A-LEVEL

Psychology Specification B

PSYB3/Unit 3 Child Development and Applied Options
Mark scheme

2180
June 2015

Version 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer 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 associates 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 associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate 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, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

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

Section A Child Development

Topic: Social Development

01	It would be important for the psychologists to agree on what is meant by 'clinging behaviour' before they started the observation. Briefly explain why.
	[1 mark]

[AO3 = 1]

1 mark: It is important for reliability (inter-rater or observer reliability) so that behaviours are recorded/coded consistently.
Accept: to avoid observer/researcher bias; to avoid subjectivity; to be more objective; to avoid ambiguity; to be standardised; for operationalisation

'Reliability' on its own not sufficient, must be some clarification, e.g. type of reliability or reference to consistency

02	Explain how the psychologists could agree on what is meant by 'clinging behaviour' before starting their observation.
	[2 marks]

[AO3 = 2]

2 marks for a clear, coherent explanation of process and outcome
1 mark for an explanation that is muddled/vague/lacks detail

- One mark for a way of defining behaviour as follows: two psychologists would discuss beforehand/canvas opinion/consult previous research/carry out a mini/pilot observation to guide them.
- One mark for reference to the outcome of the discussion as follows: they could establish categories: they would draw up a list/tally chart of observable behaviours that they would categorise as the target behaviour (and exclude other).

Credit also explanation through example

03	In the context of attachment, briefly outline what is meant by 'privation' and 'deprivation'.
	[2 marks]

[AO1 = 2]

1 mark: Privation – never having had an attachment relationship/secure relationship/bond
1 mark: Deprivation – having had an attachment relationship/secure relationship/bond then having lost it

04   Bowlby has been accused of confusing privation and deprivation.
        Explain how Bowlby confused privation and deprivation.

[2 marks]

[AO2 = 2]

2 marks for a clear, coherent explanation related to Bowlby's theory.
1 mark for an explanation that is muddled/vague/lacks detail

Possible explanations:
- he did not differentiate between privation and deprivation – later researchers made this distinction
- in Bowlby's 44 thieves study many had experienced privation rather than deprivation
- his use of inappropriate evidence eg Goldfarb 1943, Spitz and Wolf 1946. These studies involved privation yet Bowlby used them as evidence for the effects of maternal deprivation.

05   Which **one** of the following statements about the Romanian orphan studies is **true**?
        Write **A**, **B**, **C**, or **D** in your answer book.   .

[1 mark]

[AO1 = 1]

D

06   Discuss what psychologists have told us about the development of children's
        friendships.

[12 marks]

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

AO1
Up to four marks for knowledge of research and theory into the development of children's friendships. Likely content:
- Age-related change in friendship – Selman's 5 stages showing shift from focus on physical interaction to autonomous interdependence
- Sex differences in friendship – boys' extensive, larger groups, shared activities – girls' intensive, dyads, shared intimacies.
- Sex differences in jealousy and sensitivity to friendship breakdown

- Descriptions of relevant evidence eg Bigelow and La Gaipa essay research; Halle choice of same-sex friends; Damon's interviews re stages; Benenson's sex differences; Lever's observations of sex differences
- Explanations for popularity and rejection – attractiveness, status, social skills
- Causal and incidental models of popularity (Parker and Asher)
- Research into popularity and rejection eg Dodge's playground observation, longitudinal research into the consequences of rejection (Kuperschmidt & Coie)

AO2
Up to eight marks for discussion of research and theory. Likely discussion points:
- Analysis of reasons for age-related change eg levels of cognitive development, lessening egocentrism, shared perspective-taking
- Analysis of origins of sex differences eg socialisation, role expectation, social learning, operant conditioning, evolutionary determinants e.g. competition, dominance hierarchy, nurturance
- Issues with research where linked to children's friendships- reliability and validity of the measures used in various types of friendship research e.g. use of hypothetical dilemmas (Selman), content analysis of essays (Bigelow and La Gaipa), interviews and demand characteristics.
- Implications of findings eg for future relationships
- Problems inferring cause and effect, eg is poor social skill a cause or consequence of rejection?
- Individual differences – not all males and females show stereotypical sex differences in friendships

Note: ethical criticisms of studies are not credit worthy, as they do not relate to the question.

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding in relation to psychological theory and/or research into children's friendship(s). Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks   Good answers
Answer shows knowledge and understanding in relation to psychological theory and/or research into children's friendship(s). Discussion is evident. The answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

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

4 - 6 marks   Average to weak answers

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding in relation to psychological theory and/or research into children's friendship(s). There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers
Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Topic: Cognitive Development

07	It would be important for the psychologists to agree on what is meant by 'practical assistance' before starting the observation. Briefly explain why.
	[1 mark]

[AO3 = 1]

1 mark: It is important for reliability (inter-rater or observer reliability) so that behaviours are recorded/coded consistently.
Accept: to avoid observer/researcher bias; to avoid subjectivity; to be more objective; to avoid ambiguity; to be standardised; for operationalisation

'Reliability' on its own not sufficient, must be some clarification, e.g. type of reliability or reference to consistency

08	Explain how the psychologists could agree on what is meant by 'practical assistance' before starting their observation.
	[2 marks]

[AO3 = 2]

2   marks for a clear, coherent explanation of process and outcome
1 mark for an explanation that is muddled/vague/lacks detail

- One mark for a way of defining behaviour as follows: two psychologists would discuss beforehand/canvas opinion/consult previous research/carry out a mini/pilot observation to guide them.
- One mark for reference to the outcome of the discussion as follows: they could establish categories: they would draw up a list/tally chart of observable behaviours that they would categorise as the target behaviour (and exclude other).

Credit also explanation through example

09	Briefly explain what Piaget meant by 'class inclusion'.
	[2 marks]

[AO1 = 2]

2 marks for a clear and coherent explanation.
1 mark for a partial answer that shows relevant knowledge but lacks clarity.

Likely content: the ability to understand the difference between superordinate and subordinate categories (or similar), that an object can be a member of an overall/big group (eg fruit) and also be a member of a sub-group/smaller group within the overall/big group (eg citrus fruit)

10	Referring to Piaget's theory of adaptation, explain how Oscar's knowledge of the world will change as a result of his experience.
	[2 marks]

[AO2 = 2]

2 marks for a clear, coherent application using appropriate terminology
1 mark for answers that show some knowledge of adaptation but lack clarity and use of appropriate terminology

Possible routes to application:

- Oscar's existing schema for flour (white, powdery, used in baking, only one type) needs to change (knowledge is **accommodated**) because he has discovered that there is more than one type
- The new knowledge about different types of flour is added to (**assimilated** into) Oscar's existing flour schema
- The new information conflicts with what Oscar already knows causing **disequilibrium** ('disappointment', 'surprise') and therefore his flour schema has to change to restore **equilibrium**, or any combination of these.

Full credit can be given for answers focusing on **either** accommodation **or** assimilation **or** equilibration.

11	Which **one** of the following statements about Piaget's three mountains experiment is **false**? Write **A**, **B**, **C**, or **D** in your answer book.
	[1 mark]

[AO1 = 1]

A

12	Outline and evaluate the work of Baillargeon **and** Siegler.
	[12 marks]

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

AO1
Up to four marks for outlines of the work of Baillargeon and Seigler, usually 2 marks for each. Likely content:

Baillargeon

- Nativist theory – that certain aspects of knowledge of the physical world are inborn
- Views on object permanence as illustrated through violation of expectation research using impossible events
- Knowledge of the studies – the tall and short carrot, the block and screen, the truck and block

Seigler
- Information processing theory
- Acquisition of rules and development of strategies for problem solving
- Overlapping waves model
- Knowledge of research eg the balance scale problem and the min strategy for counting

AO2
Up to eight marks for evaluation of the work of the two researchers, usually four marks for each. Likely points:

Baillargeon
- Comparisons with social constructivist theories
- Comparisons with Piaget's views about the age of development of object permanence
- Evaluation of research eg the validity of the interpretation of looking at time as a reaction to impossible events
- Restricted focus on just one aspect of cognitive development
- Use of evidence as part of evaluation

Seigler
- Strengths of the information processing approach eg provides information about sequence of stages and processes in problem solving; enables links between information processing and findings in neuroscience
- Usefulness of findings in relation to education
- Problems of the computer analogy
- Use of evidence as part of evaluation

Maximum 7 marks if one researcher only
Does not require perfect balance for marks in the top band

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding in relation to each researcher. Evaluation of each researcher includes reference to a number of issues and shows thoughtful analysis. Most evaluative points are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks   Good answers
Answer shows knowledge and understanding in relation to each researcher. Evaluation of each researcher is evident and some points are developed. There may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. An otherwise very good answer covering only one researcher can get a maximum of 7 marks.

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

4 - 6 marks   Average to weak answers
Answer shows some knowledge and understanding in relation to each researcher although there is greater focus on one than the other OR one is well done. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers
Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Topic: Moral Development

13	It would be important for the psychologists to agree on what is meant by 'sharing' before starting the observation. Briefly explain why.
	[1 mark]

[AO3 = 1]

1 mark: It is important for reliability (inter-rater or observer reliability) so that behaviours are recorded/coded consistently.
Accept: to avoid observer/researcher bias; to avoid subjectivity; to be more objective; to avoid ambiguity; to be standardised; for operationalisation

'Reliability' on its own not sufficient, must be some clarification, e.g. type of reliability or reference to consistency

14	Explain how the psychologists could agree on what is meant by 'sharing' before starting their observation.
	[2 marks]

[AO3 = 2]

2 marks for a clear, coherent explanation of process and outcome
1 mark for an explanation that is muddled/vague/lacks detail

- One mark for a way of defining behaviour as follows: two psychologists would discuss beforehand/canvas opinion/consult previous research/carry out a mini/pilot observation to guide them.
- One mark for reference to the outcome of the discussion as follows: they could establish categories: they would draw up a list/tally chart of observable behaviours that they would categorise as the target behaviour (and exclude other).

Credit also explanation through example

15	Piaget proposed a stage of moral development which he called moral relativism. Which **one** of the following statements about moral relativism is **false**? Write **A**, **B**, **C**, or **D** in your answer book. .
	[1 mark]

[AO1 = 1]

B

16	Briefly outline **one** difference between male and female moral reasoning identified by Gilligan.
	[2 marks]

[AO1 = 2]

2 marks for a clear and coherent answer using appropriate terminology
1 mark for a partial answer that shows relevant knowledge but lacks clarity and use of appropriate terminology or merely states a difference as below.

Possible differences:
- Male emphasis on justice v female emphasis on care
- Male emphasis on rights v female emphasis on responsibilities

For 2 mark answer, must be some elaboration of either male or female perspective.

17	Explain how the comments of Woman A **and** Woman B relate to Gilligan's levels of moral development. **[2 marks]**

[AO2 = 2]

One mark for each explanation as follows:
- Woman A's comments reflect Gilligan's self-interest level because she is thinking just about herself/own individual needs

- Woman B's comments reflect Gilligan's self-sacrifice level because she is not thinking about herself at all/more concerned with others/partner

Can credit 1 mark for correctly linking **both** comments to the appropriate level without explanation.

A 2 mark answer should refer to both levels by name and give explanation.

18	Describe and evaluate Eisenberg's work on moral development. As part of your evaluation you should refer to the work of Kohlberg. **[12 marks]**

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

AO1
Up to four marks for knowledge of Eisenberg's (work) theory and research into moral development. Likely content:
- Focus on prosocial moral reasoning
- Focus on empathy and feelings
- The birthday party dilemma research
- 5 levels of prosocial reasoning – hedonistic, needs-oriented, approval, empathic/reflective, internalised

Up to 2 marks for description of evidence.

AO2

Up to eight marks for evaluation of Eisenberg's theory and research and for use of Kohlberg in evaluation. Likely points:
- Focus on opportunities for doing good (more realistic and more likely in real life) than Kohlberg who focused on wrongdoing – more relevant to children's experience
- Prosocial reasoning is not mediated by law as is reasoning about wrongdoing
- Shows prosocial reasoning more advanced than reasoning about wrongdoing
- Greater emphasis on role of culture than Kohlberg who proposed universality
- Validity indicated through parallels with Kohlberg's levels
- Comparisons with Kohlberg re different levels/stages eg approval = good-boy, good-girl stage
- Underestimated the age at which empathy develops. Eisenberg stated 12 yrs whilst evidence suggests earlier
- Evaluation of research – more realistic than other hypothetical dilemmas eg Heinz
- Use of evidence eg birthday dilemma responses to evaluate theory

Maximum 8 marks if no use of Kohlberg in evaluation

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding in relation to Eisenberg's work. Evaluation is thorough and includes thoughtful analysis. Most evaluation points are well developed. Use of Kohlberg in evaluation is effective. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks Good answers
Answer shows knowledge and understanding in relation to Eisenberg's work. Evaluation is evident with some points developed and some appropriate use of Kohlberg at the top of the band, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

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

4 - 6 marks Average to weak answers
Answer shows some knowledge and understanding in relation to Eisenberg's work. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers
Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There is substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Section B Applied Options

Topic: Cognition and Law

19	Which **two** of **A**, **B**, **C**, **D** and **E** correctly describe the effects of using a sequential line-up procedure on person identification? Write the **two** correct letters in your answer book.
	[2 marks]

[AO1 = 2]

C and E

20	Outline the way **one** composite system might be used to construct a likeness of a face.
	[2 marks]

[AO1 = 2]

2 marks for a clear and coherent outline using appropriate terminology
1 mark for a partial outline that shows relevant knowledge but lacks clarity and use of appropriate terminology

- Using Photofit: witness sees a template and is asked about each feature in turn; they choose from a bank of jigsaw-like pieces (855 pieces); slot them into a template; after each piece is added the witness is asked 'is this more or less like the suspect?'

- Using E-fit: similar above but computerised version; bank contains many more features; insertion of 'average' features to fill in blanks; final face can be adjusted by witness

- Using Evo-fit: witness selects 6 faces similar to suspect from a computer bank of faces; computer uses features of these parent faces used to generate offspring faces; offspring faces bred together to produce likenesses for witness to assess

Not all detail (above) necessary for full marks.

21 Explain **two** limitations of composite systems.

[4 marks]

[AO2 = 4]

For each limitation;
2 marks for a clear and fully explained limitation
1 mark for a partially explained limitation that lacks clarity

Note for the second mark the expansion must be specific to the limitation – not enough to simply state 'affects accuracy/reliability/identification'

(limitations may relate to any composite system [or the general idea] not only the one used in answer to Q20).

Likely limitations:
- Chance of operator contamination – confounding effect whereby behaviour/language of the operator affects the witness's responses – affects the reliability of the witnesses recall
- Images produced are usually 2D and static whereas real faces are 3D and have movement and expression – lack realism
- Limited effectiveness of some systems – use of evidence to support this eg system helps in only 23% cases (Kapardis)
- Early systems – likenesses were marred by demarcation lines between features – unrealistic
- Early systems – based on feature analysis and have lower success rate than systems based on holistic face recognition
- Generally based on research using faces of strangers – to be properly useful the systems should be underpinned by research using real witnesses to real events

22 Discuss influences of post-event contamination on eye-witness accounts. Refer to evidence in your answer.

[12 marks]

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

AO1
Up to 4 marks for knowledge of influences of post-event contamination:

- Leading questions as a source of post-event contamination - contaminate recall by suggesting course of events so that memory is reconstructed to fit the Q
- Post-event discussion as a source of post-event contamination - contaminates recall by suggesting course of events so that memory is reconstructed to fit other people's accounts
- Knowledge of theoretical basis eg role of schema – reconstruction, confabulation, effort after meaning

- Research examples eg Loftus and Palmer's car accident research; Wright et al effect of pair discussions on recall of story; Candel Coca-Cola discussion pairs; Poole and Lindsay Mr Science experiment.

Up to 2 marks for description of evidence

AO2
Up to 8 marks for discussion

Possible points:
- Use of evidence to support or refute effects
- Analysis of the effects eg deletion v insertion
- Analysis of implications/consequences
- Analysis of the theoretical basis eg role of schema
- Comparisons/interactions with other factors affecting eye-witness account e g emotion
- Analysis of effects of mediating variables: age – children generally found to be more susceptible but Candel showed older children are more susceptible than younger; crucial v peripheral information; plausibility; timing of contamination

Ethical criticisms of studies are not creditworthy unless explained as to how affect the influence of post-event contamination

Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding in relation to the effects of post-event contamination. Discussion is thorough and includes thoughtful analysis. Most points are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks   Good answers
Answer shows knowledge and understanding in relation to the effects of post-event contamination. Discussion is evident with some points developed. There may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

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

4 - 6 marks   Average to weak answers

Answer shows some knowledge and understanding in relation to the effects of post-event contamination. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers

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

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Topic: Schizophrenia and Mood Disorders

23	Identify the sub-type of schizophrenia experienced by Ben.
	[1 mark]

[AO2 = 1]

Residual (also accept Type 2/negative)

24	Identify the sub-type of schizophrenia experienced by Charlie.
	[1 mark]

[AO2 = 1]

Disorganised/Hebephrenic (also accept Type 1/positive)

25	Briefly explain **one** problem that might arise when using symptoms to classify schizophrenia.
	[2 marks]

[AO2 = 2]

2 marks for a clear and fully explained problem using appropriate terminology
1 mark for a partially explained problem that lacks clarity.

Note the answer must focus on the issue of using the symptoms for classification but need not focus specifically on differentiation of subtypes.

Likely problems:
- Need to consider factors other than just the presenting symptoms - such as age of onset, response to medication and duration of symptoms
- Co-morbidity – disorder often exists alongside other conditions, potential to confuse symptoms of one disorder with another.
- Drugs may be masking outward symptoms – schizophrenia is often co-morbid with other conditions for which the person may be taking medication
- Symptoms are subjective/self-reported/no outward signs
- Symptom overlap – the sub-categories do not have exclusive symptoms so that the same symptom could be an indicator of more than one type

26	Briefly outline **one** study in which the diagnosis of schizophrenia was investigated. In your answer, you should refer to how the study was conducted and the results obtained.
	[2 marks]

[AO1 = 2]

Most answers will focus on the Rosenhan study but other relevant studies are creditworthy.

2 marks for a brief coherent and organised outline which includes an accurate account of method/procedure and findings

1 mark for brief outline with some account of both method/procedure and findings but some inaccuracy (or an accurate account of either method/procedure or findings)

0 marks for an answer that is very muddled/inaccurate/incomplete

---

27 Which **two** of the following statements about community care, **A**, **B**, **C**, **D** and **E**, are **false**?
In your answer book, write the **two** letters that match the **false** statements.
[2 marks]

[AO1 = 2]

A and B

---

28 Discuss cognitive explanations **and** cognitive treatments for mood disorders.
[12 marks]

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

AO1
Up to four marks for knowledge of cognitive explanations and cognitive treatments for mood disorders. Not all of the following is required for full credit

- **Explanations**: negative schema cause depression; ABC model; negative cognitive triad – negative thoughts about self, world and future; elements for negative scheme – overgeneralization, magnification, selective perception, absolutist thinking; negative attributional style and the attribution helplessness model - depressed people show internal, stable, global attributions for negative events (only credit learned helplessness where linked to cognition).
- **Treatments:** outline may be generic or focus on one specific treatment: patient as scientist – setting up hypotheses to test to challenge irrational thought; CBT – identifying and challenging negative automatic thoughts plus reinforcement; SIT – self-instructional training – positive self-statement to counter automatic negative thoughts; RET – use of confrontation and argument to contest irrational beliefs.

One mark for description of relevant evidence

AO2
Up to eight marks for discussion and comment on cognitive explanations and cognitive treatments for mood disorders. Likely discussion points:

- Sensible to focus on thought rather than just outward behaviour
- Cognitive explanations are not so useful in explaining manic depression

- Issue of cause and effect – is negative thinking the cause of mood disorders or a consequence?
- Use of evidence in discussion of both explanation and treatment eg Damasio showed that emotions may be controlling cognition and not the other way round; Alloy found that depression was linked to thinking style identified 2 ½ years earlier; Elkin – comparison of different treatment types showed effectiveness of cognitive therapy.
- Cognitive treatments engage/involve the patient, unlike medication
- Cognitive treatments are best combined with medication, especially at the start
- Cognitive treatment suits articulate, intelligent, well-motivated clients better
- Cognitive treatment useful in preventing mild depression turning into more severe depression
- Comparison with other explanations and treatments

Maximum 7 marks if only explanation or treatment presented

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding in relation to both explanation and treatment. Discussion of both explanation and treatment includes reference to a number of issues and shows thoughtful analysis. Most evaluative points are well developed. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks   Good answers
Answer shows knowledge and understanding in relation to both explanation and treatment. Discussion of both explanation and treatment is evident and some points are developed. There is minor irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.
An otherwise very good answer focusing on just one aspect (explanation or treatment) can get a maximum of 7 marks.

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

4 - 6 marks   Average to weak answers
Answer shows some knowledge and understanding in relation to explanation and treatment although there is greater focus on one than the other OR one aspect only is well done. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

The candidate expresses basic ideas reasonably well but there may be some ambiguity. The candidate uses key psychological terminology inappropriately on some occasions. The

answer may lack structure, although there is some evidence of use of sentences and paragraphs. There are occasional intrusive errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling which obscure meaning.

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers
Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Topic: Stress and Stress Management

29	Statements **A**, **B**, **C**, **D** and **E** below describe the activity of the endocrine system in a stressful situation. Which **two** of the statements are **false**? In your answer book, write the **two** letters that match the **false** statements. **[2 marks]**

[AO1 = 2]

C and E

30	Outline **one** self-report technique that has been used to measure stress. **[2 marks]**

[AO1 = 2]

Up to two marks for an outline. Most students will refer to the SRRS (Holmes and Rahe). Others are acceptable eg the Hassles and Uplifts Scale (Kanner); Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen); Stress Appraisal Measure (Peacock and Wong)

SRRS – Qs about critical life events in the last year with a score for each event (1) tally of scores to indicate overall level of stress with high score = greater stress (1)

For full marks the answer should include some detail of type of question and some detail of how final score/measure indicates stress.

31	Identify and explain the defence mechanism being used by the person in quote **A**. **[2 marks]**

[AO2 = 2]

1 mark for denial
plus
1 mark for psychological explanation (not simple repetition of stem): person copes emotionally with stressor by refusing to accept that there is a problem

32	Identify and explain the defence mechanism being used by the person in quote **B**. **[2 marks]**

[AO2 = 2]

1 mark for regression
plus
1 mark for psychological explanation (not simple repetition of stem): person copes emotionally with stressor by reverting to excessively emotional childlike behaviour/reacting in a similar way to a child.

33   Describe and evaluate **two or more** behavioural approaches to stress management.
[12 marks]

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

AO1
Up to 4 marks for description of two or more behavioural approaches to stress management.
Likely content:
- Behavioural concepts relevant to stress management eg associative learning, repeated pairings, conditioning (operant and classical), reinforcement
- Systematic desensitization: relaxation training, hierarchy construction, gradual exposure
- Biofeedback: operant conditioning of autonomic responses associated with stress eg muscle tension, use of positive reinforcement

One mark for description of relevant evidence

AO2
Up to 8 marks for evaluation. Likely issues:
- Use of evidence as part of evaluation
- Effectiveness – long-term and short-term
- Generalisation outside training
- Ethical issues and constraints
- Role of relaxation – sufficient on its own?
- Appropriateness for different types of stress and different stressors
- Reductionist rather than holistic – breaks the process down into behavioural elements losing sight of person's experience as a whole
- Comparison with other approaches eg limited focus on outward behaviour whereas cognitive approach addresses underlying thinking
- Validity of behavioural concepts

Maximum 7 marks if only one approach presented

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding in relation to two or more behavioural approaches to managing stress. Evaluation is thorough and includes thoughtful analysis. Most evaluation points are well developed. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks   Good answers
Answer shows knowledge and understanding in relation to behavioural approaches to managing stress. Evaluation is evident with some points developed at the top of the band.

There may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. An otherwise top band answer dealing with only one approach may gain 7 marks.

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

4 - 6 marks   Average to weak answers
Answer shows some knowledge and understanding in relation to behavioural approach(es) to managing stress. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers
Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Topic: Substance Abuse

34	Which **one** of **A**, **B**, **C**, or **D**, reflects the sequence of the statements about Lucy? **[1 mark]**

[AO1 = 1]

A

35	Outline **one** study in which the effect of social factors on substance abuse has been investigated. Refer to what the researchers did and what they found. **[2 marks]**

[AO1 = 2]

2 marks for a brief coherent and organised outline which includes an accurate account of method/procedure and findings

1 mark for brief outline with some account of both method/procedure and findings but some inaccuracy (or an accurate account of either method/procedure or findings)

0 marks for an answer that is very muddled/inaccurate/incomplete

Most students will refer to Garnier and Stein, Bricker et al and Brook. Other relevant studies should be credited.

36	Briefly outline the action **and** effect of stimulants. **[1 mark]**

[AO1 = 1]

Increased CNS/NS/sympathetic/neuronal activity (action) leading to elevated mood/heightened sensation/increased energy (effect) (Accept also relevant physiological effects e.g. increased heart rate, increased breathing, pupil dilation etc.)

Accept answers based on a named stimulant e.g. caffeine

37	Explain **two** limitations of hereditary factors as an explanation for substance abuse. **[4 marks]**

 [AO2 = 4]

In each case:

2 marks for a clear and fully explained limitation
1 mark for a partially explained limitation that lacks clarity

Likely limitations:
- Reductionist – explains a complex behaviour eg alcohol addiction in terms of its most basic components eg specific genes or a combination of genes; oversimplifies and does not allow for an overall understanding of the way in which many factors combine to result in addiction.
- Deterministic – leads to an assumption that anyone who inherits a specific gene or combination of genes for addiction is likely to develop the behaviour; a negative and pessimistic view which might result in self-fulfilling behaviour.
- Importance of interactionism; a person may inherit a predisposition but not develop the addiction because circumstances do not trigger the behaviour.
- Genes may act in a less direct way than some assume eg as an absence of brakes rather than as a direct determinant (Plomin)
- Issues related to evidence eg problems with twin studies which could support an environmental explanation as much as a genetic explanation eg MZs have a more shared environment than DZs
- Alternative explanations or use of counter-evidence

Credit other relevant limitations

---

38   Discuss self-management as a way of treating substance abuse. As part of your discussion, you should refer to the Prochaska model of behaviour change.

[12 marks]

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

AO1
Up to 4 marks for knowledge of self-management of substance abuse. Likely content:

- Motivation through self-help group of people, perhaps with an assigned 'buddy' and/or professional guidance
- Control of intake – self-regulated
- Monitoring of own intake eg written record/diary
- Providing insight into reasons for abusing – through group discussion
- Awareness raising re consequences for others eg family – through group discussion
- A form of talking therapy
- Specific examples eg AA

One mark for description of relevant evidence
One mark for knowledge of the Prochaska model

AO2
Up to 8 marks for discussion and for analysis of the process of self-management. Likely issues:
- Difficult to assess effectiveness – confidential nature, voluntary sector, limited record-keeping
- Group is a powerful source of emotional support – peer pressure from within the group – role of reinforcement from a 'buddy'
- Comparison with other treatments/techniques eg better success when elements like monitoring intake are combined with more direct therapy eg cognitive behaviour therapy

- Relapse is frequent – contacts outside the group can exert peer pressure to continue to abuse – better self-management programmes include refusal training to help with peer pressure
- Links to Prochaska model eg attending a group = decision/preparation stage; keeping diary and restricting own intake = action stage; reverting to abusing behaviour/previous levels of intake = relapse.
- Use of evidence as part of evaluation

Maximum 8 marks if no reference to Prochaska.

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows some knowledge and understanding of self-management. Discussion is thorough and includes thoughtful analysis. Most discussion points are well developed. Use of Prochaska in discussion is effective. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks   Good answers
Answer shows knowledge and understanding of self-management. Discussion is evident with some points developed. Must be some reference to Prochaska for 9 marks. There may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.

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

4 - 6 marks   Average to weak answers
Answer shows some knowledge and understanding of self-management. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers

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

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Topic: Forensic Psychology

39	Which **two** statements above apply to anger management? Write the correct combination of letters in your answer book.
	[1 mark]

[AO1 = 1]

B and C

40	Which **two** statements above apply to behaviour modification? Write the correct combination of letters in your answer book.
	[1 mark]

[AO1 = 1]

A and D

41	Briefly outline how atavistic form might relate to offending behaviour.
	[2 marks]

[AO1 = 2]

2 marks for a clear and coherent answer using appropriate terminology and clear explanation of how atavistic form would lead to offending

1 mark for a vague answer that shows relevant knowledge but lacks clarity and use of appropriate terminology or is only implicitly linked to offending

Content: Genetic/evolutionary sub-species/throwback with primitive characteristics/ behaviour not modified by expectations/rules of developed society, has lower moral standards, engages in offending behaviour to satisfy own immediate needs; self-fulfilling prophecy explanation, possessing physical characteristics that lead person to be treated in a certain way, leading to offending behaviour.

---

42   Choose one alternative to custodial sentencing and explain **two** limitations of the alternative to custodial sentencing that you have chosen.

[4 marks]

[AO2 = 4]

For each limitation:
2 marks for a clear and coherent explanation.
1 mark for a vague/brief/muddled explanation or a limitation briefly stated.

Likely points:
- Tagging – unlikely to lead to reform – can stll maintain criminal contacts; little deterrent – not seen as severe enough; badge of honour
- Restorative justice – offender may not be truly remorseful; just using RJ as a ploy for early parole; victim may be reluctant/intimidated/afraid to participate; requires trained mediator to be effective
- Community sentencing – leads to resentment; socially divisive and stigmatising; not seen as suffciently punitive by general public
- Fines – rarely lead to reform but only if penalty is very severe; little stigma attached and therefore re-offending is not deterred; more damaging for lower socio-economic groups than for middle/higher socio-economic groups

Credit limitations of other alternatives.

---

43   Outline and evaluate psychodynamic **and** learning theory explanations of offending.
[12 marks]

[AO1 = 4, AO2 = 8]

AO1
Up to 4 marks for outlines of psychodynamic and learning theory explanations. Likely content:
- Psychodyamic: role of the superego; Blackburn's offending types of superego – deviant, weak, over-harsh; affectionless psychopathy theory (Bowlby); role of defence mechanisms eg sublimation
- Learning theory: differential association theory – influence of role models; role of societal norms, values and expectations; peers/family as reinforcers of offending behaviour; general learning theory concepts as the relate to offending eg conditioning, associative learning, reinforcement, vicarious reinforcement; modeling

One mark for description of relevant evidence

AO2
Up to 8 marks for evaluation of psychodynamic and learning theory explanations. Likely points:
Psychodynamic
- Problems of testability – theory based on unconscious mechanisms
- Deterministic approach – psychic determinism eg Bowlby early damage cannot be overcome; consequences for attempting reform
- Use of evidence eg against Freud's theory of superego development – females are less likely to offend than males; most people without a same-sex parent with whom to identify do not offend
- Difficulty establishing cause and effect – does personality determine offending or does offending affect personality?

Learning theory
- Deterministic approach – environmental determinism eg influence of environment cannot be avoided; consequences for attempting reform
- Use of evidence eg Bandura's research into imitation of aggression and Farrington's Cambridge Delinquent Development research
- Difficulty establishing cause and effect – role of confounding variables such as level of education and intelligence

Credit also comparisons between explanations

Maximum 7 marks if one explanation only

Does not require perfect balance for top band

10 - 12 marks Very good answers

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding in relation to each explanation. Evaluation of each explanation includes reference to a number of issues and shows thoughtful analysis. Most evaluative points are well developed. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

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

7 - 9 marks   Good answers
Answer shows knowledge and understanding in relation to each explanation. Evaluation of each explanation is evident and some points are developed. There is minor irrelevance and/or misunderstanding.
An otherwise very good answer covering only one explanation can get a maximum of 7 marks.

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

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

4 - 6 marks   Average to weak answers
Answer shows some knowledge and understanding in relation to each explanation although there is greater focus on one than the other OR one is well done. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant description but without proper focus on the question are likely to be in this band. There may be considerable irrelevance/inaccuracy.

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

1 - 3 marks   Poor answers
Answer shows very limited knowledge and understanding but must contain some relevant information in relation to the question. There may be substantial confusion, inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Assessment Objectives

Social Dev	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total for topic
01			1	
02			2	
03	2			
04		2		
05	1			
06	4	8		
Total	**7**	**10**	**3**	**20 marks**
Cog Dev				
07			1	
08			2	
09	2			
10		2		
11	1			
12	4	8		
Total	**7**	**10**	**3**	**20 marks**
Moral Dev				
13			1	
14			2	
15	1			
16	2			
17		2		
18	4	8		
Total	**7**	**10**	**3**	**20 marks**
Cog and Law				
19	2			
20	2			
21		4		
22	4	8		
Total	**8**	**12**		**20 marks**
Schiz/Mood				
23		1		
24		1		
25		2		
26	2			
27	2			
28	4	8		
Total	**8**	**12**		**20 marks**
Stress				
29	2			
30	2			
31		2		
32		2		
33	4	8		
Total	**8**	**12**		**20 marks**

Substance Ab	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
34	1			
35	2			
36	1			
37		4		
38	4	8		
Total	**8**	**12**		**20 marks**
Forensic				
39	1			
40	1			
41	2			
42		4		
43	4	8		
Total	**8**	**12**		**20 marks**