



**General Certificate of Education
June 2011**

GCE Psychology B

1186

PSYB2

**Social Psychology, Cognitive 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 meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

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

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

SECTION A SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Question 01

[AO2 = 2 marks]

- AO2** One mark for knowledge of the explanation (through identification or description).
One mark for application to Howard (must go beyond the stem).

Likely explanations: evaluation apprehension, social inhibition, presence of an audience, distraction, dominant response, drive theory.

Evaluation apprehension (1) Howard felt he was being judged by the instructor/others this leads to over-arousal and poor performance as he is a novice driver (1).

Distraction (1) Howard was distracted and less able to concentrate due to the presence of others (1).

Presence of an audience increases arousal increased arousal increases the likelihood of dominant responses (1). Howard's dominant response is 'poor parking' as he is a novice driver (1).

Social inhibition (1) in this case Howard's poor performance is due to a dominant response that is not required in this situation of parking (1).

Credit reference to Yerkes-Dodson (Howard has exceeded his optimal arousal).

Question 02

[AO3 = 1 mark]

- AO3** Independent variable: whether the responses were written down or given out loud.

Accept public/private response; mode of response; how participants respond; type of response.

Question 03

[AO3 = 1 mark]

- AO3** One mark for an acceptable extraneous variable that might have affected the DV if not controlled.

Likely answers: whether the same jar of peas/number of peas was shown in both conditions. Whether the participants saw the answers of others in Condition A. Previous experience with estimating tasks.

Question 04
[AO3 = 2 marks]

AO3 Up to 2 marks for explaining an advantage of independent groups design for this study.

One mark for identification of an advantage.
One mark for application to the study.

Likely answers: There would be no order effects/practice effect as the participants only take part in one condition.

The researcher would be able to show the same jar of peas to both groups as the participants only take part in one condition.

Or as the participants would only see the jar of peas once /would be naïve, there would be reduced demand characteristics.

Accept other valid answers

Question 05
[AO3 = 2 marks]

AO3 Up to 2 marks for an explanation of a reason why the study lacks ecological validity.

Likely answers: The task is an artificial one (1) we rarely find ourselves in groups estimating in this way (1).

The behaviour being measured does not reflect real life (1) and therefore we cannot be sure that the researcher is measuring an effect of informational social influence on behaviour (1).

For the second mark the answer must be linked to the task described.

Accept other valid reasons that are explained.

Question 06
[AO2 = 2 marks]

AO2 Up to 2 marks for discussion or elaboration of these results based on knowledge of informational conformity including any of the following points.

The situation is ambiguous and the answer unknown. In Condition A the participants have to rely on their own judgements to provide an answer, but in Condition B participants can use the answers they hear from others to inform their own answer, the answers in Condition B are more likely to be internalised or accepted as 'correct'.

One mark for a definition of informational social influence only.

Reference to both conditions is not necessary for full marks.

Question 07**[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]**

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

- AO1** Up to 5 marks for knowledge of two factors investigated by Milgram. Likely factors: proximity of authority figure; proximity of 'victim'; status of location; legitimacy of figure or uniform; presence of dissenter; conflicting orders; personality; gender; culture; past experience. Credit description of effect of factors on obedience levels. Maximum of 1 mark for only a list of factors, eg proximity, location. Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks. Likely studies: Milgram (1974)
- AO2** Up to 5 marks for discussion of the factors. Explanation of why given factor increases or decreases obedience eg being in an agentic/autonomous state, diffusion of responsibility, gradual commitment/entrapment; the implications of evidence/use of evidence specifically to support or refute influence of stated factors such as the Hofling or Bickman studies which demonstrate the factors of legitimacy are more influential than Milgram found – obedience levels were higher in these studies, which highlights the methodological issue of ecological validity. Discussion of the wider implications of the factors, eg in real life obedience situations (one per factor). Comparison of relative power of factors. Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the factors.

Maximum 6 marks – only one factor**Maximum 6 marks – no evidence****Mark bands****9 – 10 marks Very good answers**

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of two factors that affect obedience as identified by Milgram. The evaluation/analysis is clear, coherent and detailed. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused on Milgram with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of two factors for more than 6 marks, though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. At the top of the band the answer is well-focused on Milgram with little or no misunderstanding.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of factor(s) and/or basic/limited evaluation/analysis. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is extremely limited knowledge/evaluation/analysis of factor(s), but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content.

Question 08
[AO2 = 2 marks]

AO2 Up to two marks for an appropriate discussion of the limitation.

Likely answers:

- Even without competition for resources: there is evidence that even without competition for resources, just belonging to a group is enough to cause prejudice.
- Social identity theory: most of the research has focused on membership of one group and the theory fails to take into account the fact that people have multiple group memberships.
- The Authoritarian personality: the scale used to measure this personality trait has a response bias and it is not clear exactly what a high score might actually be measuring. Or the issue of whether all members of the prejudiced group have the same personality as prejudiced people are often found to have different personality types.

Accept other valid answers

Question 09
[AO3 = 1 mark]

AO3 Independent variable: whether the participant imagined being the driver or the pedestrian; the perspective of the participant.

Question 10
[AO3 = 1 mark]

AO3 Dependent variable: the decision (about fault/blame) for the incident.
Or – whether the decision was the driver was to blame/at fault or the pedestrian was to blame/at fault; who was at fault/to blame; number of situational attributions.

Accept other valid expressions of the DV.

Question 11
[AO3 = 2 marks]

AO3 Up to 2 marks for explaining an advantage of independent groups design for this study.

Likely answers: There would be no order effects/practice effect as the participants only take part in one condition.

The researcher would be able to show the same film to both groups as the participants only take part in one condition.

Or as the participants would only see the video once /would be naïve there would be reduced demand characteristics.

Accept other valid answers

Question 12
[AO3 = 1 mark]

AO3 The task /the experience in the experiment is artificial/not true to life.
Accept similar expressions.

Question 13
[AO2 = 2 marks, AO3 = 1 mark]

AO2 Up to 2 marks for explanation or elaboration of these likely results based on knowledge of the **self-serving bias** including any of the following points.
The bias is one in which the person explaining his/her own 'poor' behaviour/where blame needs to be attributed has a tendency to blame external factors /not their own actions (1). This is done to protect self-esteem/to feel better (1).

AO3 1 mark for stating the likely outcome.
Likely answer: The responses (in Condition A and in Condition B) are likely to be situational explanations (blaming others rather than self.) Accept expanded expressions such as the 'drivers'/participants in Condition A will blame the pedestrian and the 'pedestrians'/participants in Condition B will blame the driver.

Question 14
[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]

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

AO1 Up to 5 marks for knowledge of two factors. Likely factors: Social schemas; primacy effects; recency effects which may be expressed as order of presentation of information, stereotyping, central traits. Description of the effect of the factor on impression formation.
Maximum of 1 mark for only a list of factors.
Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks.
Likely studies: Hoffman (1986), Asch (1946), Luchins (1957), Jones (1968), Asch (1946), Kelley (1950), Razran (1950), Broverman (1972), Haire and Grune (1950).

AO2 Up to 5 marks for discussion of the factors. This might include analysis/explanation of why the factor operates as it does; the implications of evidence/use of evidence specifically to support or refute impact of stated factors. Discussion of the wider implications of the factors, eg in real life situations-interviews. Comparison of relative power of factors. Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the factors.

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

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of two factors that affect impression formation. The evaluation/analysis is clear, coherent and detailed. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of two factors for more than 6 marks, though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation/analysis is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of factor(s) and/or basic/limited evaluation/analysis. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is extremely limited knowledge/evaluation/analysis of factor(s), but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content.

SECTION B COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY

Question 15

[AO1 = 3 marks]

- AO1** Up to 3 marks for the following:
- 1 mark for naming of stores
 - 1 mark for reference to rehearsal
 - 1 mark for further feature of the model (capacity, duration or coding of stores).
- Credit description using a detailed diagram.

Question 16

[AO1 = 1 mark, AO2 = 1 mark]

- AO1** 1 mark for reference to the memory not becoming permanently fixed due to some physical disruption. Failure to modify neurons/cell assemblies.
- AO2** 1 mark for a valid explanation such as: disruption of neurochemical activity, head trauma, ECT, drugs.

Question 17

[AO1 = 3 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

- AO1** Up to 2 marks for a description of interference theory.
- Likely points: Events that take place between learning and recall can disrupt memory, proactive interference occurs when older learning/memories cause forgetting of newer information, retroactive interference occurs when newer learning causes forgetting of older memories, interference more likely if competing memories are similar.
- 1 mark for stating that interference can be proactive or retroactive.
- 1 mark for identifying an appropriate limitation of the theory.
- Likely limitations: Most of the research uses artificial tasks/lacks ecological validity. There is a difficulty in separating the effects of interference and decay over time. The theory does not explain the possible cognitive processes involved. It does not adequately explain forgetting of semantic material.
- AO2** Up to 2 marks for a brief discussion of the limitation identified.
- Possible answer for lack of ecological validity: Using tasks like learning unrelated words and in a laboratory/highly controlled environment means that the results may not reflect the processes that occur in everyday memory/ cannot be generalised to normal memory use.
- The discussion might be via use of evidence, for example: Jenkins and Dallenbach (1924) or counter argument.

Question 18

[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]

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

- AO1** Up to 5 marks for description of the model/ levels – structural/orthographic/shallow/visual, acoustic/phonetic/intermediate/sound-based/phonological; semantic/deep. The idea that deep processing leads to better recall. Recall is a by-product of processing. Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks.
Maximum of 1 mark if the three levels are merely named.
Likely studies: Craik and Tulving (1975), Morris (1977)
- AO2** Up to 5 marks for evaluation of the model. Evaluations might refer to the problem of measuring depth of processing. Also, that the model works best for learning word lists – which is unlikely to be appropriate for all types of learning. The model stresses the importance of learning semantically. The model suggests that some memories are retained without rehearsal. The importance of elaborative rehearsal. Discussion of the possible effects of effort. Criticisms have led to recent updating of the model and attention to the importance of factors such as relevance to learning. Credit the use of examples that illustrate application of the model for example to revision 1 mark only.
Evaluation of the model by comparison with others, eg the multi-store model with its emphasis on rehearsal/repetition.
Only credit evaluation of methodology if made relevant to discussion of the model.
Credit use of evidence.

Maximum of 6 marks – no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of the levels of processing explanation. The evaluation is clear, coherent and detailed. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of levels of processing though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of levels of processing and/or basic/limited evaluation. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is extremely limited knowledge/evaluation of levels of processing, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content.

Question 19
[AO1 = 3 marks]

AO1 Up to 3 marks for description of Gestalt principles which might include a diagram to illustrate the principle(s). Credit may be given for 3 principles with limited description or for 2 principles with some more description. Award 2 marks for one principle well elaborated. Maximum of 1 mark for a list of named principles.

Likely principles:

Proximity: in which things that are close together are seen as belonging together/part of the same object.

Similarity: in which things that have similar characteristics are grouped together rather than seen as separate/single items.

Closure: in which incomplete figures are completed by filling in the missing information in order to make the figure whole.

Part-whole: in which we prefer to perceive the whole rather than individual elements.

Accept other valid answers related to principles such as: figure-ground, symmetry, continuity/good continuation, common fate.

Credit reference to more general Gestalt principles eg law of Pragnanz/principle of least effort, concept of holism – the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

Credit evidence as expansion.

Question 20
[AO1 = 1 mark, AO2 = 1 mark]

AO1 mark for a named distortion illusion such as: Muller-Lyer illusion, Ponzo illusion, Moon illusion, Ebbinghaus illusion/Titchener circles.

AO2 1 mark for a valid explanation.

Possible answer: the illusion shows that past experience plays a part in perception or that perception is not simply a bottom-up process.

Credit reference to constancy scaling; influence of culture/environment on perception eg carpentered world hypothesis.

Question 21

[AO1 = 3 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1 Up to 2 marks for a description of Gibson's theory.

Likely points: Past experience not required to perceive the world/perceptual ability is innate. Gibson proposes that perception is affected by affordances derived from visual cues that enable us to perceive the properties of objects immediately. He also said that the human eye has evolved to be extremely sensitive to visual cues like texture and that these cues enable the process of visual perception to be direct/data-driven/bottom-up. Emphasis on the optic array and the role of the optic flow. There is an ecological emphasis. No distinction between sensation and perception.

1 mark for identifying an appropriate strength of the theory:

The theory accounts for behaviours such as depth perception.

The theory has ecological validity.

AO2 Up to 2 marks for a discussion of the strength identified.

Likely points:

- Research using infants indicates they have an innate ability to perceive depth because they were able to respond in ways that indicate they had not learned previously or were not using stored information, (This might be explained with reference to a study, such as Bower 1970.)
- Gibson's theory is concerned with movement and how visual cues change when we move (1) this is real life behaviour because people do move around as they perceive the world (1).

Or

- The research conducted related to this theory is not laboratory based but concerned with real behaviours like looking at faces, long jumping or flying planes (1) these are things that people actually do so the results can be applied to the real world (1).

Accept other valid strengths.

Credit counter arguments and/or comparison with Gregory as part of the discussion.

Question 22

[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]

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

- AO1** Up to 5 marks for knowledge of at least two factors that are involved in perceptual set. Credit definition of perceptual set. Up to 2 marks for describing the effect(s) of factors – what happens to perception. Likely factors: expectation, motivation, culture, emotion. Accept other valid factors eg reward and punishment.
Credit description of evidence up to 3 marks.
Likely studies include: Turnbull (1961), Segall et al (1963), Gilchrist & Nesberg (1952), Toch and Schulte (1961), McGinnies (1949), Lazarus & McCleary (1951), Brislin (1993), Deregowski (1972), Bruner & Minturn (1955).
- AO2** 5 marks for discussion of the factors. Discussion of why the factor changes perception, eg increasing or decreasing the likelihood of noticing/attending to some stimuli (perceptual accentuation, perceptual defence), influencing the interpretation/distorting perception of stimuli. Carpentered world hypothesis to explain cultural differences.
Credit relevant links to Gregory's theory or other theory.
Only credit evaluation of methodology if made relevant to discussion of factors.
Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Maximum 6 marks – only one factor

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of at least two factors that affect perception. The discussion is clear, coherent and detailed. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of at least two factors for more than 6 marks, though some detail may be lacking. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of factor(s) and/or basic/limited discussion. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is extremely limited knowledge/discussion of factor(s), but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content.

SECTION C INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

Question 23

[AO1 = 2 marks]

- AO1** Up to 2 marks for symptoms of a phobia.
Likely points include: an extreme fear (1) which is disproportionate to the danger (1) irrational (1)/leads to avoidance (1)/maladaptiveness/affects every day life (1).
Accept physical symptoms of a panic attack eg hyperventilation, palpitations, sweating, dry mouth, etc.
Do not credit high anxiety.

Question 24

[AO1 = 3 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

- AO1** Up to 2 marks for an outline of psychodynamic theory for phobias.
Likely points: A phobia arises due to conflict between the id, ego and superego (1), this conflict first occurs in early childhood – the anal and phallic stages (1), id impulses are repressed and the anxiety displaced by the ego onto another object (1). The phobic object symbolises an unconscious fear (1). The description could be via a case study such as Little Hans.
Credit other valid points eg agoraphobia linked to separation anxiety in childhood.

1 mark for identifying an appropriate limitation of the theory:

Likely limitations: It is very difficult to test the explanation; there is limited evidence to support the explanation, unscientific, based on case studies, alternative explanations eg classical conditioning.

- AO2** Up to 2 marks for a discussion of the limitation identified.
Possible answers: Freud used case studies like that of Little Hans to support his explanation but other explanations like that of the behaviourists provide a simpler way of understanding phobia development as a result of classical conditioning. The use of retrospective data in case studies makes it difficult to be sure that the events actually occurred as people may be misremembering or inventing events. It has been difficult to verify the existence of personality components, id, ego and super-ego as their effects are often at an unconscious level.

Credit alternative answers that match the limitation presented.

Question 25

[AO1 = 1 mark, AO2 = 2 marks]

- AO1** One mark for knowledge of explanation such as:
OCD is due to a cognitive bias/making catastrophic misinterpretations/ hypervigilant attentional system/poorer memories/faulty thinking/negative self-talk. Credit other valid points
- AO2** Up to 2 marks for expansion.
Possible answer: In normal behaviour any intrusive thoughts (obsessions) would be dismissed or ignored but for the person with OCD these thoughts cause great anxiety and this can only be dealt with by performing a behaviour (compulsion) to neutralise the effects of the obsessions (such as constant checking of something).
Credit use of evidence as part of explanation.

Question 26

[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]

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

AO1 Up to 5 marks for knowledge of the two treatments. Answers may focus on Phobias, OCD or both disorders. Maximum of 3 marks for any one therapy/treatment described.

Systematic desensitisation is based on the idea that two competing emotions cannot co-exist, requires people learning to relax, a stepped approach to exposure to the feared object/situation – anxiety hierarchy, this might be described by an example related to phobias or OCD (VRET).

Drug therapy for phobias generally involves attempting to change the level of implicated neurotransmitters in the brain, these are usually anti-depressants (MAOIs), these are not given in an attempt to change the behaviours exhibited by people with anxiety disorders, but to reduce the anxiety experienced. For OCD the drugs usually target low levels of serotonin- SSRIs.

Credit description of evidence up to 1 mark.

Likely studies: Lang and Lazovik (1963) Kordon (2005) Julien (2005).

AO2 Up to 5 marks for evaluation of these treatments: discussion of the strengths and limitations of both systematic desensitisation and drug therapy, in relation to type of phobia and duration of success outside clinical situations; side effects of drugs and fact that the phobia/fear is not removed or the person with OCD rarely cured by drugs alone: comparison with alternative treatments and the likely improved rates of success when other therapies are combined with drug therapy for OCD and phobias; reasoned discussion of cost, time required and ethical implications.
Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 6 marks – only one therapy/treatment.

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of both treatments. The evaluation is clear, coherent and detailed. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of both treatments for more than 6 marks though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of treatment(s) and/or basic/limited evaluation. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is extremely limited knowledge/evaluation of treatment(s), but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content.

Question 27

[AO1 = 2 marks]

AO1 Up to 2 marks for a description of two symptoms associated with autism.

Likely symptoms:

Likely points include reference to symptoms associated with impairment in verbal communication – such as not speaking or speaking repetitively, impairment in social interaction such as not sharing or not gazing or gesturing, restricted repertoire of activities or interests such as hand flapping or head banging, lack of empathy.

Credit other relevant symptoms.

One mark only for a symptom plus examples of that symptom.

Question 28

[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1 Up to 2 marks for a description of features of the Lovaas technique.

Likely points: The procedure aims to improve communication skills using operant conditioning, any behavioural response in the desired direction is reinforced, the idea of successive approximations, the behaviour is shaped so that selected responses are strengthened.

Maximum 1 mark only if no reference to language training.

AO2 Up to 2 marks for a brief discussion of effectiveness.

Likely points include: Research has suggested that there is improvement in language skills when using an ABA technique. The changes seen in behaviour can be considered successful if they make the lives of the parents and child more manageable. However, there are problems – in particular, the child often regresses quite quickly if the therapy stops. Also, for some children there is no way of knowing if the child has developed an understanding of the language skills acquired so it is difficult to measure effectiveness. The implementation has to be consistent or the therapy is not effective.

Credit use of evidence.

Question 29

[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

AO1 Up to 2 marks for a description of the cold parenting hypothesis.

Likely points: In this explanation it is proposed that the cause of autism is the personalities of the parents (1) in particular, the early interactions of these caregivers with the child were thought to be rigid and unresponsive (1), the idea of the 'refrigerator mother' (1), failure to develop a sense of autonomy (1).

AO2 Up to 2 marks for explaining why the cold parenting hypothesis is not regarded as an acceptable explanation in modern times. The explanation might focus on lack of evidence to support the hypothesis or the cause-effect dilemma. Credit other valid answers.

Possible answers: There is very little evidence that the parents of autistic children have personalities that are significantly more 'cold' than any other parents, the majority are loving and sensitive towards their children.

It seems unlikely that the behaviour of the parents is the cause of autism as other children in the same family often do not exhibit the disorder.

There is some evidence that the behaviour of the autistic child affects the responses of the parents rather than parental behaviour being the cause of the behaviour of the child. Unethical/unhelpful/counterproductive to blame parents.

Credit use of evidence.

Question 30

[AO1 = 5 marks, AO2 = 5 marks]

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

AO1 Up to 5 marks for description of cognitive explanations for autism. Maximum of 3 marks for any one explanation.

Cognitive explanations:

- Theory of mind: suggestion that people with autism do not understand the world from the point of view of others. The idea of 'mind-blindness.' Failure to grasp false belief. Theory of mind mechanism.
- Description of (failure of) executive functioning as, (lack of) ability to switch attention and initiate new behaviours. Perseverative errors.
- Central coherence, (deficit) as (in)ability to process information in general. Examples of these behaviours. These explanations attempt to explain both the deficits and exceptional skills seen in people with autism. Elaboration of 'coherence' or wholeness. Examples of coherent/deficit behaviours to illustrate behaviours in face recognition, memory studies and visual illusions.

Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks

Theory of mind evidence: Baron-Cohen (1985)(1986) Perner (1989).

Central coherence deficit: Shah and Frith (1993).

Failure of executive functioning: Turner (1999) the Wisconsin card sorting task.

AO2 Up to 5 marks available for discussion of the explanations chosen.
Many studies support the TOM explanation. The theory does not account for the 'islets of ability.' Some people with autism do not fail the false belief tasks. However, it is the case that they struggle with second order tasks.
Weak central coherence might account for the 'savant abilities.' Superiority on embedded figures tasks might be better explained by difficulty in generalising.
Failure of executive functioning does explain repetitive and stereotyped behaviours and is supported by some research. It fits well with the working memory model as it may be the central executive component that may be impaired. It fits with biological evidence.

General points: cognitive explanations do not really provide information about cause, but provide further detail about the cognitive differences between people with and without autism. It seems likely that an explanation that attempts to fit biological information with cognitive information might be the way forward.

Credit reference to alternative explanations when used to highlight limitations or strengths of the cognitive explanations.
Credit use of evidence.

Only credit evaluation of methodology when made relevant to the evaluation of explanation.

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

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of at least two cognitive explanations of autism. The evaluation is clear, coherent and detailed. There is appropriate reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

6 – 8 marks Good answers

There is reasonably accurate and organised description of at least two cognitive explanations for more than 6 marks though some detail may be lacking. Evaluation is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of cognitive explanation(s) and/or basic/limited evaluation. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

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

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

0 marks No relevant content.

Assessment grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3
1		2	
2			1
3			1
4			2
5			2
6		2	
7	5	5	
8		2	
9			1
10			1
11			2
12			1
13		2	1
14	5	5	
15	3		
16	1	1	
17	3	2	
18	5	5	
19	3		
20	1	1	
21	3	2	
22	5	5	
23	2		
24	3	2	
25	1	2	
26	5	5	
27	2		
28	2	2	
29	2	2	
30	5	5	

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion