AQA

General Certificate of Education (A-level)
June 2013

Psychology B   **PSYB2**

(Specification 2185)

Unit 2: Individual Differences, Social Psychology and Cognitive Psychology

Final

Mark Scheme

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

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

Section A Social Psychology

Topic Social Influence

Question 01

[AO1 = 3]

AO1 Up to three marks for an outline of a recognisable study; students may briefly describe the aim, method, results and/or conclusion. Alternatively, students may gain **full credit** for focusing on two sections of the study only, when there is sufficient detail provided.
Likely studies include: Sanders et al 1978, Triplett 1898, Travis 1925, Zajonc 1969, Michaels 1973, Strube et al 1981.
If the study is not explicitly about distraction there must be reference to distraction for full marks. If no reference to distraction, **max 2**.
A classroom activity that illustrates the concept of distraction, **max 2.**

Question 02

[AO2 = 2]

AO2 Up to two marks for an explanation of one problem involved in studying distraction as a cause of arousal. Award one mark for a weak attempt at explaining a problem and two marks for a clear explanation.
For full credit the explanation must be linked to distraction.
Possible problems include: difficulty in defining/operationalising 'distraction'; the artificiality of the task/situation; separating the effects of distraction from other factors that may cause arousal; arousal is inferred rather than measured; the issue of generalising from animal studies. Credit reference to relevant ethical issues.

Possible answer: 'distraction' as a phenomenon is very difficult to define objectively/operationalise (1); what one participant considers to be 'distracting' in a study may be very different from what another considers to be distracting (1).

Question 03

[AO1 = 1]

AO1 Award one mark for a definition of compliance.
Possible answer: going along/agreeing with/conforming (to the group) publicly, but privately disagreeing (1).
Definitions of compliance as acceding to a request could be made relevant to this question.

Question 04

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

AO1 Award two marks for knowledge/identification of two factors that might affect whether or not Lisa and Sean will conform to the rest of the group. Likely factors: group size; social support/presence of an ally/dissenter; presence of a dissenter who then begins to conform; personality/self-esteem (of Lisa and Sean); opinion expressed in public;

perceived competence/status of group members; attractiveness of the group; cohesiveness; culture. Accept task difficulty if appropriately justified.
Accept other valid factors.

AO2   Award up to two marks for a brief explanation of how each of the chosen factors may affect conformity.

Possible answer: If the group size (1) is large/small this will increase/decrease the likelihood that Lisa and Sean will conform to the group (1).
Social support may affect conformity (1). As Lisa and Sean agree with each other, this will decrease the likelihood that they will conform to the rest of the group (1).
Credit explanations of why Lisa and Sean may or may not conform.

Question 05

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 = 5, AO2 = 5]

AO1   Up to five marks for description/elaboration of at least two explanations of defiance of authority. Maximum of 3 for any one explanation. Likely explanations: the influence of disobedient role models/social support; being in an autonomous state; past experience. Also credit the inverse of factors/explanations usually used to explain obedience to authority, eg (lack of) proximity of authority figure; proximity of victim; (lack of) legitimacy of authority figure/uniform/setting; (lack of) authoritarian personality.
One mark only for simply listing/naming of explanations.
Credit description of relevant evidence up to two marks.
Likely studies include Milgram 1963, 1974, Bickman 1974, Hofling 1966, Feldman and Schelbe 1972, Gamson 1982, Hamilton 1978, Rochat and Modigliani 1995.

AO2   Up to five marks for discussion of at least two explanations of defiance of obedience. Use of evidence to support/illustrate the influence of the explanations chosen, eg specific studies of defiance and/or variations of Milgram`s basic experiment that demonstrated increased defiance. Discussion of the wider implications of the explanations, eg in real-life situations of defiance (one per explanation). Credit any other social psychological concepts that are appropriately applied to defiance of authority. Comparison of relative power of explanations. Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanations eg use of specific studies.

Maximum 6 marks if only one explanation
Maximum 6 marks if no evidence

Mark bands
9 – 10 marks Very good answers
          There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of at least
          two explanations of defiance of authority. The discussion is clear,
          coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis.
          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 explanations of defiance of authority, although some detail may be lacking. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused, with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum six marks if only one explanation and/or there is no reference to evidence.

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 explanation(s) of defiance of authority and/or basic/limited discussion. There may be exceptional description for five marks with no discussion of the explanations described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately, although 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 very limited knowledge/discussion of explanation(s) of defiance of authority, but there must be some relevance.
At the bottom of the band may be a list of relevant explanations only.

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

0 marks   **No relevant content**

Topic Social Cognition

Question 06

[AO1 = 3]

AO3   Up to three marks for an outline of a recognisable study; students may briefly describe the aim, method, results and/or conclusion. Alternatively students may gain **full credit** for focusing on two sections of the study only, when there is sufficient detail provided.
Likely studies include: Asch 1946, Luchins 1957, Jones et al 1968.

Question 07

[AO2 = 2]

AO2   Up to two marks for an explanation of one problem involved in studying the primacy effect in impression formation. Award one mark for a weak attempt at explaining the problem, and two marks for a clear explanation.
For full credit the explanation must be linked to the primacy effect.

Possible answers include: the lack of information upon which participants are asked to make a judgement; the artificiality of the task/situation; the use of 'imaginary' characters rather than 'real' people.
Note that some of these points may overlap.

Possible answer: Often, in studies of the primacy effect, participants are asked to make a judgement based on much less information than they would receive about a person in real life (1), so the research might lack ecological validity (1).

Question 08

[AO1 = 1]

AO1   Award one mark for a definition of the cognitive component of an attitude.
Possible answer: what someone knows/thinks/believes/perceives about an attitude object/something (1).

Question 09

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

AO1   Award one mark for naming a relevant bias and one mark for elaboration of the bias.
Likely answer: This is the actor-observer effect (1) which is the tendency to explain/attribute one's own behaviour situationally/externally and others' behaviour dispositionally/internally (1).
Any relevant bias named and explained can get both marks.

AO2   Award up to two marks for application to the scenario.

Possible answer: Mr Buss explained his own lateness situationally, as being due to traffic (1); but he explained the student`s lateness dispositionally, as being due to his lack of organisation (1).

Note that students may name and explain self-serving bias or fundamental attribution error, as these could be made relevant to the scenario in part only (**max 3** in either case).

Question 10

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 = 5, AO2 = 5]

AO1 Up to five marks for description of social identity theory and competition for resources as explanations of prejudice. Award a maximum of three marks for any one explanation.

Likely content: social identity theory – emphasises the role of cognitive and motivational factors in the development and maintenance of prejudice; the world is divided into us/them/social categorisation; the enhancement of in-group over out-group/social comparison.
Competition for resources – resources such as housing/land/employment are scarce; competing/conflicting groups develop negative attitudes and prejudice towards each other.

Credit description of evidence up to two marks. Likely studies: Sherif 1961, Tajfel 1971, Brown 1986, Tyerman and Spencer 1983, Murrel et al 1994, Bobo 1988, Kerr and Park 2001, Mullen 1991, Brewer and Campbell 1976.

AO2 Up to five marks for discussion of the explanations which might include positive and negative points of each explanation: social identity theory may not apply to all cultural groups; people belong to many groups so the research has simplified human behaviour; much evidence supports the behaviours demonstrated in SIT both in research and real world relationships; competition for resources ignores the fact that prejudice can arise without competition, merely through categorisation; it can explain changes in prejudice over time and across contexts. Credit for specifically applying an explanation to an example, such as how members are identified as an in-group or as competitors (1 mark per explanation). Credit comparison between explanations and with alternatives, eg the authoritarian personality. Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanations. Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 6 marks if only one explanation
Maximum 6 marks if no evidence

Mark bands
9 – 10 marks Very good answers
There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of social identity theory and competition for resources. The discussion is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. 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 social identity theory and competition for resources. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused, with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum six marks if only one explanation and/or there is no reference to evidence.

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 social identity theory and/or competition for resources. There may be exceptional description for five marks, with no discussion of the explanations described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately, although 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 very limited knowledge/discussion of social identity theory and/or competition for resources, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks   **No relevant content**

Topic   Remembering and Forgetting

Question 11

[AO1 =2, AO2 = 1]

AO1   Award up to two marks for a definition of any two of the following:
- semantic – memory for facts/general knowledge;
- episodic – memory for (life) events/experiences;
- procedural – memory for (motor) skills/actions/knowing how to do things.

No credit for stand-alone examples.

AO2   Award one mark for a valid distinction/difference between the types of long-term memory chosen.

Possible answers: semantic/episodic – 'knowing that'/declarative memory; available for conscious inspection – procedural – 'knowing how'/non-declarative memory; often unavailable for conscious inspection.
Semantic – may not recall when we learned/encoded these memories
– episodic – stored with reference to time and place.
Credit distinctions based on the durability/resistance to forgetting of different types of memory; the fact that evidence suggests that these types of memory reside in different areas of the brain.
Credit other valid distinction points.

Note that the explanation of the difference must make reference to **both** types of memory.

Question 12

[AO1 = 1, AO2= 2]

AO1   Award one mark for knowledge of an appropriate limitation of the levels of processing model of memory.
Likely limitations include: the concept of depth of processing is difficult to measure/operationalise/circular; evidence supporting the model tends to be artificial; the difficulty/impossibility of controlling how participants process information in studies; some studies show that phonetic processing leads to greater recall.

AO2   Up to two marks for explanation/expansion of the limitation given.

Possible answer: the concept of depth of processing is difficult to measure (1) and is based on circular reasoning (1): deep processing is assumed to have occurred (in the semantic condition) since/only because recall was higher for that condition (1).

Question 13

[AO1 = 2, AO2= 2]

AO1   Award up to two marks for relevant knowledge of the working memory model. Credit knowledge/identification of each store/sub-systems (not episodic buffer); the idea that two tasks using separate stores can be performed simultaneously; performing two tasks that involve the same store impairs performance.
Credit reference to limited capacity.
Credit reference to the allocation of tasks by the central executive.

Students may gain both marks by referring to specific stores or more general, relevant features of the model.

AO2 Up to two marks for application to the scenario.

For full credit answers must refer to both sets of tasks.

Possible answer: Claire is able to search for photos and listen to music as these tasks involve different sub-systems in working memory (1) – the visuo-spatial sketch/scratch pad and the articulatory/phonological loop/store/primary acoustic store (1). Claire finds it difficult to read her e-mails and talk on the phone as these tasks involve the same store (1) – the articulatory/phonological loop/store/primary acoustic store (1).

Question 14

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 = 5, AO2 = 5]

AO1 Up to five marks for description of research studies in which decay has been investigated and research studies in which interference has been investigated. Credit description of procedure/methods, ie what participants were asked to do, detail of conditions and description of relevant findings. Award up to three marks for any one study.
Note that there are no marks available here for description of trace decay and/or interference as explanations of forgetting.

Likely studies include: Ebbinghaus (1885), Jenkins and Dallenbach (1924), McGeogh (1942), Brown (1958), Peterson and Peterson (1959), Underwood (1957), Keppel and Underwood (1962), Waugh and Norman (1965), Baddeley and Hitch (1977), Schmidt et al (2000).

AO2 Up to five marks for evaluation of the studies described. Likely content: Evaluation of the methodology of studies described, eg high control in lab studies; artificiality of setting; artificiality of task; sampling issues; lack of control in field studies, etc. Note that for the higher bands these should be explained rather than 'listed'.
Discussion of broader issues, eg studies rely on the learning of artificial stimuli such as nonsense syllables, lists of unrelated words, etc; difficulties associated with testing trace decay – relies on a 'blank' period of time between learning and recall during which no new information can be introduced; problems of interpretation of findings – some studies supporting trace decay might also be read as supporting interference, and vice versa; or as supporting other explanations of forgetting such as displacement; lab studies of interference involve learning similar material in compressed time-frames, and these conditions are rare in everyday life.
Credit analysis of the implications of findings, ie explanation of why studies support/contradict the named explanations.

Maximum 6 marks if only studies of either only decay or only interference

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of at least one study of interference and at least one study of decay. The evaluation is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. 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 research studies that have investigated decay and interference although some detail may be lacking. Evaluation may be present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused, with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum six marks if only studies of decay or interference.

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 research studies that have investigated decay and/or interference. There may be exceptional description for five marks, with no evaluation present. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately, although 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 very limited knowledge of research studies that have investigated decay and/or interference, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content

Topic   Perceptual Processes

Question 15

[AO1 = 1]

AO1   Award one mark for identification/description of one monocular depth cue.
Likely answers: relative size; height in plane; superimposition/overlap/occlusion;
texture gradient; linear perspective; motion parallax. Could be identified by
description.

Question 16

[AO1 = 1, AO2 = 1]

AO1   Award one mark for a definition of shape constancy.

Possible answer: the ability to perceive objects as the same shape when viewed from
different angles/despite changes in the retinal image.

AO2   Award one mark for a relevant example.

Possible answer: a door is still perceived as rectangular/the same shape/'door-
shaped' even when viewed from different angles.
Award both marks if definition is embedded within the example.

Question 17

[AO1 = 1, AO2= 2]

AO1   Award one mark for knowledge of an appropriate limitation of Gestalt
explanations of perceptual organisation.

Likely answers: tendency only to describe organisation of 2D images; descriptive
rather than explanatory; lack of evidence for neurological basis; set of principles
rather than unified theory.

AO2   Up to 2 marks for explanation/expansion of the limitation given.

Possible answer: Gestalt principles tend to describe 2D images (1), as opposed to
the 3D images/objects that we are used to seeing in everyday life. (1) As such, many
Gestalt displays may have low ecological validity (1).

Question 18

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

AO1   Award up to two marks for brief explanation of the effect of expectation and
motivation on perception (one mark per factor).

AO2   Award up to two marks for application to the scenario.

Possible answer: Expectation – previous experience/the immediate context
influences what we notice/attend to within our environment/creates perceptual set (1).

Geoff has just bought a green car and so is more likely to notice other green cars in the car park (1).
Motivation – wanting something increases its attractiveness/appeal (1) which explains why Geoff has bought more food than he usually would (because he is hungry) (1).
Credit reference to perceptual accentuation/sensitisation.
For full credit answers must refer to both the cars and the food.

Question 19

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 = 5, AO2 = 5]

AO1   Up to five marks for knowledge of one distortion illusion and one ambiguous figure and how each works. Award a maximum of three marks for any one illusion/figure.

Likely distortion illusions: Ponzo illusion; Muller-Lyer illusion; Ebbinghaus illusion/Titchener circles; moon illusion.
Likely ambiguous figures: Necker cube; Rubin's vase; Boring's old/young woman/Leeper's lady; duck-rabbit illusion.
Credit description of how/why the illusion/figure works, eg Ponzo illusion – top line seen as longer; converging lines are perceived as railway lines/a road giving the impression of distance; use of depth cues – linear perspective; misapplied size constancy – line perceived as 'further away' is scaled up making it appear longer. Necker cube – figure perceived as cube that can be seen from two perspectives; brain generates two hypotheses and cannot decide between the two; image appears to 'flip'. Credit diagram(s) as description.
Credit description of evidence up to one mark. Likely studies: Segall 1963, Coren et al, 1999.

AO2   Up to five marks for discussion of what ambiguous figures and distortion illusions tell us about perception.

Possible content: reveal brain`s tendency to perceive 2D drawings in terms of 3D world; use of monocular depth cues to infer depth/distance; use of size constancy to mentally enlarge objects perceived as 'further away'; brain engages in hypothesis testing; we look for symmetry/distinguish figure from ground; suggests that perception is an active process that relies on learning/past experience; support top-down rather than bottom-up processing. Credit reference to influence of culture/environment on perception/carpentered world hypothesis. Credit links to theory – Gregory, Gestalt principles. Credit evaluation of illusions, eg Gibson`s criticism that they are artificial situations designed to 'induce' error and tell us little about perception in the real world.
Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 6 marks if distortion illusion or ambiguous figure only

Mark bands
9 – 10 marks Very good answers
There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of one   distortion illusion and one ambiguous figure. The discussion of each type is clear,

coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. The answer is well-focused, with little or no misunderstanding. There need not be a balance between the two types for the top band.

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 one distortion illusion and one ambiguous figure, although some detail may be lacking. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused, with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum six marks if distortion illusion or ambiguous figure only.

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 one distortion illusion and/or one ambiguous figure. There may be exceptional description for five marks, with no discussion present. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately, although 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 very limited knowledge of one distortion illusion or one ambiguous figure or both, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks   **No relevant content**

Topic   Anxiety Disorders

Question 20

[AO3 = 1]

AO3   One mark for identifying the independent variable in this study.
Likely answer: whether the participants in the study have OCD or not.

Question 21

[AO3 = 2]

AO3   Award two marks for an explanation of why this study is a quasi-experiment.

Possible points: This study is a quasi-experiment because the IV (whether the participants have OCD or not) is pre-existing/naturally occurring (1) the IV has not been manipulated/could not have been controlled by the researcher (1) random allocation is not possible (1).

Question 22

[AO3 = 1]

AO3   One mark for identifying one relevant variable that could have been used to match participants in this study.
Likely answers: gender; age; health; IQ; ethnicity; weight.

Question 23

[AO3 = 2]

AO3   Award one mark for an outline of an advantage of matched pairs and one further mark for an explanation of why this is an advantage. For two marks there must be some application to the study described.

One mark only for an advantage of matched pairs not linked to the study described.

Possible answer: One advantage of matched pairs is that participant variables/individual differences are controlled/reduced (1) so the researcher can be more confident that the results are due to OCD, rather than other variables (1).

Do not credit participant variables are eliminated/removed.

Question 24

[AO1 = 2, AO2 = 2]

AO1   Award up to two marks for an outline of how cognitive therapy would be used to treat OCD.

Likely points: identifying/describing catastrophic thoughts; challenging distorted thinking with counter-statements/cognitive restructuring/'thought-stopping'; cognitive rehearsal; testing the reality of negative expectations; habituation training; keeping records of unwelcome thoughts.

AO2   Award up to two marks for brief evaluation which may be for two brief points or a single point that is elaborated.

Likely points: successful in reducing the frequency of obsessive thoughts; less successful at dealing with compulsive behaviours; more effective when combined with behaviour therapy/drug therapy; addresses the root cause of OCD (if the cause is obsessive thoughts). Credit reasoned discussion of issues such as time, cost, etc. Credit use of evidence as part of the discussion. Credit reasoned comparison with alternative treatments/therapies.

Question 25

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 = 5, AO2 = 5]

AO1   Up to five marks for description of the psychodynamic explanation of phobias and the use of psychodynamic therapy as a treatment for phobias. Award up to three marks for description of the explanation: the ego is threatened by unconscious conflict; uses displacement to focus the unconscious thoughts onto something external; phobic object/situation is a 'symbol' of underlying, unconscious fear. Accept alternative explanations for other phobias such as agoraphobia.
Award up to three marks for description of the treatment/therapy: aims to provide client with insight into the unconscious cause of the symptoms; description of techniques including free association to encourage verbalisation so that the ego eventually cannot censor the content; dream analysis in which manifest content is interpreted to uncover latent content.
Credit description of evidence up to 1 mark, eg Little Hans.

AO2   Up to five marks for discussion/evaluation of the explanation and the treatment/therapy. Likely content: difficulty of testing the explanation; limited evidence/evidence from case studies; premise that phobias only occur due to repressed experiences; psychodynamic therapy attempts to address the root cause of phobias; analysis relies on subjective interpretation by the therapist. Credit reasoned discussion of therapy based on time, cost, etc. Credit ethical issues associated with therapy. Credit critical comparison with alternative explanations and/or treatments, eg Behaviourist. Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanation and/or therapy. Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 6 marks if explanation or therapy only

Mark bands
9 – 10 marks Very good answers
There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of both the psychodynamic explanation of phobias and the use of psychodynamic therapy to treat phobias. Discussion is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis.

The answer is well-balanced and 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 the psychodynamic explanation of phobias and the use of psychodynamic therapy to treat phobias. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused, with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum of six marks if answer includes explanation or therapy only.

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 the psychodynamic explanation of phobias and/or the use of psychodynamic therapy to treat phobias and/or basic/limited evaluation. There may be exceptional description for five marks, with no discussion of the explanation or therapy. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately, although 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 very limited knowledge/discussion of the psychodynamic explanation of phobias or the use of psychodynamic therapy to treat phobias,bu there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks   No relevant content

Topic   Autism

Question 26

[AO3 = 1]

AO3   One mark for identifying the independent variable in this study.
Likely answer: whether the participants in the study have autism or not.

Question 27

[AO3 = 2]

AO3   Award two marks for an explanation of why this study is a quasi-experiment.

Possible points: This study is a quasi-experiment because the IV (whether the participants have autism or not) is pre-existing/naturally occurring (1) the IV has not been manipulated/could not have been controlled by the researcher (1) random allocation is not possible (1).

Question 28

[AO3 = 1]

AO3   One mark for identifying a relevant variable that could have been used to match participants in this study.
Likely answers: gender; age; verbal ability; mental age/IQ.

Question 29

[AO3 = 2]

AO3   Award one mark for an outline of an advantage of matched pairs and one further mark for an explanation of why this is an advantage. For two marks there must be some application to the study described.

One mark only for an advantage of matched pairs not linked to the study described.

Possible answer: One advantage of matched pairs is that participant variables/individual differences are controlled/reduced (1) so the researcher can be more confident that the results are due to autism, rather than other variables (1).

Do not credit 'participant variables are eliminated/removed'.

Question 30

[AO2 = 2]

AO2   Award one mark for knowledge/understanding of lack of joint attention, and one mark for the link to the study.

Possible answer: Lack of joint attention is the failure to initiate/share interest in an object/event/person (1), which is why, in this study; children with autism were less likely to show toys to their mother (1).

Question 31

[AO1 = 2]

AO1   Award up to two marks for an explanation of why autism is considered a syndrome. Award one mark for knowledge of the term 'syndrome' and one mark for the link to autism.

Possible answer: a syndrome is a group of symptoms that tend to occur together/suggest a common origin, (1) as in the triad of impairments in cases of autism (1). Alternatively, the three components of the triad may be named for the second mark (poor communication; poor social interaction; repetitive/stereotyped behaviour or lack of symbolic play.

Question 32

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 = 5, AO2 = 5]

AO1   Up to five marks for description of biological explanations of autism. Genetic explanation: credit reference to inherited predisposition/familial influence; explanation of concordance; reference to links with other genetic conditions such as Fragile X syndrome and/or Tourette's syndrome; specific chromosomes/gene analysis, eg HOSA1 gene, chromosomes 2,6,15 and 16.
Neurological correlates: suggests that there is a relationship/correlation between the symptoms of autism (triad of impairments) and brain damage/structural abnormalities; areas of damage are commonly identified through post-mortems or scanning techniques, eg MRI, PET, SPECT; credit description of specific areas of damage/structural abnormalities that have been identified through studies, eg cerebellum, frontal lobe, etc.
No marks for simply naming explanations.
Credit description of evidence up to 2 marks, eg genetic - Folstein and Rutter (1977) Folstein and Piven (1991), Ritvo et al (1985), Bolton (1994); neurological correlates – Zilbovicius et al (2000), Ohnishi et al (2000), Courchesne et al (1994), Piven et al (1995), Fombonne (1999), Allen et al (2004), Roder (2000), Baron-Cohen et al (2000).

AO2   Up to five marks available for discussion of the explanations. Discussion of the genetic explanation might include problems of twin studies such as small sample sizes, environmental influence as a confounding factor, etc; Carson et al (2000) – 80-90% of variance is related to genetic factors, but transmission not yet understood; ethical issues associated with genetic research such as the possibility of pre-natal screening. Discussion of neurological correlates might include issue of cause and effect; explanation does not account for the full range of autistic symptoms. Credit also general discussion of issues related to the biological approach, eg reductionism, determinism. Credit critical comparison with alternative explanations, eg cognitive. Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanations. Credit use of evidence.

Maximum 6 marks if only one explanation
Maximum 6 marks if no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers
There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of two biological explanations of autism. The discussion is clear, coherent and detailed, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis. 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 biological explanations of autism, although some detail may be lacking. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum six marks if only one explanation and/or no evidence.

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 biological explanation(s) of autism and/or basic/limited discussion. There may be exceptional description for five marks, with no discussion present. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

Some basic ideas are expressed adequately, although 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 very limited knowledge/discussion of biological explanation(s) of autism, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content

Assessment Objectives Grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3
Social Influence			
1	3		
2		2	
3	1		
4	2	2	
5	5	5	
Total	**11**	**9**	
Social Cognition			
6	3		
7		2	
8	1		
9	2	2	
10	5	5	
Total	**11**	**9**	
Memory			
11	2	1	
12	1	2	
13	2	2	
14	5	5	
Total	**10**	**10**	
Perception			
15	1		
16	1	1	
17	1	2	
18	2	2	
19	5	5	
Total	**10**	**10**	
Anxiety Disorders			
20			1
21			2
22			1
23			2
24	2	2	
25	5	5	
Total	**7**	**7**	**6**
Autism			
26			1
27			2
28			1
29			2
30		2	
31	2		
32	5	5	
Total	**7**	**7**	**6**

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