



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2011**

**GCE Psychology B**

**2186**

**Child Development and Applied Options**

**PSYB3**

**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](http://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.

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 CHILD DEVELOPMENT

### Topic: Social Development

#### Question 01

[AO1 = 2marks]

**AO1** One mark for identification of a long-term consequence. One further mark for elaboration. Likely answers: inability to form relationships/attachments; poor mothering; poor communication; low IQ; quasi-autistic symptoms eg undifferentiated attachments, affectionless behaviour. Also accept other consequences more usually associated with maternal deprivation. Accept animal studies eg Harlow.

Credit description of evidence as elaboration.

#### Question 02

[AO3 = 2 marks]

**AO3** Up to two marks for explanation: To avoid observer effect/researcher effect/demand characteristics or similar (1) where the child's behaviour would be affected simply by the presence of an observer (1).  
Note that 'observer bias' is not a correct answer in this case.

#### Question 03

[AO3 = 1 mark]

**AO3** One mark for any relevant suggestion. Likely answers: having two observers to control for observer bias; using a child who has not experienced privation as a control for comparison; carrying out the observation on more than one occasion. Can credit answers based on ethics as long as there is a valid link to this study. Accept 'inter-observer reliability'.

#### Question 04

[AO1 = 1 mark, AO2 = 2 marks]

**AO1** One mark for identifying a relevant case. Likely answers: Genie; the Koluchova twins; the Romanian orphan studies; Harlow's monkeys. Identification can be by name of individual(s), researcher(s) or by description. Do not accept Bowlby's 44 thieves.

**AO2** Up to two marks for brief discussion of the case cited. Content will depend on which case is presented but relevant issues might include: usefulness of a single case; the appropriateness of generalising from unusual single cases; the way in which the case impacted on theory eg Bowlby's use of the Harlow findings to support his theory of maternal deprivation or use of the Genie case to support the notion of a critical period.

**Question 05**

**[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]**

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

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of age-related change in children's understanding of friendships. Answers should be located in psychological theory and/or research. Likely content: Selman's (1980) 5 stages: 3-6 years physical partner; 5-9 years one way assistant; 7-12 years reciprocity; 10-15 years exclusive intimacy; 12+ years autonomous interdependence. Damon's (1977) shift from play partner to shared interests/trust to mutual understanding/intimacy. Bigelow and La Gaipa's (1975) 'best friend' stories – change in emphasis from physical interaction to psychological characteristics.

Up to two marks for descriptions of relevant evidence.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion of theory/ research/ alternative influencing factors. Possible content: role of other factors eg sex – evidence shows that boys and girls have very differing perceptions of friendship; effects of socialisation and expectations; problems with individual studies eg language ability as a confounding variable; use of hypothetical dilemmas may not reflect real life reasoning; problems involved in using content analysis; subjective coding of responses; focus on understanding (ie cognitive element) is limited – would also be useful to study behavioural changes with age; link between changes in understanding of friendship and broader cognitive shift from egocentric thinking to mutual awareness.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Credit evaluation of methodology if made relevant to discussion.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

## Mark Bands

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

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

The 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 age-related changes in children's understanding of friendships. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. Maximum 8 marks if no evidence is presented.

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 age-related changes in children's understanding of friendships. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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**

### **Question 06**

**[AO1 = 2 marks]**

- AO1** Assimilation: adding to an existing schema/incorporating a new experience into an existing schema/applying an existing schema to a new situation (1).  
Accommodation: modifying or changing a schema to deal with a new situation/developing a new schema to cope with a new situation (1).

Can accept definitions embedded within examples.

### **Question 07**

**[AO1 = 1 mark]**

Answer: Class inclusion

### **Question 08**

**[AO2 = 2 marks]**

- AO2** One mark for the following key question or equivalent:  
Are there more (wooden) bricks or more red/yellow bricks?

Plus one further mark for any other question used by Piaget eg  
Are all the bricks wooden?  
Are there more red bricks or more yellow bricks?

### **Question 09**

**[AO3 = 3 marks]**

- AO3** Up to 3 marks to be awarded for discussion based on reference to detail of Piaget's research. First mark for giving source/sources of confusion. Up to 2 marks for discussing why this was a problem; discussing affect of outcome/theory; comparing with alternative research.

Candidates may choose to focus on issues in relation to one type of study eg class inclusion or may make a more general point in relation to more than one study. Possible answers: tasks did not make human sense eg in conservation study children had to answer same question twice which may have led to them believing their first answer was incorrect and therefore....; discussion of alternative findings eg Rose and Blank's one question version of the conservation studies or Hughes's policeman-doll egocentrism research.

**Question 10**

**[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]**

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

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of the information approach to children's cognition. Likely content: emphasis on cognitive efficiency; task analysis in terms of cognitive processes involved; focus on specific cognitive processes such as memory and problem-solving strategies and stages within these processes; changes identified by Bee (1997) – increased capacity, processing efficiency, rule development, metacognitive awareness; computer analogy; the active nature of information processing; Siegler's (1996) overlapping waves theory – use of different strategies overlapping in time. Relevant evidence includes: Siegler (1976) balance scale problem; Siegler & Jenkins (1989) adding strategies; Flavell (1966) study of spontaneous use of memory strategies.

Up to two marks for description of relevant evidence.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for evaluation of the information processing approach and for comparison with other approach(es). Possible content: knowledge of differences between the information processing approach and other approach; provide detailed information about processes involved in problem solving; early work focuses on solving specific problems – range of concepts covered is not as broad as Piaget; Piaget focuses on concepts whereas IP focuses on strategies which can be used in a variety of contexts; usefulness of applications of findings eg teaching strategies; novel consideration of role of metacognitive awareness; differs from Vygotsky re extent of consideration of influence of social factors; reductionism; emphasis on experience eg feedback and age in the balance task (contrast with Piaget); methodological issues eg control; criticisms of specific studies. Top band discussions should contrast with other approach/approaches.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Credit evaluation of methodology if made relevant to evaluation.

**Maximum 8 marks if no reference to other approach**



## **Mark Bands**

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

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of the information processing approach to children's cognition. Evaluation is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Contrast with at least one other approach is accurate and appropriate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the evaluation 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 of the information processing approach to children's cognition. At the top of the band there is some contrast with other approach(es). Evaluation is evident and 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 of the information processing approach to children's cognition. There must be some evaluation/analysis for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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**

### **Question 11**

**[AO1 = 2marks]**

- AO1** One mark for each key aspect of Eisenberg's dilemmas, up to a maximum of 2 marks: one option the child has is to gain something pleasurable for him or herself/own needs (1) the second option is to do something good for another person/help another/other's needs, thereby forfeiting own pleasurable experience (1).

Accept answers specific to a certain dilemma eg Mary chooses between going to the party and helping the other child.

For second mark must convey notion of having to choose between...

### **Question 12**

**[AO1 = 1 mark, AO3 =2 marks]**

- AO1** One mark for knowledge of any basic difference/s between the two types of dilemma. Possible content: Eisenberg's is pro-social (involves chance of doing a good deed) whereas Kohlberg's is a choice between two apparent wrong-doings/negative outcomes; Eisenberg's is a more realistic dilemma than Kohlberg's therefore has greater validity.

Note that this difference may be embedded in the discussion rather than stated at the outset.

- AO3** Up to 2 marks for brief discussion. Candidates may elaborate on one reason or may offer more than one in less detail. Likely discussion: Validity - opportunity for pro-social activity occurs more frequently in real-life than the choice of two wrong-doings and therefore Eisenberg's research is a more useful measure of real-life moral reasoning. Eisenberg's scenario is more familiar and one that participants may fully comprehend and therefore responses are likely to be more meaningful.

Credit also answers which offer valid counter-argument.

### **Question 13**

**[AO2 = 2 marks]**

- AO2** Award one mark each for applying knowledge of Kohlberg's stages to a novel situation.

Jack: punishment stage/heteronomous morality stage.

Andy: good-boy, good-girl stage/ approval stage/ mutual interpersonal expectations, relationships and interpersonal conformity stage.

**Question 14**

**[AO3 = 1mark]**

- AO3** One mark for a brief explanation linking the issue of confidentiality to the study described. The most likely answer: Jack is admitting to an illegal act; interviews of a personal nature should always be kept confidential.

**Question 15**

**[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]**

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

- AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of Piaget's theory of moral development. Likely content: Piaget's stages of moral reasoning: pre-moral stage; moral realism stage - focus on consequence, heteronomous governance; belief in immanent justice and expiatory punishment, time of unilateral respect for parental rules, moral relativism stage – focus on intention, autonomous governance, belief in reciprocal justice, time of equal status contact and mutual respect. Up to 1 mark for descriptions of relevant evidence eg Piaget's research in this area – telling lies, rules of marble playing, moral comparisons.
- AO2** Up to 8 marks for evaluation and contrast. Possible content: Piaget's explanations for development ie shift from egocentric thinking; theory in accord with general view of cognitive development; possible underestimation of child's reasoning; limited time scale of development proposed by Piaget ie notion that moral development is complete by the age of about 12 years; findings that even young children can reason by intent eg Chandler (1973), Nelson (1980) using more sophisticated methods of study; findings that adults sometimes reason by consequence eg attribution research (Walster 1966); the dichotomous judgement required in moral comparisons cannot measure the subtlety of real-life moral reasoning; Laupa & Turiel's finding that children in Piaget's moral realism stage do not show unilateral respect. Piaget's contributions – setting the scene for other researchers both in terms of stage theory and use of moral comparisons and interviews as a forerunner for moral dilemmas. Contrast with at least one other theory eg knowledge of differences between Piaget's theory and the other; foundation for Kohlberg's work; age limitations of Piaget's work compared with Kohlberg, limited focus on wrong-doing as opposed to Eisenberg; focus on cognition rather than guilt (Freud).

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Credit evaluation of methodology if made relevant to evaluation

**Maximum 8 marks if no contrast with other theory.**

## Mark Bands

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

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of Piaget's theory of moral development. Evaluation is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Contrast with at least one other approach is accurate and appropriate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the evaluation 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 of Piaget's theory of moral development. At the top of the band there is some contrast with other approach(es). Evaluation is evident and 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 of Piaget's theory of moral development. There must be some evaluation/analysis for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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**

## SECTION B APPLIED OPTIONS

### Topic: Cognition and Law

#### Question 16

[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

**AO1** One mark each for knowledge of sequential and simultaneous line-up procedures:

Sequential – members of the line-up appear separately.

Simultaneous – members of line-up appear together.

**AO2** 1 mark for effect(s) on identification ie which is most effective/accurate.

Further mark for explanation/why: sequential leads to an absolute judgement about each person therefore fewer false positives; sequential leads to fewer identifications altogether; simultaneous leads to a relative judgement about which best resembles the perpetrator; simultaneous leads to more false positives; other valid elaboration eg Wells (1998) relative judgement theory that in simultaneous line-ups witness assumes the suspect must be present so will make an identification even if unsure.

#### Question 17

[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]

**AO1** One mark for definition: detailed/vivid memory for a shocking event or similar. One mark for giving at least one difference between flashbulb memories and ordinary memories. Possible answers: contain information in addition to the event itself such as time/place/context; highly emotional; lead to re-experiencing; long-lasting etc.

**AO2** Up to two marks for elaboration/explanation of the difference/s given. Candidates are likely to explore possible neural basis for the difference eg role of the amygdala; resistance to normal forgetting – the Challenger evidence; credit also reference to evidence to support findings.

**Question 18**

**[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]**

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

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of explanations of face recognition. Likely content: feature analysis theory as a bottom-up explanation; importance of different features; holistic theory as a top-down explanation; role of configuration, expression, face as a whole; importance of semantic information; Bruce and Young (1986) model sequence (FRUs, PINs etc). Up to 2 marks for description of evidence.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion/evaluation/analysis/comparison. Most of the discussion will be evidence based. Possible content: evidence against a purely feature-based model eg Sergent (1984) similar-different pairs, Young (1985) diaries confirm sequence of Bruce and Young, Young and Hay (1986) composite of split halves slows recognition; need for an interactional approach – necessity for both bottom-up and top-down information; relating models to recognition disorders such as prosopagnosia and Capgras syndrome; Burton's (1990) computer modelling revision of the Bruce and Young model. Credit use of relevant evidence.

Credit evaluation of methodology if made relevant to discussion.

**Maximum 7 marks if only one explanation**

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

**Mark Bands**

**10 -12 marks Very good answers**

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

The 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 explanations for face recognition. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. Maximum 7 marks if only one explanation.

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 explanation(s) for face recognition. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks.

Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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**

### **Question 19**

**[AO1 = 2 marks]**

- AO1** Award one mark for each relevant behaviour. Most likely behaviours include: euphoric state; excessive irritability; non-stop speech; exaggerated excitability; lack of sleep; poor attention; recklessness; increased sexual activity etc.

### **Question 20**

**[AO2 = 4 marks]**

- AO2** Up to 4 marks for brief discussion. Possible content: In manic phase do not feel ill therefore tend to stop taking medication; leads to revolving door syndrome as symptoms become worse; leading to repeat hospitalisation; usual treatment is lithium carbonate which has unpleasant, even dangerous, side effects eg kidney damage; SSRIs to treat depressive phase take a while to be effective, stigma associated with psychoactive medication; not a cure just alleviates the symptoms.  
Accept other relevant answers.  
Candidates may discuss several issues in brief or focus on one in more depth.

### **Question 21**

**[AO1 = 2 marks]**

- AO1** Up to 2 marks for knowledge of basis for SAD dependent on detail. Likely content: darkness triggers production of melatonin; role of the pineal gland; melatonin affects levels of serotonin; evolutionary roots to hibernation behaviour; circannual rhythms; role of suprachiasmatic nucleus; role of geomagnetic forces.

### **Question 22**

**[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]**

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

- AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of cognitive explanations. Candidates may focus on one in detail or may refer to more than one in less detail. Credit any of the following: Slade and Bentall (1988) five factor theory of hallucinations; Maher (1974) anomalous experience model – delusions as abnormal reasoning, attention etc; Beck & Rector (2005) misperception of mental experiences; Frith (1992) inability to monitor own thoughts; Frith (1992) alien control symptoms – belief external forces influence thoughts/actions; Stirling (1998) poor self-monitoring of own output.

Up to 2 marks for descriptions of relevant evidence.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for evaluation and use of other explanation(s) in evaluation. Possible content; cognitive explanations describe the processes/maintenance rather than explain initial cause of disorder; cognitive disturbances may be symptoms of disorder rather than explanation; better at explaining some symptoms rather than others; compatible with biological explanation; role of biological factors – genes are inherited and responsible for dysfunctional thinking; role of social factors in triggering dysfunctional thinking; some cognitive explanations relate to specific sub-types and not others; evaluation of specific models.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Credit evaluation of methodology if made relevant to evaluation.

**Maximum 8 marks if no reference to other explanation**

### **Mark Bands**

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

Answer is clearly focused on the question and shows sound knowledge and understanding of cognitive explanation(s) for schizophrenia. Discussion is full and includes thoughtful analysis. Reference to at least one other explanation is accurate. Most evaluative comments are well developed and presented in the context of the discussion as a whole. The answer is well organised and mostly relevant with little, if any, misunderstanding.

The 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 cognitive explanation(s) for schizophrenia. Evaluation is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. At the top of the band reference to other explanation is apparent but is not linked so clearly to the discussion as for the top band.

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 cognitive explanations for schizophrenia. There must be some evaluation for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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**

**Question 23**

**[AO2 = 2 marks]**

One mark for each correct answer.

- A emotional support
- B instrumental support
- C informational support
- D esteem support
- E appraisal support.

**Question 24**

**[AO2 = 1 marks]**

**AO2** One mark for any valid reason. Most likely answer: reason why other people can be a source of stress/reasons why support may hinder rather than alleviate stress.

**Question 25**

**[AO1 = 4 marks]**

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for description of technique.

1-2 marks for a basic description with at least one or two key aspects

3-4 marks for a fairly detailed description including most/all key elements and using behavioural terminology. Note: relaxation is a necessary element of systematic desensitisation for full marks.

Most candidates will offer either biofeedback or systematic desensitisation as these are named on the Specification. Accept other relevant behavioural techniques that could be employed to treat stress. Credit answers embedded in description of a specific study. Note that if candidates offer a cognitive therapy that has some behavioural elements (eg CBT) credit can be awarded for the behavioural content up to a maximum of 2 marks.

**Question 26**

**[AO2 = 1 mark]**

**AO2** Award one mark for a relevant problem outlined. Possible content:  
Biofeedback – difficult to generalise beyond training situation; needs specialist equipment; only treats the behaviour not the understanding of the stressful situation.

Systematic desensitisation – not very appropriate where stress is due to something other than fear of an object or situation; time-consuming as long as this is explained; not useful for unexpected stressors; only treats the behaviour not the understanding of the stressful situation; does not always generalise outside treatment.

‘Not effective’ on its own not sufficient, must be evidence or reason not just percentage.

Credit other relevant answers.

**Question 27**

**[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]**

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

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of relevant psychological theory and/or evidence. Possible content includes: sympathetic activity and sustained activity of the cardiovascular system; sustained production of corticosteroids; impaired immune system function; role of cortisol; Selye’s stages of resistance and exhaustion. Relevant evidence includes: Kiecolt-Glaser (1995) wound-healing times, Cohen (1991) vulnerability to infectious diseases; Kimvaki (2002) high pressure jobs and CHD; Friedman and Rosenman (1959) type A behaviour and CHD; Frankenhauser (1975) illness in sawmill workers; Kobasa (1982) hardiness and illness.

Credit description of relevant evidence up to 4 marks.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion. Possible content: Role of other variables eg social factors, personality, locus of control, diet etc; a diathesis-stress approach to stress – chronic stress plus acute stress may trigger illness; criticism and appraisal of individual studies; early work eg GAS based on animal research; lowered immunity does not always lead to illness; stress not causal but an interim state between external event and onset illness.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Credit evaluation of methodology if made relevant to discussion.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

**Mark Bands**

**10 -12 marks Very good answers**

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

The 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 psychological insights into the relationship between stress and illness. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. At the top of the band references to evidence are apparent but are not linked so clearly to the discussion as for the top band.

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 psychological insights into the relationship between stress and illness. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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

### Question 28

[AO1 = 4 marks]

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for description of the Prochaska model.

One mark is for general description ie a progressive, cyclical or spiral model of behaviour change that allows for stages to be re-visited several times before behaviour is finally changed altogether.

Award a further one mark each for any three of the six stages outlined:

- pre-contemplation = no awareness of problem/no intention to change
- contemplation = awareness of problem and thinking of changing
- preparation/decision = planning to change
- action = behaviour change taking place
- maintenance = behaviour change continues for sustained period
- relapse **or** termination = person either reverts to original abusing behaviour or is permanently established with the non-abusing behaviour as normal.

Maximum one mark for just naming two or more stages.

### Question 29

[AO2 = 4 marks]

**AO2** One mark for identification of the technique: fear arousal

Plus up to 3 marks for discussion of the technique in terms of effectiveness.

Possible content: inverted U theory ie high fear may be counter-productive as it is off-putting; evidence suggests medium level of fear-arousal is most effective; may work because of classical conditioning ie fear becomes associated with the substance itself and substance is therefore avoided; role of cognitive dissonance (Festinger 1957); comparison with other techniques. Credit use of relevant evidence.

### Question 30

[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]

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

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of biological explanations for substance abuse.

Likely content: role of genetic factors; more likely to suffer if close relative also suffers; evidence from twin and adoption studies; evidence from selective breeding experiments; physical processes underlying addiction- role of dopamine receptors. Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks eg Cloninger (1987), Kaij (1960), Schuckit (1985), Melo (1996).

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion of the view that substance abuse is biological and for discussion of evidence. Likely content: most supporting research is limited to studies of alcoholism; links with antisocial personality disorder (Morgenstern 1987); problems with interpretation of twin and adoption evidence; arguments about cause and effect; Plomin's 'absence of brakes' interpretation; alternative social explanations for substance abuse eg social influence processes such as modelling; role of peer influences and social norms (Garnier & Stein 2002); cultural differences supporting a social explanation; interactional approach.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Credit evaluation of methodology if made relevant to discussion.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

### **Mark Bands**

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

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

The 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 biological explanations for substance abuse. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. At the top of the band references to evidence are apparent but are not linked so clearly to the discussion as for the top band.

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 biological explanations for substance abuse. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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**

### **Question 31**

**[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]**

**AO1** One mark each for outlining two learning theory concepts/explanations in relation to offending. Candidates may refer to any of the following: operant conditioning and role of reinforcement eg positive reinforcement in form of reward for criminal behaviour; Sutherland's differential association theory – peer reinforcement and peer group norms as determinants of offending; vicarious reinforcement – observation of outcome for others; social learning concepts eg observation, imitation, identification, modelling.  
Maximum 1 mark for naming two relevant concepts.

**AO2** One mark for each valid application to the stem, up to 2 marks. Possible answers:  
Poor parenting – parent may reward inappropriate behaviours e.g. encourage fighting, bullying etc leading to later criminality.  
Poor parenting – parent may be an inappropriate model; child observes and imitates parent's deviant behaviour.  
Low school achievement – child may seek attention (positive reinforcement) via bad behaviour.  
Low school achievement – child may model the behaviour of deviant peers.  
Social and environmental factors – reinforcement of peers for deviant behaviour.

### **Question 32**

**[AO1 = 2 marks, AO2 = 2 marks]**

**AO1** Up to 2 marks for description of the processes involved in social skills training. Likely content: initial instruction involving raising awareness of own deficiencies; demonstration; social learning theory concepts of observation and imitation; role play and modelling; acquisition of micro skills eg eye contact and macro skills eg initiating conversation and negotiating; use of feedback; reinforcement of successful interactions.

**AO2** Up to 2 marks for brief evaluation. Possible content: basis for use may be unfounded as some offenders do not lack social skills e.g. fraudsters; weak evidence for effectiveness – general discussion may be just as helpful (Goldstein 1986, Sarason 1978); possible short-term benefits but little evidence for long-term effect on recidivism; indirect benefits may include enhanced self-esteem/competence which might lead to lower offending.  
'Effective' or 'not effective' on its own is not sufficient, must be evidence (not just percentages)/reason/explanation.

Full credit may be awarded for one point covered in detail or two points in less detail.

**Question 33**

**[AO1 = 4 marks, AO2 = 8 marks]**

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

**AO1** Up to 4 marks for knowledge of offender profiling. Possible content: typology approach – US FBI top-down notion of two basic categories ie organised and unorganised (Douglas 1992); crime scene indicators and characteristics of each type; geographical approach (Rossmo 1997) – criminal spatial behaviour; crime scene location/other spatial data to infer base; offenders' use of mental maps to operate within familiar area; use of computer programmes eg smallest space analysis/criminal geographic targeting; investigative approach – interpersonal coherence; crime scene data.

Credit description of relevant evidence up to 2 marks.

**AO2** Up to 8 marks for discussion/evaluation/analysis. Possible content: evidence in relation to usefulness/effectiveness/attitudes of police eg Copson (1995), Pinizzotto (1984), Bartol (1996); Alison (2003) police confidence in ambiguous/contradictory profiles; role of the Nickell (Paul Britton) case in confidence; basis for the type distinction eg limited sample of 36; validity of type distinction eg Canter (2004) no evidence for disorganised type and Douglas's addition of a 'mixed' offender category; erroneous assumption of consistency across contexts eg Alison's (2002) person-situation effect criticism that people are not consistent across different situations; comparison of effectiveness of different approaches to profiling eg geographical profiling useful for many types of crimes; geographical profiling founded on memory theory eg schema.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Credit evaluation on methodology if made relevant to discussion.

**Maximum 8 marks if no evidence presented**

## **Mark Bands**

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

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

The 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 psychological theory and evidence in relation to offender profiling. Discussion is evident and the answer is mostly focused on the question, although there may be some irrelevance and/or misunderstanding. At the top of the band evidence is apparent but is not linked so clearly to the discussion as for the top band.

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 psychological theory and evidence in relation to offender profiling. There must be some discussion for 5/6 marks. Answers in this band may be mostly descriptive. Answers constituting reasonable relevant information 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 GRID**

<b>Question</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
01	2		
02			2
03			1
04	1	2	
05	4	8	
06	1		
07		2	
08			3
09	2		
10	4	8	
11	2		
12	1		2
13		2	
14			1
15	4	8	
16	2	2	
17	2	2	
18	4	8	
19	2		
20		4	
21	2		
22	4	8	
23		2	
24		1	
25	4		
26		1	
27	4	8	
28	4		
29		4	
30	4	8	
31	2	2	
32	2	2	
33	4	8	

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