer influences and norms; skills acquisition, eg how to say 'No'; public commitment. Credit knowledge shown through description of specific programmes, eg McAlister et al (1980) anti-smoking; Cuijpers et al (2002) Dutch school project.
- AO2** Up to two marks for application to smoking in schools, one mark for each valid suggestion. Credit any concrete suggestions in relation to the four elements of social inoculation. Examples: nurse could show class a film about what smoking does to lungs; the class could have a group discussion about norms of smoking behaviour and what peers do; role play sessions practising resisting pressure by saying 'no' to offer of cigarette; public pledge not to smoke in front of class. Credit any sensible and relevant suggestion.

## Question 27

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of social explanations for substance abuse: conformity to peer norms; normative influence; modelling; cultural norms; parental influences; expectation acceptability. Relevant evidence includes: Brickner et al (2006), Garnier and Stein (2002), White et al (2000), Helzer and Canino (1992).  
Credit description of relevant evidence up to 2 marks.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion, and for application to the headline. Content may include: role of social selection – choice of peer group; factors affecting degree of peer influence, eg status, self-esteem and self-efficacy etc; peers v parents; social control as a mediating factor; no evidence for single susceptible personality type; problem of establishing cause and effect; comparison with alternative explanations, eg genes; interactionist explanations, eg genetic predisposition requiring a social trigger; use of evidence. More general points include: environmental determinism; implications for treatment; relevance of explanation to specific substances. Two marks to be awarded for application to stem, ie young people – most effective application will be through use of social explanation, peer group, etc or for reference to contrasting views (of experts) or for references to specific named substances.  
Credit evaluation of evidence where used to discuss explanation.  
Credit use of relevant evidence.

## Mark Bands

### 10 - 12 marks **Very good answers**

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of social explanations for substance abuse. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. At the top of the band there is clear and appropriate application. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

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

Answer shows knowledge and understanding of social explanations for substance abuse. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

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

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

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

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

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

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

The student 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**

## Topic Forensic Psychology

### Question 28

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** Up to two marks for knowledge of relevant roles of custodial sentencing. Given the context, students are most likely to focus on **deterrence** (individual and/or general), **retribution** or possibly **incapacitation**.

Deterrence - seeing/experiencing the negative consequence means that the offending behaviour should be avoided in the future; prison as negative reinforcement; avoidance learning; vicarious learning - seeing peers go to prison; punishment acts such that negative consequences will be avoided in future.

Retribution – society exacting revenge for unacceptable conduct.

Incapacitation – sending to prison removes the offender from society, putting the offender out of action.

Maximum 1 mark for simply naming two relevant roles.

Note: Do not credit **reform** as there is nothing relevant to reform in the stem.

**AO2** Up to two marks for brief discussion of the two roles presented. For full marks students must comment briefly on each role. Relevant discussion points include: recidivism rates indicate prison does not deter (approximately 70% of young male offenders re-offend within two years); exacting retribution does not change the offender's behaviour (alternatives to prison may be better than straightforward punishment, eg restorative justice); retribution often occurs as a result of the political imperative to appear to be tough on crime; incapacitation is only temporary in most cases; even people in prison can continue to commit crime so incapacitation is not complete.

### Question 29

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

**AO1** Up to two marks for knowledge/outline of anger management programmes. Likely content includes: Novaco's 3 stages of cognitive preparation (recognising own feelings of anger and what triggers anger), skills acquisition (learning strategies to control own anger, eg deep breathing, repeating calming mantra, counting to 10, application (practising using newly learned strategies in safe situations, eg role play of anger provoking situation). Credit description of specific programmes.

Although unlikely, credit may also be given where student makes a case for an alternative treatment being effective in this situation, (ie in relation to the stem material).

**AO2** Up to two marks for discussion/evaluation. Students may focus on one issue elaborated or more than one issue in brief. Likely content includes: evidence for effectiveness in reducing anger, eg Ireland (2000); long-term v short-term effectiveness; misplaced assumption that offending is caused by anger (Loza and Loza-Fanous (1999); focus on cognition as opposed to changing behaviour; need for trained personnel.

### Question 30

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

**Examiners must read the whole response prior to marking in order to make a band judgement about whether the response is Very Good (10-12), Good (7-9), Average to Weak (4-6) or Poor (1-3). Examiners should be guided by the band judgement when annotating scripts.**

**AO1** Up to four marks for knowledge of Eysenck's theory of criminal personality. Credit any of the following: personality is innate; we inherit a type of nervous system that predisposes us to offending; personality varies along three dimensions – neurotic – stable, extravert – introvert, psychoticism; typical criminal type is the neurotic-extravert; neuroticism leads to unstable, unpredictable behaviour; extraversion is due to chronically under-aroused nervous system which leads to sensation seeking; extraverts do not condition easily and do not learn from mistakes; high psychoticism – cold, heartless offender; high NE scores in delinquent population, eg McGurk and McDougall (1981).  
Credit description of relevant evidence – 1 mark.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion/analysis/evaluation. Likely discussion points include: alternative explanations used to evaluate Eysenck's theory, eg how biological explanations in part support Eysenck's theory about neurological differences between offenders and controls; alternatives to the idea of a unitary type, eg Moffitt (1993) proposed four distinct types; incompatibility with modern personality theory, eg the 5 factor model (Digman, 1990) which emphasises role of other dimensions, eg conscientiousness and agreeableness, it is possible to have a high E and N score and still not offend; basis for the model is in the EPI; reliability and validity issues re EPI; inability to infer cause and effect; determinism and the implications of Eysenck's emphasis on heritability and inevitability; reductionism and the need to consider wider influences, eg society; Eysenck's theory in the historical context as anti-liberal; relevance to eugenic ideal; links between Eysenck's traits and other explanations for offending, eg psychoticism and brain structure/function. Credit evaluation of evidence where used to discuss theory.  
Credit use of relevant evidence, eg (McGurk and McDougall, 1981), (Farrington et al. 1982).

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

#### Mark Bands

##### 10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of Eysenck's theory of the criminal personality. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. References to evidence are accurate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

**7 - 9 marks    Good answers**

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

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

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

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

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

**1 - 3 marks    Poor answers**

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

The student 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**

### Assessment Objectives

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
01	3			
02			3	
03		2		
04	4	8		20
05	3			
06			3	
07		2		
08	4	8		20
09	3			
10			3	
11		2		
12	4	8		20
13	1			
14	1			
15		2		
16	2	2		
17	4	8		20
18	2	2		
19	1	1		
20	1	1		
21	4	8		20
22	2	2		
23	2	2		
24	4	8		20
25	2	2		
26	2	2		
27	4	8		20
28	2	2		
29	2	2		
30	4	8		20

UMS conversion calculator [www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)