

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

**Psychology A** 

PSYA2

(Specification 2180)

Unit 2: Biological Psychology, Social Psychology and Individual Differences

# **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

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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).

Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

# Section A Biological Psychology

#### Question 1

# AO2 = 4 marks Analysis of unfamiliar situation and application of knowledge of body's response to stress.

The stem refers to the body responding to a short-term stressor, the release of adrenaline is responsible for increased heart rate and faster breathing and the dry mouth is linked to the digestive system "shutting down". Students can refer to the pituitary adrenal system and/or the sympathomedullary pathway. They can also refer to the fight-or-flight response. For full marks there must be explicit engagement with the stem.

### 4 marks Effective analysis of unfamiliar situation

Effective explanation that demonstrates sound knowledge of the body's response to stress. There is explicit engagement, which relates to either at least two of the specific changes identified in the stem or the car as the stressor.

## 3 marks Reasonable analysis of unfamiliar situation

Reasonable explanation that demonstrates knowledge of the body's response to stress with reference to one or more of the changes identified in the stem.

## 2 marks Basic analysis of unfamiliar situation

Basic explanation of the body's response to stress

## 1 mark Rudimentary analysis of unfamiliar situation

Rudimentary, muddled, explanation of the body's response to stress demonstrating very limited knowledge.

#### 0 marks

No creditworthy material.

#### Question 2

# AO3 = 6 marks Understanding of scattergram and strengths & weaknesses of correlations.

- **2 (a)** The graph indicates a fairly strong, positive correlation between scores on a stress questionnaire and days off through illness. The following can all receive a mark: direction, strength and a description of their relationship. Credit can also be given for mentioning the flattening of the graph at higher stress levels.
- **2 (b)** Strength: can study relationship between variables that occur naturally. Can measure things that cannot be manipulated experimentally. Can suggest trends that can lead to experiments.

Weakness: It is not possible to say that one thing causes another. Just because there is a correlation between stress scores and days off it does not mean that stress caused people to take days off work, or there may be another variable connecting them. Elaboration through the use of an appropriate example can also receive credit. Any other appropriate answer can get credit.

One mark for a brief outline of strength/limitation and a further mark for elaboration. For example, cannot say one thing causes another (1 mark) there may be a third variable that connects the two (2nd mark for elaboration.)

# AO2 = 6 marks Analysis of unfamiliar situation and application of knowledge of the influence of personality on the body's response to stress.

- 3 (a) Roy = Type B / B / Personality Type B and Mick = Type A / A / Personality Type A (1 mark for each correct answer)
- 3 (b) It is people with Type A behaviour who are more likely to suffer the negative effects of stress. So in the stem it is Mick (competitive and angry when loses) who is more likely to suffer from CHD. Friedman and Rosenman research indicated that it is those with Type A who become ill as a consequence of their stress. Type B people such as Roy who doesn't get physically aroused at losing, are much less likely to experience the "fight or flight" response and so less likely to have raised blood pressure etc. Examiners need to remember that 'research' can include both theories and studies. For full marks there must be explicit engagement with the stem.

# 4 marks Effective analysis of unfamiliar situation

Effective explanation that demonstrates sound knowledge of how personality factors can affect the body's response to stress and who is more likely to suffer from a stress-related illness.

## 3 marks Reasonable analysis of unfamiliar situation

Reasonable explanation that demonstrates knowledge of how personality factors can affect the body's response to stress.

#### 2 marks Basic analysis of unfamiliar situation

Basic explanation of how personality factors can affect the body's response to stress

## 1 mark Rudimentary analysis of unfamiliar situation

Rudimentary, muddled, explanation of how personality factors can affect the body's response to stress demonstrating very limited knowledge.

#### 0 marks

No creditworthy material.

#### **Question 4**

#### AO1 = 4 marks Knowledge of drugs as a method of stress management

The two main groups of drugs used to manage stress are Benzodiazepines and Beta-blockers. BZs act on the brain by increasing the action of GABA. This neurotransmitter reduces the activity of other neurotransmitters in the brain.

Beta-blockers act directly on the cardiovascular system. They reduce any increase in heart rate and blood pressure that may arise as a result of stress.

Examiners should be aware of a breadth/depth trade off: one type in detail or both in less detail.

wark Scheme – General Certificate of Education (A-level) Psychology A – PSTA2 – Sandary 2013

### 4 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed

Accurate and reasonably detailed answer that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of drug therapy as a method of stress management. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question.

## 3 marks Less detailed but generally accurate

Less detailed but generally accurate answer that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.

#### 2 marks Basic

Basic answer that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.

## 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate

Very brief or flawed answer demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate.

#### 0 marks

No creditworthy material.

#### Question 5

# AO1 = 4 marks Knowledge of stress inoculation therapy as method of stress management

Stress Inoculation therapy (SIT) involves three stages.

- The first is conceptualization, where the client and therapist identify the source of the stress. This could include keeping a diary of when and where the stressful experiences occurred. During this stage the therapist might even challenge the client's views.
- The second stage allows the client to learn specific skills and to practice them with the therapist.
- Finally the client will try out these skills in the real world. At the same time the client together with the therapist will consider how well these new skills worked.

Credit also a more theoretical answer eg assumptions and rationale.

### 4 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed

Accurate and reasonably detailed answer that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of SIT as a method of stress management. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question.

# 3 marks Less detailed but generally accurate

Less detailed but generally accurate answer that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.

#### 2 marks Basic

Basic answer that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.

## 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate

Very brief or flawed answer demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate.

#### 0 marks

No creditworthy material.

# Section B Social Psychology

#### Question 6

AO3 = 6 marks Knowledge and understanding of criticisms relating to Milgram's research

Students may refer to one methodological and one ethical issue, or two ethical or two methodological issues.

There are a range of ethical issues that can be considered during the experiment.

- Protection from harm participants were clearly distressed.
- While participants were in fact given the right to withdraw initially it was made very difficult for them to do so during the experiment. Students can only gain credit for right to withdraw if this is explained.
- Deception participants were deceived at several stages of the study
- Informed consent because of deception, participants were unable to give their full informed consent.
- Socially sensitive research eg the obedience alibi and the 'Germans are different' hypothesis are also creditworthy.

One mark for identification of the issue and a further 2 marks for elaboration.

The methodological issues can relate to the fact that this was an experiment, so it could be said to lack external validity as well as internal validity. In Milgram's early versions he only used male participants, thus population validity is an issue. Any relevant methodological issue can be credited.

One mark for identification of the issue and a further 2 marks for elaboration.

#### **Question 7**

AO2 = 4 marks Analysis of unfamiliar situation and application of knowledge of why people obey.

There are various reasons why people obey:

- Legitimate authority
- Power of uniform
- Any other psychological explanation, if it is relevant to the scenario, is creditworthy.

On a train, it is likely that the ticket collector is seen as having legitimate authority and so will be obeyed, however another passenger does not have such authority and so is unlikely to be obeyed.

For full marks there must be explicit engagement with the stem.

Mark Continue Continue of Education (7.1676), 1 Sychology 7. 1 61712 Canaday 2616

## 4 marks Effective analysis of unfamiliar situation

Effective explanation that demonstrates sound knowledge of why people are more likely to obey a ticket collector than another passenger.

### 3 marks Reasonable analysis of unfamiliar situation

Reasonable explanation that demonstrates knowledge why people obey on a train/ticket collector

## 2 marks Basic analysis of unfamiliar situation

Basic explanation of why people obey

## 1 mark Rudimentary analysis of unfamiliar situation

Rudimentary, muddled, explanation of why people obey, demonstrating very limited knowledge.

#### 0 marks

No creditworthy material.

#### **Question 8**

# AO1 = 6 marks Knowledge of how social influence research explains social change

There are various ways in which social influence research can help explain social change and examiners must be aware of the wide range of possible answers here. However, social change refers to the change that occurs in a society and not at the individual level.

- Minorities bring about social change by being consistent, flexible and non-dogmatic.
   Through social crypto-amnesia and the snowball effect, gradually the minority turns into the majority.
- Dictators can bring about social change through power and through the process of obedience.

Detailed descriptions of studies (eg Moscovici) are only relevant if they are used effectively to show how they have helped our understanding.

Research can refer to either theory or study.

## 6 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed

Accurate and reasonably detailed answer that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of how social influence research helps our understanding of social change. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question.

#### 5 - 4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate

Less detailed but generally accurate answer that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.

### 3 - 2 marks Basic

Basic answer that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.

## 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate

Very brief or flawed answer demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate.

#### 0 marks

No creditworthy material.

## AO1 = 4 marks Knowledge of research into conformity

Research can include both theories and studies. The most likely study offered is Asch's research into conformity and any aspect of his research is creditworthy. Other studies, such as Sherif, Crutchfield would also be creditworthy. Students could also consider reasons such as NSI and ISI to explain why people conform.

#### AO2 = 4 marks Evaluation of research

The evaluation will depend on which route students take. If they offer studies as their AO1, the commentary can come from a consideration of the strengths and limitations of the research. How other studies have challenged their findings. If a more theoretical route is taken, research studies to support the explanation can be used as commentary. As the question requires students to discuss, credit can be given for wider discussion points, such as implications and consequences.

A manufacture of the same of t	A manufacture of the control of the		
4 marks Accurate and reasonably	4 marks Effective evaluation		
detailed	Effective use of material to address the		
Accurate and reasonably detailed	question and provide informed commentary.		
description that demonstrates sound	Effective evaluation of research.		
knowledge and understanding of research	Broad range of issues and/or evidence in		
into conformity.	reasonable depth, or a narrower range in		
There is appropriate selection of material to	greater depth.		
address the question.	Clear expression of ideas, good range of		
	specialist terms, few errors of grammar,		
	punctuation and spelling.		
3 marks Less detailed but generally	3 marks Reasonable evaluation		
accurate	Material is not always used effectively but		
Less detailed but generally accurate	produces a reasonable commentary.		
description that demonstrates relevant	Reasonable evaluation of research.		
knowledge and understanding.	A range of issues and/or evidence in limited		
There is some evidence of selection of	depth, or a narrower range in greater depth.		
material to address the question.	Reasonable expression of ideas, a range of		
·	specialist terms, some errors of grammar,		
	punctuation and spelling.		
2 marks Basic	2 marks Basic evaluation		
Z IIIai kā Dasic	Z IIIai ks Dasic Evaluation		
Basic description that demonstrates some	The use of material provides only a basic commentary.		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but	The use of material provides only a basic		
Basic description that demonstrates some	The use of material provides only a basic commentary.  Basic evaluation of research.		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of	The use of material provides only a basic commentary.		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled.	The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of	The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of	The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar,		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.	The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity.		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.  1 mark Very brief/flawed or	The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity.  1 mark Rudimentary evaluation		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.  1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate	The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity.  1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.  1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description	The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity.  1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary.		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.  1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge.	The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity.  1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.  1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is	The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity.  1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent.		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.  1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge.	The use of material provides only a basic commentary.  Basic evaluation of research.  Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.  Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity.  1 mark Rudimentary evaluation  The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary.  Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent.  Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.  1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is	The use of material provides only a basic commentary. Basic evaluation of research. Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity.  1 mark Rudimentary evaluation The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary. Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.  1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is	The use of material provides only a basic commentary.  Basic evaluation of research.  Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.  Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity.  1 mark Rudimentary evaluation  The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary.  Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent.  Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms		
Basic description that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.  1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate Very brief or flawed description demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate.	The use of material provides only a basic commentary.  Basic evaluation of research.  Superficial consideration of a restricted range of issues and/or evidence.  Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity.  1 mark Rudimentary evaluation  The use of material provides only a rudimentary commentary.  Evaluation of research is just discernible or absent.  Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning.		

## Section C Individual Differences

## Question 10 (a)

# AO2 = 1 + 1 mark Analysis of unfamiliar situation and application of knowledge of ideal mental health definition of abnormality

Jahoda suggested the following criteria necessary for ideal mental health:

- Resistance to stress
- Growth, development or self-actualisation
- High self-esteem and a strong sense of identity
- Autonomy
- Perception of reality.

Examiners should be aware that these terms are subjective/descriptive and that students may name the concepts in slightly different ways.

## Question 10 (b)

## AO2 = 2 + 2 marks Limitation of ideal mental health definition of abnormality

- Difficulty of meeting all criteria, very few people would be able to do so and this suggests that very few people are psychologically healthy.
- The criteria are subjective and not operationalised, so being defined as abnormal is not objective.
- These ideas are culture-bound, based on a Western idea of ideal mental health: cultural relativism.

One mark for identification of each weakness and a further mark for elaboration.

## AO1 = 4 marks Knowledge of the procedures involved in ECT

ECT can be either unilateral (electrode on one temple) or bilateral (electrodes on both temples). Patient is given a short acting anaesthetic and muscle relaxant before the shock is administered. Oxygen is also administered. Small amount of current (about 0.6 amps) passed through the brain lasting for about half a second. The resulting seizure lasts for about a minute. ECT is usually given three times a week for up to 5 weeks.

#### 4 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed

Accurate and reasonably detailed answer that demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of how ECT is used. There is appropriate selection of material to address the question.

# 3 marks Less detailed but generally accurate

Less detailed but generally accurate answer that demonstrates relevant knowledge and understanding. There is some evidence of selection of material to address the question.

#### 2 marks Basic

Basic answer that demonstrates some relevant knowledge and understanding but lacks detail and may be muddled. There is little evidence of selection of material to address the question.

## 1 mark Very brief/flawed or inappropriate

Very brief or flawed answer demonstrating very little knowledge. Selection and presentation of information is largely or wholly inappropriate.

#### 0 marks

No creditworthy material.

#### Question 12

## AO1 = 2 marks Knowledge of techniques of psychoanalysis

Techniques could include:

- Free association, client is encouraged to talk freely without any censorship of thoughts.
- Dream analysis, client recalls dreams and therapist interprets the manifest content to discover the latent content.
- Projective techniques, client is shown for example an inkblot and is asked what they see in the picture.

A 'technique' is something that is instigated by the therapist.

One mark for identification of technique and further mark for elaboration.

## AO1 = 6 marks Knowledge of behavioural approach to psychopathology

#### Remember not to credit information given in the quote

Answers that only consider therapies, maximum 3 AO1 marks and 3 AO2 marks.

The emphasis of the behavioural approach is on the environment and how the behaviour is acquired, through classical conditioning, operant conditioning and social learning. For marks in the top two bands, the focus must be on explaining psychological abnormality, rather than on behaviour in general.

If no attempt to explain abnormality, maximum 3 marks. Examiners should be aware this might result in quite a wide range of responses being awarded 3 marks.

### AO2 = 6 marks Commentary on behavioural approach to psychopathology

The commentary can include strengths; such as it has provided some convincing explanations for some disorders such as phobias and has also led to some very successful therapies (systematic desensitization). The weaknesses are that it ignores the role of biology and there is plenty of evidence to support a genetic transmission of some disorders. An evaluation of therapy could consider whether it is effective and for what disorders. Studies (eg "Little Albert") can be *used* as commentary.

A01 AO2 Knowledge and understanding Application of knowledge and understanding 6 marks Accurate and reasonably 6 marks Effective evaluation detailed Effective use of material to address the question and provide informed commentary. Accurate and reasonably detailed Effective evaluation of research. description that demonstrates sound Broad range of issues and/or evidence in knowledge and understanding of the behavioural approach to psychopathology. reasonable depth, or a narrower range in There is appropriate selection of material to greater depth. address the question. Clear expression of ideas, good range of specialist terms, few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 5 - 4 marks Reasonable evaluation 5 - 4 marks Less detailed but generally accurate Material is not always used effectively but produces a reasonable commentary. Less detailed but generally accurate description that demonstrates relevant Reasonable evaluation of research. knowledge and understanding. A range of issues and/or evidence in limited There is some evidence of selection of depth, or a narrower range in greater depth. material to address the question. Reasonable expression of ideas, a range of specialist terms, some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. 3 - 2 marks Basic 3 - 2 marks Basic evaluation Basic description that demonstrates some The use of material provides only a basic relevant knowledge and understanding but commentary. lacks detail and may be muddled. Basic evaluation of research. There is little evidence of selection of Superficial consideration of a restricted range of material to address the question. issues and/or evidence. Expression of ideas lacks clarity, some specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling detract from clarity. 1 mark Very brief/flawed or 1 mark Rudimentary evaluation inappropriate The use of material provides only a rudimentary Very brief or flawed description commentary. demonstrating very little knowledge. Evaluation of research is just discernible or Selection and presentation of information is absent. largely or wholly inappropriate. Expression of ideas poor, few specialist terms used, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling often obscure the meaning. 0 marks 0 marks No creditworthy material. No creditworthy material.

# **Assessment Objectives**

Question	AO1 Mark	AO2 Mark	AO3 Mark
Biological			
1		4	
2			6
3		6	
4	4		
5	4		
Total	8	10	6
Social			
6			6
7		4	
8	6		
9	4	4	
Total	10	8	6
Individual Differences			
10		6	
11	4		
12	2		
13	6	6	
Total	12	12	
Overall Totals	30	30	12

UMS conversion calculator <a href="www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion">www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion</a>