



AS

Psychology (Specification B)

PSYB2 Social Psychology, Cognitive Psychology and Individual Differences

Mark scheme

2185
June 2016

Version 1.0: Final Mark Scheme

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk.

Section A Social Psychology

Topic: Social Influence

01 What is meant by 'dominant response'? Give an example of a dominant response.
[2 marks]

AO1 – 2

Award 1 mark for what is meant by dominant response and 1 mark for a relevant example.
Possible answer: The most likely/instinctive/automatic response/reaction in a given situation (when performing in front of an audience/as a result of arousal) (1) e.g. a skilled/unskilled basketball player will shoot more/fewer hoops (in front of an audience) (1).

Note that the example need not be sport related.

02 What is meant by 'evaluation apprehension'? Give an example of evaluation apprehension.
[2 marks]

AO1 – 2

Award 1 mark for what is meant by evaluation apprehension and 1 mark for a relevant example.
Possible answer: the awareness of/expectation of/fear of being judged by an audience/expert (1) e.g. when a ballroom dancer performs in front of a judging panel (1).

Note that marks are not awarded for the effect of evaluation apprehension on performance – rather, for a definition of the term and a contextualised example of when this could occur.

03 Outline **two** findings from Asch's conformity experiments. **[2 marks]**

AO1 – 2

Award 2 marks for any two findings from Asch's conformity experiments. These may include findings from the original study or of variations. The latter may be expressed in the form of a percentage, or brief explanation as to whether the rate of conformity increased or decreased (which implies comparison with the original study).

Likely findings:

- the average/overall conformity rate was around 32-37%;
- the majority (approx. 75%) of participants conformed at least once (do not credit the obverse of this if those are the only two findings presented);
- very few (5%) conformed on all trials;
- the more ambiguous/difficult the task, the higher the rate of conformity;

- reduced majority size led to a decrease in conformity.

Accept other valid answers.

04 Briefly explain **one** ethical issue in Asch's conformity experiments.

[2 marks]

AO2 – 2

1 mark for outline/identification of a relevant ethical issue and 1 mark for how it occurred in Asch's conformity experiments.

Likely issues: deception; lack of informed consent; protection from harm/distress/stress; right to withdraw.

Possible answer: Participants were not protected from harm in Asch's experiments (1). Hearing the responses of others could have led them to question their judgement and caused stress (1).

05 Briefly explain **one** methodological issue in Asch's conformity experiments.

[2 marks]

AO2 – 2

1 mark for outline/identification of a relevant methodological issue and 1 mark for how it occurred in Asch's conformity experiments.

Likely issues: lack of ecological validity/mundane realism; lack of population validity/generalisability/sample bias; lack of temporal validity; lack of internal validity/presence of demand characteristics.

Possible answer: one methodological issue in Asch's experiments was sample bias/an unrepresentative sample (1). Asch's original sample was mostly made up of white, middle-class, male students (1).

06 Discuss one dispositional explanation of obedience and one other explanation of obedience. Refer to evidence in your answer. [10 marks]

AO1 5 marks AO2 5 marks

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

AO1 Up to five marks for description of one dispositional explanation of obedience (which is likely to be the authoritarian personality) and one other explanation of obedience. Maximum of 3 for any one explanation. Likely explanations: the authoritarian personality – a collection of traits/dispositions; developed from strict/rigid parenting; conformist/conventional/dogmatic; obedient/servile towards people perceived as having higher status/harsh towards people perceived as having lower status; reference to F-scale as a way of measuring personality type.

One 'other' explanation may include: legitimacy of authority figure – which may be linked to setting, uniform, system, etc; agentic state; the presence of 'buffers'; gradual commitment/'foot in the door'. Also credit factors (derived from Milgram variations) that affect levels of obedience e.g. proximity of authority figure; proximity of victim, in the absence of an obvious 'explanation'.

Accept another dispositional explanation as the 'one other' as this is not ruled out by the question.

One mark only for candidates who simply state two explanations (and do nothing else).

Credit description of relevant evidence up to 1 mark.

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 which may include evaluation of the authoritarian personality as an explanation for obedience - measurement of authoritarianism relies on self-report (F-scale) data which may be unreliable; difficulty in establishing cause and effect between authoritarianism/parenting style and obedience; explanation cannot easily account for obedience of entire social groups/societies. Credit use/analysis of evidence/Milgram variations when linked to the explanations e.g. decreased obedience in the run-down 'seedy' building suggests that obedience setting must be seen to be legitimate. Credit discussion/comparison of the relative merits of the explanations – evidence suggests that explanations based on the effects of situational factors have more explanatory power than dispositional accounts. Credit use of real-life examples up to 1 mark per explanation.

One credit evaluation of the methodology/ethical issues in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanation.

Maximum 6 marks if only one explanation.

Maximum 6 marks if no evidence.

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate and well-organised description of one dispositional explanation of obedience and one other explanation of obedience. The discussion is clear and coherent, 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 one dispositional explanation of obedience and one other explanation of obedience, 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 6 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 one or both explanations. 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 though the answer may lack structure. Psychological terminology may be missing or used inappropriately. There may be intrusive errors of grammar, spelling and punctuation.

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/discussion of one or both explanations, 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: Social Cognition

07 What is meant by a 'social schema' in impression formation? Give an example of a social schema in impression formation. **[2 marks]**

AO1 – 2

Award 1 mark for what is meant by social schema and 1 mark for a relevant example.
Possible answer: A set of ideas/beliefs/cognitive structure/mental representation about people or groups (1) e.g. nurses are caring (1).

2 marks may be awarded for definitions and examples of specific types of social schema e.g. person schema, role schema, event schema, self-schema.

08 What is meant by the 'primacy effect' in impression formation? Give an example of the primacy effect in impression formation. **[2 marks]**

AO1 – 2

Award 1 mark for what is meant by the primacy effect and 1 mark for a relevant example.
Possible answer: The first/earlier impression we get of someone is more influential than the last/later information (1) e.g. if someone arrives late for an interview they will be judged as disorganised (1).

No marks for an explanation of the primacy effect in the context of memory research.

09 Outline **one** explanation of prejudice. **[2 marks]**

AO1 – 2

Up to 2 marks for an outline of one explanation of prejudice. Award one mark for identification/brief outline of a relevant explanation and one mark for elaboration/expansion.

Likely explanations: authoritarian personality; competition for resources/realistic conflict theory/relative deprivation hypothesis; social identity theory. Accept alternative explanations e.g. frustration-aggression hypothesis; social learning theory; conformity.

Likely answers:

- Authoritarian personality – harsh upbringing/overly punitive parenting leads to introjection of hostility; expressed as prejudice/scapegoating of groups perceived as 'weaker'.
- Competition for resources - resources such as housing/land/employment are scarce; competing groups develop negative attitudes and prejudice towards each other.

- Social identity theory - the world is divided into us/them (social categorisation); the enhancement of in-group over out-group (social comparison).

10	Briefly explain one strength and one limitation of the explanation of prejudice you outlined in your answer to 09 .	[4 marks]
-----------	--	------------------

AO2 – 4

Up to 2 marks for one strength and up to 2 marks for one limitation of the explanation outlined in 09. 1 mark for identification/brief statement of the issue and a further mark for expansion/elaboration.

Possible strengths: Authoritarian Personality – generated considerable body of research; evidence supports relationship between authoritarianism and prejudice e.g. Brown (1995).

Competition for resources – can be applied to real-life issues/examples such as disputes over territory; evidence that prejudice increases during times of economic crisis/downturn; evidence supports the link between competition and prejudice e.g. Sherif (1935).

Social identity theory – complementarity with competition for resources theory; supported by research using minimal group paradigms e.g. Tajfel (1970).

Possible limitations: Authoritarian Personality – measurement of authoritarianism relies on self-report (F-scale) data which may be unreliable; explanation cannot easily account for prejudice within entire social groups/societies; difficulty in establishing cause and effect between authoritarianism/parenting style and prejudice.

Competition for resources – simply being a member of a group is a sufficient condition for prejudice; later studies have failed to replicate Sherif's findings.

Social identity theory – artificiality of research evidence; in real-life people are members of several groups at once.

Note that some of these points may overlap.

Credit use of contrasting explanations to support explanation of strength or limitation.

Accept other valid answers.

11	Discuss the structure and function of attitudes. Refer to evidence in your answer.	[10 marks]
-----------	---	-------------------

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

AO1 Up to 5 marks for description of the structural and description of the functional approach to attitudes (max of 3 marks for any one description).

Functions of attitudes – content likely to focus on specific functions: knowledge function - attitudes help us make sense of the world by making it predictable; an explanation of e.g. stereotyping; adaptive function - attitudes help us gain social approval/acceptance/goals when we display generally-accepted attitudes; we avoid punishment by displaying these attitudes; an explanation of conformity in attitudes; ego/self-expressive function - attitudes help us to establish identity when we express our own values and opinions; this function represents the fact that we are social beings who need to communicate with others; an explanation of unusually strongly-held or idiosyncratic beliefs; ego-defensive function - protecting the individual from recognising personal deficiencies or inferiority; this function can protect our self-esteem and promote a positive self-image to others; Freudian roots.

Structure of Attitudes – ABC model of attitudes: affective component – evaluate/emotional part of an attitude; behavioural/conative component – action part of an attitude; cognitive component – knowledge/belief part of an attitude; the model implies that attitudes and behaviour should be in accordance with one another.

Credit description of relevant evidence up to 1 mark.

Likely studies: La Pierre (1934); Edwards (1990); Fishbein and Azjen (1975); Petty and Cacioppo (1986); Razran (1950), Martin (1987), Tajfel et al (1971), Han and Shavitt (1993), Herek (1987).

AO2 Up to five marks for discussion of the functional and structural approach to attitudes.

Functional approach: discussion of the disadvantages that might arise from these functions e.g. stereotyping/prejudice/discrimination as a result of the knowledge function when information is ignored or rejected; dogmatism/inflexibility as a result of the ego-expressive function; cultural differences in functions; recognition that one attitude might serve more than one function so the divisions are simplistic; the use of the functional approach as a way of understanding how attitudes might be changed, or why they might be resistant to change. The use of examples to illustrate functions (up to 1 mark).

Structural approach: not all components of an attitude are equally weighted; research suggests inconsistency between attitudes and behaviour e.g. La Pierre – analysis of cognitive dissonance within this context; other researchers have proposed two-component/single-component models. Up to 1 mark for an example that illustrates all 3 components.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Max 6 marks if only structure or function

Max 6 marks if no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of the structure and function of attitudes. The discussion is clear and coherent, providing evidence of thoughtful analysis, though this need not be balanced across the two topics in the top-band. 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 the structure and function of attitudes although some detail may be lacking. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum 6 marks if only structural or functional approach is present 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 the structure and/or function of attitudes and/or basic/limited discussion. There may be exceptional description for 5 marks with no discussion. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/discussion of the structure and/or function approach to attitudes, 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

12 Explain **one** difference between semantic memory and episodic memory.

[2 marks]

2 - AO1

Up to 2 marks for an explanation of one difference between semantic and episodic memory. 1 mark for identification of a difference and a further mark for elaboration/expansion. 0 marks for answers that just focus on one type of memory.

Likely differences: semantic – memory for facts, general knowledge; episodic – memory for events/autobiographical information; semantic – may not contain information to do with when we learned/encoded these memories - episodic – stored with reference to time and place.

Credit answers 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.

No credit for examples of semantic and/or episodic memory unless used to support the explanation of a difference.

Credit other valid differences.

13 Outline **either** retrieval failure **or** interference as an explanation for forgetting.

[2 marks]

2 - AO1

Up to 2 marks for an outline of retrieval failure or interference as an explanation for forgetting.

Retrieval failure – credit any 2 points eg a problem of accessibility (1); forgetting occurs in the absence of cue/clues/triggers/prompts / ‘tip of the tongue’ forgetting (1); reference to types of cues: context-dependent, state-dependent (1); the encoding specificity principle (1).

For 2 marks, the answer must focus on forgetting rather than remembering.

Interference - credit any 2 points eg forgetting is a result of disruption / confusion of one memory by other information (1); more likely to occur when memories are similar (1). There are two types – **retroactive** where recent information learned disrupts recall of previously stored information (1) and **proactive** where what we have already stored disrupts more recent memory (1). 1 mark for only naming the two types.

Credit other valid points.

14 Explain **one** limitation of **either** retrieval failure **or** interference as an explanation for forgetting.

[3 marks]

3 - AO2

Note that limitation does not have to be for the explanation outlined in question 13.

3 marks for a limitation of retrieval failure or interference theory of forgetting.

Retrieval failure – likely answers: supporting studies are conducted under artificial circumstances e.g. Godden and Baddeley; recall tends to survive dramatic changes in context so the effects may be overstated.

Interference - likely answers: many of the studies on which the theory is based are laboratory based; difficulty of distinguishing effects of interference from other forms of forgetting; unsure of the mechanisms involved in interference / how and why it occurs.

Possible answer: studies that support interference tend to be laboratory based, where participants are required to learn similar material in a very short time-frame, making it more likely that interference will occur.

When crediting methodological issues there must be at least some link to the explanation for full marks.

15 Outline **one** study in which **either** retrieval failure **or** interference as an explanation for forgetting was investigated. In your answer, refer to what psychologists did and what was found.

[3 marks]

3 - AO1

Note that outline of study does not have to be for explanation used in either question 13 or question 14.

Up to 3 marks for a description of a study in which retrieval failure or interference was investigated. Credit description of procedure/methods i.e. what participants were asked to do, detail of conditions and description of relevant findings/conclusions.

Note: 1 mark for procedure/method and 1 mark for findings, plus further mark for detail of either procedure/method or findings.

Likely studies: Jenkins and Dallenbach (1924), Underwood (1957), Keppel and Underwood (1962), Waugh and Norman (1965), Baddeley and Hitch (1977), Schmidt et al (2000), Godden and Baddeley (1975), Tulving and Thompson (1973), Tulving and Pearlstone (1966), Bower et al (1969), Abernethy (1975).

16 Discuss the working memory model. Refer to evidence and **one other** model of memory in your answer.

[10 marks]

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

AO1 Up to 5 marks for description of the model/sub-components: description of central executive and 'slave systems' – visuo-spatial scratch/sketch pad; phonological store/loop; articulatory loop/control process; primary acoustic store; episodic buffer (versions vary – not all of the slave systems need to be present for full marks). Credit general information about the model: sees STM as an active processor; information concerning capacity and coding of each store; allocation of resources/divided attention/dual-task performance.

Credit description of evidence up to 1 mark.

Likely studies: Paulesu et al (1993), Logie et al (1989), Robbins et al (1996), Hunt (1980), Brooks (1968), Baddeley, Thomson and Buchanan (1975), Hoosain and Salili (1988), Hulme, Thomson, Muir and Lawrence (1984), Levey, Aldaz, Watts and Coyle (1991), Baddeley et al (1998).

AO2 Up to 5 marks for discussion of the model including strengths and weaknesses. Possible strengths: explains how cognitive processes interact; memory is active rather than passive; provides explanation/treatments for processing deficits; highlights different memory tasks that STM can deal with by identifying separate components; explains results of dual task studies. Limitations include: vague, untestable nature of the central executive; supported by highly controlled lab studies which may undermine the validity of the model.

Credit comparison with alternative models (as per the question). This is likely to focus on the 'active' nature of processing in STM compared to the 'passive' version of STM presented in the multi-store model.

Credit use of evidence to support or refute the model.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the model.

Maximum of 6 marks – no evidence

Maximum of 6 marks – no reference to an alternative model

Mark bands**9 – 10 marks Very good answers**

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of the working memory model. The discussion is clear and coherent. There is appropriate reference to evidence. There is appropriate comparison with at least one other model of memory. 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 the working memory model though some detail may be lacking. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. At the bottom of the band there may be no reference to evidence and/or no reference to an alternative. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

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

3 – 5 marks Average to weak answers

There is some knowledge of the working memory model and/or basic/limited discussion. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/discussion of the working memory model, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content.

Section B: Cognitive Psychology

Topic: Perceptual Processes

17 Explain **one** difference between Gibson's theory of perception and Gregory's theory of perception.

[2 marks]

2 – AO1

2 marks for an explanation of one difference between Gibson's and Gregory's theories. 1 mark for identification of a difference and a further mark for elaboration/expansion. 0 marks for answers that just focus on either Gibson's or Gregory's theory.

Likely differences (note that some of these may overlap): direct vs indirect processing; bottom-up vs top-down processing; data-driven vs concept-driven; innate vs learnt perception; ecological validity vs artificiality of supporting evidence.

Possible answer: one difference is direct vs indirect processing (1). Gregory's theory relies on inference to 'fill in the gaps' of our visual perception whereas Gibson claims that perception is determined by sensory information alone (1).

Credit evidence/examples used to illustrate the difference e.g. contrasting approach to explaining illusions.

Credit other valid differences.

18 Identify **one** distortion illusion.

[1 mark]

1 – AO1

1 mark for naming (or drawing) a distortion illusion.

Likely answers: Ponzo illusion; Muller-Lyer illusion; Poggendorf illusion; Titchener's circles/Ebbinghaus illusion; Wundt's illusion; Zollner's illusion; moon illusion.

Accept other valid answers.

19 Identify **one** ambiguous figure.

[1 mark]

1 – AO1

1 mark for naming (or drawing) an ambiguous figure.

Likely answers: Necker cube; Rubin's vase; Boring's old/young woman/Leeper's lady; Jastrow's duck/rabbit head; the rat-man.

Accept other valid answers.

20 Explain what distortion illusions tell us about perception.

[3 marks]

3 - AO2

Credit may be awarded for 1 point fully elaborated/expanded; 2 points – one expanded, one brief; 3 brief points.

Likely points: 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; 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

Accept other valid answers.

21 Outline **one** study in which the influence of emotion on perception was investigated. In your answer, refer to what psychologists did and what was found.

[3 marks]

3 – AO1

Up to 3 marks for a description of a study in which the influence of emotion on perception was investigated. Credit description of procedure/methods i.e. what participants were asked to do, detail of conditions and description of relevant findings/conclusions.

Note: 1 mark for procedure/method and 1 mark for findings, plus further mark for detail of either procedure/method or findings.

Likely studies: McGinnes (1949); Lazarus and McCleary (1951).

22 Discuss the Gestalt principles of perceptual organisation. Refer to evidence in your answer. [10 marks]

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

AO1 5 marks for description of Gestalt principles of perceptual organisation. Likely content: proximity – things that are close together are usually seen as belonging together; similarity – things that have similar characteristics tend to be grouped together; closure – we mentally complete figures that are incomplete; wholeness – we tend to perceive the whole figure rather than component parts. Accept reference to more general principles such as figure-ground, symmetry, continuity/good continuation, common fate, simplicity, Law of Pragnanz, phenomenological approach. Credit reference to biological basis of perceptual organisation.

Maximum of 1 mark for only naming principles.

Credit description of evidence up to 1 mark.

Likely studies: Navon (1977); Greene (1990); Pomerantz and Garner (1973).

AO2 Up to 5 marks for discussion of Gestalt principles including strengths and weaknesses. Possible strengths: intuitively appealing; phenomenological approach that explains real-life instances of perception. Limitations include: 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.

Credit use of examples to illustrate principles up to 2 marks.

Credit comparison with alternative explanations/theories e.g. Gibson, Gregory, Neisser.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the principles.

Max 6 marks if no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate and well-organised description of Gestalt principles. The discussion is clear and coherent, 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 Gestalt principles although some detail may be lacking. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding. Maximum 6 marks if 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 Gestalt principles and/or basic/limited discussion. There may be exceptional description for 5 marks with no discussion of the principles described. The answer may lack focus. There may be inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/discussion of Gestalt principles, 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

23 Identify the independent variable in this study.

[1 mark]

1 - AO3

1 mark for the independent variable

IV – type of treatment / treatment group / whether the participants had drug therapy, cognitive therapy or no treatment.

24 Identify the dependent variable in this study.

[1 mark]

1 - AO3

1 mark for the dependent variable.

DV – the (average) number of obsessive thoughts (experienced daily).

25 Explain the purpose of **Group 3** within this study.

[2 marks]

2 - AO3

1 mark each for any two of the following:

- the no treatment group is a control group/used for the purpose of comparison/as a baseline
- to establish cause and effect/to show that the IV affected the DV/to increase the validity of the study
- to show that improvements were due to the (cognitive and drug) treatments and not some other variable (e.g. improvement over time).

26	Explain one way in which the researcher could have randomly allocated participants to the three groups.	[2 marks]
-----------	--	------------------

2 - AO3

Up to 2 marks for an explanation of one way in which participants may have been randomly allocated to the three groups.

1 mark for explaining that the names/numbers of **all** participants should be placed in e.g. a hat, a random number generator, computer or calculator, etc.

1 mark for explaining how names/numbers would be allocated to the three groups e.g. the first ten names/numbers would be allocated to Group 1, the next ten to Group 2.

Accept alternative wording/method e.g. the first name/number allocated to Group 1, the second to Group 2 and so on.

27	Evaluate one of the treatments for OCD identified in this study.	[4 marks]
-----------	---	------------------

4 - AO2

4 marks for an evaluation of either drug therapy or cognitive therapy. Note that this may include 1 or 2 points (strengths or weaknesses) that are elaborated/expanded or more points that are less detailed/briefly stated.

Possible points for drug therapy: reduction of symptoms not elimination; relapse when drugs not taken; specific side-effects of named drugs; dual approach with other therapy e.g. cognitive is more effective; reduced need for surgery.

Possible points for cognitive therapy: attempts to address root cause so changes should be more permanent; active approach – allows patient to 'self-manage' their own treatment/condition; very effective when combined with drug therapy/behavioural techniques; rapport between therapist and patient/client is essential.

Credit reasoned discussion of practical implications e.g. time, cost, for either therapy.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

28 Discuss **two** explanations for phobias. Refer to evidence in your answer.

[10 marks]

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

AO1 Up to five marks for description of two explanations for phobias with a maximum of 3 marks for any one explanation. The most likely explanations are behavioural and psychodynamic, but any other relevant explanations e.g. cognitive, biological are acceptable.

The behaviourist explanation - fear is due to classical conditioning; temporal association between UCS (original cause of fear) and CS (going outside/people, etc); leads to a conditioned response; elicited inappropriately; credit relevant labelled diagram; operant conditioning - reinforcement of avoidance behaviour; two-process model. Social learning theory – phobias learned through observation and imitation.

The psychodynamic 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; due to childhood event. Accept alternative explanations for other phobias such as agoraphobia.

Credit description of relevant evidence up to 1 mark.

Likely studies: Freud (1909); Watson & Rayner (1920); Bagby (1922); Di Gallo et al (1997); King et al (1998); Di Nardo et al (1988); Bandura and Rosenthal (1966).

AO2 up to 5 marks for discussion of the explanations including strengths and limitations.

Behaviourist: more appropriate for specific phobias; neglects cognitive factors; based on animal research; based on sound scientific research; cannot explain phobias in the absence of direct experience.

Psychodynamic: lacks methodological rigour; difficulty of testing the explanation; limited evidence/evidence from case studies; premise that phobias only occur due to repressed (sexual) experiences.

Credit reasoned comparison between explanations and with alternatives e.g. preparedness.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanations.

Maximum 6 marks – only one explanation

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Mark Bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate and well-organised description of two explanations for phobias. The discussion is clear and coherent 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 two explanations for phobias though 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. At the bottom of the band may be answers that include only 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 one or more explanation(s) for phobias and/or basic/limited discussion. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. At the top of the band there may be exceptional description for five marks.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/discussion of one or more explanation(s) for phobias, but there must be some relevance.

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

0 marks No relevant content.

Topic: Autism

29	Identify the independent variable in this study.	[1 mark]
-----------	--	-----------------

1 - AO3

1 mark for the independent variable.

IV – type of treatment / treatment group / whether the children received drug therapy, behaviour modification or no treatment.

30	Identify the dependent variable in this study.	[1 mark]
-----------	--	-----------------

1 - AO3

1 mark for the dependent variable.

DV – the (average) number of repetitive behaviours (daily).

31	Explain the purpose of Group 3 within this study.	[2 marks]
-----------	--	------------------

2 - AO3

1 mark each for any two of the following:

- the no treatment group is a control group/used for the purpose of comparison/as a baseline
- to establish cause and effect/to show that the IV affected the DV/to increase the validity of the study
- to show that improvements were due to the (behaviour modification and drug) treatments and not some other variable (e.g. improvement over time).

32 Explain **one** way in which the researcher could have randomly allocated participants to the three groups. **[2 marks]**

2 - AO3

Up to 2 marks for an explanation of one way in which participants may have been randomly allocated to the three groups.

1 mark for explaining that the names/numbers of **all** participants should be placed in e.g. a hat, a random number generator, computer or calculator, etc.

1 mark for explaining how names/numbers would be allocated to the three groups e.g. the first ten names/numbers would be allocated to Group 1, the next ten to Group 2.

Accept alternative wording/method e.g. the first name/number allocated to Group 1, the second to Group 2 and so on.

33 Evaluate **one** of the therapies for autism identified in this study. **[4 marks]**

4 - AO2

4 marks for an evaluation of either drug therapy or behaviour modification. Note that this may include 1 or 2 points (strengths or weaknesses) that are elaborated/expanded or more points that less detailed/briefly stated.

Possible points for drug therapy: reduction of symptoms not elimination; relapse when drugs not taken; specific side-effects of named drugs; dual approach with other therapy e.g. behaviour modification, is more effective.

Possible points for behaviour modification: ethical issues – manipulation; often requires parental involvement to be truly effective; puts strain on other family members; effectiveness depends on consistency of treatment; issues of generalisation from the clinical setting.

Credit reasoned discussion of practical implications e.g. time, cost, for either therapy.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

34 Discuss **two** explanations for autism. Refer to evidence in your answer.

[10 marks]

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

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

Students may focus on two separate explanations within an approach or global explanations eg biological or cognitive.

Possible explanations (likely to be cognitive and/or biological):

- (Lack of) theory of mind: suggestion that people with autism do not understand the world from the point of view of others; ‘mind-blindness’; failure to grasp false belief; theory of mind mechanism.
- Executive functioning deficit: inability to switch attention and initiate new behaviours; perseverative errors.
- Central coherence deficit: inability to process information in general; attempt to explain both the deficits and exceptional skills seen in people with autism; elaboration of ‘coherence’ or wholeness; examples of coherent/deficit behaviours (maximum 1 mark).
- Genetic explanation: 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 e.g. HOSA1 gene, chromosomes 2,6,15 and 16.
- Neurological correlates: relationship/correlation between the symptoms of autism (triad of impairments) and brain damage/structural abnormalities.

Credit description of evidence up to 1 mark.

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

Central coherence deficit: Shah and Frith (1993).

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

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 5 marks available for discussion of the explanations chosen: many studies support the TOM explanation; the theory does not account for the ‘islets of ability’; some people with autism do not fail the false belief tasks; however, they struggle with second order tasks.

Weak central coherence might account for the ‘savant abilities’; the failure seen on embedded figures tasks might be better explained by difficulty in generalising.

Failure of executive functioning does explain repetitive and stereotyped behaviours and is supported by some research; it fits well with the working memory model as it may be the central executive component that may be impaired; it fits with biological evidence.

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. Discussion of how areas of damage are commonly identified through post-mortems or scanning techniques e.g. MRI, PET, SPECT; description of specific areas of damage/structural abnormalities.

General points: cognitive explanations do not really provide causal information, but provide further detail about the cognitive differences between people with and without autism; it seems likely that an explanation that attempts to fit biological information with cognitive information might be the way forward. Discussion of issues related to the biological approach e.g. reductionism, determinism.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to the discussion of the explanation(s).

Maximum 6 marks – only one explanation

Maximum 6 marks – no evidence

Mark bands

9 – 10 marks Very good answers

There is accurate, well-organised and detailed description of two explanations for autism. The discussion is clear and coherent 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 explanations for autism though some detail may be lacking. Discussion is present but may be limited in either depth or breadth. There is some reference to evidence. The answer is well-focused with little or no misunderstanding.

Maximum 6 marks if only one explanation is given 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) and/or basic/limited discussion. There may be exceptional description for 5 marks with no discussion of the explanations described. The answer may lack focus. There may be substantial inaccuracy and/or irrelevance.

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

1 – 2 marks Poor answers

There is very limited knowledge/ discussion of explanation(s), but there must be some relevance. Basic ideas are poorly expressed. There is little evidence of structure. There may be significant errors in grammar, spelling and punctuation.

0 marks No relevant content.

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES GRID

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3
Social Influence			
1	2		
2	2		
3	2		
4		2	
5		2	
6	5	5	
Total	11	9	
Social Cognition			
7	2		
8	2		
9	2		
10		4	
11	5	5	
Total	11	9	
Remembering and forgetting			
12	2		
13	2		
14	3		
15		3	
16	5	5	
Total	12	8	
Perceptual Process			
17	2		
18	1		
19	1		
20		3	
21	3		
22	5	5	
Total	12	8	
Anxiety Disorders			
23			1
24			1
25			2
26			2
27		4	
28	5	5	
Total	5	9	6
Autism			
29			1
30			1
31			2
32			2
33		4	
34	5	5	
Total	5	9	6