

**OXFORD**

INTERNATIONAL  
AQA EXAMINATIONS

---

# INTERNATIONAL AS **PSYCHOLOGY**

## **PS01**

Unit 1: Introductory Topics in Psychology

---

Mark scheme

January 2020

---

Version: 1.0 Final

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 Examiner.

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [oxfordaqaexams.org.uk](http://oxfordaqaexams.org.uk)

#### **Copyright information**

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

Copyright © 2020 Oxford International AQA Examinations and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

### Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

### Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A: Memory

Total for this section: 30 marks

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
01		<p>Henry witnesses a man steal some money from a shop and reports the theft to a security guard. The security guard then interviews Henry about the theft.</p> <p>Explain how <b>three</b> components of the cognitive interview could be used by the security guard when interviewing Henry.</p> <p>For each component award marks as follows:  <b>2 marks</b> for a clear and detailed explanation of how the component could be used with Henry  <b>1 mark</b> for a limited/vague/muddled explanation of how the component could be used with Henry.</p> <p><b>Possible application:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The security guard could ask Henry to recall the context of the theft such as recalling details of the shop, the weather outside or how he was feeling at the time of the theft (context reinstatement).</li> <li>• The security guard could ask Henry to report every single detail of the theft even if it seemed trivial or irrelevant (report everything).</li> <li>• The security guard could ask Henry to begin by recalling what happened at the end of the theft and then work his way back in time towards the beginning of the theft (reverse the order).</li> <li>• The security guard could ask Henry to imagine he was the shop owner and recall the events of the theft from his perspective (change perspective).</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant components such as those of the enhanced cognitive interview.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>AO2=6</b></p>

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
02		<p>Explain <b>one</b> difference between the capacity of short-term memory and the capacity of long-term memory in the multi-store model of memory.</p> <p>Award marks as follows:  <b>2 marks</b> for a clear and elaborated explanation of one difference  <b>1 mark</b> for a limited/vague/muddled explanation of one difference.</p> <p><b>Content:</b>                      Long-term memory can store more information than short-term memory or short-term memory can store fewer items than long-term memory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-term memory has a limited memory capacity of between 5–9 items of information.</li> <li>• Long-term memory has a very large or unlimited storage capacity.</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>AO3=2</b></p>

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
03		<p>Explain <b>one</b> difference between the duration of short-term memory and the duration of long-term memory in the multi-store model of memory.</p> <p>Award marks as follows:  <b>2 marks</b> for a clear and elaborated explanation of one difference  <b>1 mark</b> for a limited/vague/muddled explanation of one difference.</p> <p><b>Content:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long-term memory can store information for a longer time than short-term memory or the duration of short-term memory is much less than long-term memory.</li> <li>• Short-term memory has a limited duration of around 18–30 seconds.</li> <li>• Long-term memory can hold information for very long periods of time eg 50 years or more.</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>AO3=2</b></p>

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks									
04		<p>Describe and evaluate the working memory model.</p> <p><b>Possible content:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed by Baddeley and Hitch.</li> <li>• An updated version of STM which views WM as an active processor.</li> <li>• Knowledge of the components of WM including their functions and properties (eg capacity and coding); central executive; phonological loop/store (articulatory and acoustic processing); visuo-spatial scratchpad/sketchpad; episodic buffer.</li> <li>• Knowledge of overall functioning of WM eg divided attention/dual-task performance.</li> </ul> <p>Credit the use of a diagram.</p> <p>Credit other relevant description.</p> <p><b>Possible evaluation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains how different cognitive processes interact.</li> <li>• Comparison with passivity of STM in the MSM.</li> <li>• Use of evidence to support or contradict the concept of working memory.</li> <li>• Problem of testing/fully explaining the central executive.</li> <li>• Provides explanation/treatments for processing deficits.</li> <li>• Has explanatory power as WM can explain the results of dual task studies.</li> <li>• Use of evidence to support or refute the model such as brain imaging research showing different areas of the brain are active when performing different types of task or clinical evidence of selective impairments to STM.</li> <li>• Issues with research where linked back to WM eg use of artificial situations and laboratory experiments, use of artificial tasks, issues with samples related to generalisability etc.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant evaluation.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="403 1565 1264 2038"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="403 1570 512 1630">Level</th> <th data-bbox="512 1570 1126 1630">Descriptor</th> <th data-bbox="1126 1570 1264 1630">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="403 1630 512 1906">4</td> <td data-bbox="512 1630 1126 1906">Knowledge of the working memory model is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.</td> <td data-bbox="1126 1630 1264 1906">16–20</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="403 1906 512 2038">3</td> <td data-bbox="512 1906 1126 2038">Knowledge of the working memory model is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some</td> <td data-bbox="1126 1906 1264 2038">11–15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	4	Knowledge of the working memory model is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	16–20	3	Knowledge of the working memory model is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some	11–15	<p>20</p> <p>AO1=8 AO3=12</p>
Level	Descriptor	Marks										
4	Knowledge of the working memory model is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	16–20										
3	Knowledge of the working memory model is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some	11–15										

			effective evaluation. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	
		<b>2</b>	Limited knowledge of the working memory model is present. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	<b>6–10</b>
		<b>1</b>	Knowledge of the working memory model is very limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	<b>1–5</b>
		<b>0</b>	No creditable content.	

**Section B: Social Psychology**

**Total for this section: 30 marks**

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks															
05		<p>Sian and her friends are taking part in an experiment in which an authority figure orders them each to tell a lie to a stranger. Sian thinks that telling lies is wrong and hears one of her friends disobey the order.</p> <p>Explain how social support from her friend might cause Sian to resist social influence and disobey the authority figure.</p> <p><b>Possible application:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As Sian thinks that telling lies is wrong, she is likely to want to disobey and not tell a lie.</li> <li>• Sian witnessing her friend disobey the authority figure and not tell a lie would increase her confidence that her own view to disobey is correct.</li> <li>• Therefore, Sian is likely to disobey and not tell a lie.</li> <li>• Sian’s disobedient behaviour would be less likely to stand out from others as she is not alone in her disobedience.</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="405 1021 1302 1487"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="405 1021 512 1084">Level</th> <th data-bbox="512 1021 1158 1084">Descriptor</th> <th data-bbox="1158 1021 1302 1084">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1084 512 1220">3</td> <td data-bbox="512 1084 1158 1220">Application is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1158 1084 1302 1220">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1220 512 1323">2</td> <td data-bbox="512 1220 1158 1323">Application is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.</td> <td data-bbox="1158 1220 1302 1323">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1323 512 1426">1</td> <td data-bbox="512 1323 1158 1426">Application is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.</td> <td data-bbox="1158 1323 1302 1426">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1426 512 1487">0</td> <td data-bbox="512 1426 1158 1487">No creditable content.</td> <td data-bbox="1158 1426 1302 1487"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Application is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	Application is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2	1	Application is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1	0	No creditable content.		<p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>AO2=3</b></p>
Level	Descriptor	Marks																
3	Application is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3																
2	Application is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2																
1	Application is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1																
0	No creditable content.																	



Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks															
06		<p>Mai and three other participants are taking part in an experiment. They have to say out loud the name of a colour they are shown by the researcher. Mai is told that she will say her answer last. The other three participants each say the colour is orange, but Mai thinks that it is red.</p> <p>Explain how locus of control might cause Mai to resist social influence and not conform with the other participants.</p> <p><b>Possible application:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mai may have an internal locus of control where she feels that she can influence her own life and that her actions are her own choice and responsibility.</li> <li>• As Mai believes she is personally responsible for her actions she is more likely to base her decisions on her own belief that the colour is red and resist the influences of the other participants.</li> <li>• Therefore, as Mai believes that the colour was red, she would not conform with the majority, as she did not agree with them that the colour was orange.</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Descriptor</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Application is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Application is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Application is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td colspan="2">No creditable content.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Application is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	Application is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2	1	Application is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1	0	No creditable content.		<p>3</p> <p><b>AO2=3</b></p>
Level	Descriptor	Marks																
3	Application is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3																
2	Application is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2																
1	Application is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1																
0	No creditable content.																	

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
07		<p>In Asch's study, which of the following led to an increase in the level of conformity?</p> <p>Shade <b>one</b> box only.</p> <p>Answer: D (Unanimity)</p>	<p>1</p> <p><b>AO1=1</b></p>

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
08		<p>Briefly outline informational influence as an explanation for conformity.</p> <p>Award marks as follows:  <b>2 marks</b> for a clear outline of informational influence  <b>1 mark</b> for a limited/vague/muddled outline of informational influence.</p> <p><b>Possible content:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We agree with the majority because we accept that their view/opinion is correct, and we also want to be correct.</li> <li>• ISI is likely to lead to internalisation and result in both a private and a public change of opinion/behaviour which may be long term or permanent.</li> <li>• ISI is more likely to happen where there is ambiguity or where another person is regarded as an expert.</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>AO1=2</b></p>

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
09		<p>Describe and evaluate normative influence as an explanation for conformity.</p> <p><b>Possible content:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where we agree with the majority because we want to be accepted/liked/gain social approval.</li> <li>• An emotional process.</li> <li>• Likely to lead to compliance and result in a public agreement and change of opinion/behaviour but private disagreement.</li> <li>• Likely to lead to superficial and temporary conformity.</li> <li>• More likely to occur in social situations where we are stressed, fear rejection or desire social approval.</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible evaluation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual differences – some people are more likely to use NSI than others eg people with a need for affiliation are more likely to conform due to NSI.</li> <li>• Limited application due to gender differences.</li> <li>• Explanations may be culture-bound and lack temporal validity and the extent to which they explain conformity may vary according to the culture and era being studied.</li> <li>• The idea of conformity being down to NSI is oversimplistic. It is likely that ISI is also involved, and it can be difficult to isolate the effect of NSI in experimentation.</li> <li>• Use of evidence to support or refute the influence of NSI eg Asch (1951), Hogg and Turner (1987), Mori and Arai (2010).</li> <li>• Issues with research where linked back to explanations for conformity eg use of artificial situations and laboratory</li> </ul>	<p><b>9</b></p> <p><b>AO1=4</b> <b>AO3=5</b></p>

		<p>experiments, use of artificial tasks, issues with samples related to generalisability etc.</p> <p>Credit other relevant evaluation.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="403 407 1264 1184"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="403 407 512 472">Level</th> <th data-bbox="512 407 1125 472">Descriptor</th> <th data-bbox="1125 407 1264 472">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="403 472 512 678">3</td> <td data-bbox="512 472 1125 678">Knowledge of NSI is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.</td> <td data-bbox="1125 472 1264 678">7–9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="403 678 512 916">2</td> <td data-bbox="512 678 1125 916">Knowledge of NSI is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. Evaluation is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.</td> <td data-bbox="1125 678 1264 916">4–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="403 916 512 1122">1</td> <td data-bbox="512 916 1125 1122">Knowledge of NSI is limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td data-bbox="1125 916 1264 1122">1–3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="403 1122 512 1184">0</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="512 1122 1264 1184">No creditable content.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Knowledge of NSI is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	7–9	2	Knowledge of NSI is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. Evaluation is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	4–6	1	Knowledge of NSI is limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–3	0	No creditable content.		
Level	Descriptor	Marks																
3	Knowledge of NSI is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	7–9																
2	Knowledge of NSI is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. Evaluation is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	4–6																
1	Knowledge of NSI is limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–3																
0	No creditable content.																	

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
10		<p>Describe and evaluate legitimacy of authority <b>and</b> agentic state as explanations for obedience.</p> <p><b>Possible content:</b>  <u>Legitimacy of authority</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An individual is more likely to obey those who they perceive to have authority over them.</li> <li>• The legitimacy of the authority figure may not be genuine but may be perceived as such.</li> <li>• For society to function most of us accept that authority figures must be allowed to exercise some social power and punish others.</li> <li>• Context/setting can also act as a legitimising factor eg Milgram’s Yale variation.</li> </ul> <p><u>Agentic state</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An individual ‘unthinkingly’ obeys as they do not feel personal responsibility for their own behaviour.</li> <li>• Diffusion of responsibility to the authority figure which frees an individual from the demands of their conscience.</li> <li>• Agentic shift occurs when an individual shifts from an autonomous to an agentic state.</li> <li>• Binding factors such as denial keep an individual in the agentic state as they allow them to minimise or ignore the damaging effects of their behaviour and reduce their moral strain.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant description.</p> <p><b>Possible evaluation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High explanatory power – research into the legitimacy of authority has shown that different cultures have different perceptions of legitimacy and this can explain why we see different rates of obedience between cultures.</li> <li>• Individual differences – the agentic state is an incomplete explanation as it cannot explain why some people obey when there is no perceived authority eg Mandel (1998) or why some people do not obey when there is a perceived authority (ie usually do not find 100% obedience).</li> <li>• Can explain real life crimes of obedience eg My Lai massacre (Kelman and Hamilton, 1989).</li> <li>• Use of evidence to support or refute the explanation of obedience eg Milgram (1963), Hofling (1966), Blass and Schmitt (2001).</li> <li>• Issues with research where linked back to explanations of obedience eg use of artificial situations and laboratory experiments, use of artificial tasks, issues with samples related to generalisability etc.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant evaluation.</p>	<p><b>12</b></p> <p><b>AO1=6</b> <b>AO3=6</b></p>

Level	Descriptor	Marks
4	Knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	10–12
3	Knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	7–9
2	Limited knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is present. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately. Or only one explanation at Level 3/4	4–6
1	Knowledge of legitimacy of authority and agentic state is very limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. Or only one explanation at Level 2	1–3
0	No creditable content.	

**Section C: Psychopathology**

**Total for this section: 30 marks**

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks								
11		<p>Four definitions of abnormal behaviour are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• deviation from ideal mental health</li> <li>• deviation from social norms</li> <li>• failure to function adequately</li> <li>• statistical infrequency.</li> </ul> <p>Complete <b>Table 1</b> by writing the correct definition of abnormal behaviour from the list above next to the relevant description.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Table 1</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Description of abnormal behaviour</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Definition of abnormal behaviour</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Behaviour which demonstrates an inability to cope with daily routines</td> <td>Failure to function adequately</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Behaviour which is different from the accepted standards in a group</td> <td>Deviation from social norms</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Behaviour which occurs rarely</td> <td>Statistical infrequency</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description of abnormal behaviour	Definition of abnormal behaviour	Behaviour which demonstrates an inability to cope with daily routines	Failure to function adequately	Behaviour which is different from the accepted standards in a group	Deviation from social norms	Behaviour which occurs rarely	Statistical infrequency	<p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>AO1=3</b></p>
Description of abnormal behaviour	Definition of abnormal behaviour										
Behaviour which demonstrates an inability to cope with daily routines	Failure to function adequately										
Behaviour which is different from the accepted standards in a group	Deviation from social norms										
Behaviour which occurs rarely	Statistical infrequency										

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks															
12	1	<p>Briefly outline the process of classical conditioning. How could classical conditioning explain the development of Reggie’s phobia of spiders?</p> <p><b>Possible content:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning by association (the first element of Mowrer’s two-process model).</li> <li>• Occurs when two stimuli (an unconditioned stimulus and a neutral stimulus) are paired together in time.</li> <li>• Eventually the NS produces the same response as the UCS and so a phobia is acquired.</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible application:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initially the spider would be a neutral stimulus (NS) and would not bring about a fear response in Reggie.</li> <li>• When Reggie sees the spider (NS) at the same time as he is shocked due to the unpleasant unexpected event of the spider falling on his face (UCS) an association between the spider and the shock/unexpected event forms and both now produce the fear response (UCR).</li> <li>• The spider is now a conditioned stimulus (CS) and the conditioned response (CR) of fear is now triggered every time Reggie sees a spider.</li> <li>• Reggie has acquired a phobia of spiders.</li> </ul> <p>Credit the use of a diagram.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="405 1256 1302 2033"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="405 1256 512 1323">Level</th> <th data-bbox="512 1256 1161 1323">Descriptor</th> <th data-bbox="1161 1256 1302 1323">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1323 512 1529">3</td> <td data-bbox="512 1323 1161 1529">Knowledge of classical conditioning is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Application is mostly effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1323 1302 1529">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1529 512 1767">2</td> <td data-bbox="512 1529 1161 1767">Knowledge of classical conditioning is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. Application is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1529 1302 1767">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1767 512 1968">1</td> <td data-bbox="512 1767 1161 1968">Knowledge of classical conditioning is limited. Application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1767 1302 1968">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1968 512 2033">0</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="512 1968 1302 2033">No creditable content.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Knowledge of classical conditioning is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Application is mostly effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	5–6	2	Knowledge of classical conditioning is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. Application is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	3–4	1	Knowledge of classical conditioning is limited. Application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.		<p>6</p> <p>AO1=3 AO2=3</p>
Level	Descriptor	Marks																
3	Knowledge of classical conditioning is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Application is mostly effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	5–6																
2	Knowledge of classical conditioning is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. Application is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	3–4																
1	Knowledge of classical conditioning is limited. Application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2																
0	No creditable content.																	

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks															
12	2	<p>Briefly outline the process of operant conditioning. How could operant conditioning explain why Reggie continues to have a phobia of spiders?</p> <p><b>Possible content:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning by consequence/reinforcement (the second element of Mowrer’s two-process model).</li> <li>• Knowledge of positive reinforcement (rewarding behaviour which encourages repetition).</li> <li>• Knowledge of negative reinforcement (avoiding/escaping unpleasant situation which encourages repetition).</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible application:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive reinforcement – Reggie is rewarded by feeling calm when avoiding places where spiders might be which encourage him to avoid these places in the future.</li> <li>• Negative reinforcement – Reggie avoids places where spiders might be to avoid feeling anxious which encourages him to avoid these places in the future.</li> <li>• Reinforcement maintains Reggie’s phobia of spiders.</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="405 1055 1305 1832"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="405 1055 512 1120">Level</th> <th data-bbox="512 1055 1161 1120">Descriptor</th> <th data-bbox="1161 1055 1305 1120">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1120 512 1323">3</td> <td data-bbox="512 1120 1161 1323">Knowledge of operant conditioning is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Application is mostly effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1120 1305 1323">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1323 512 1563">2</td> <td data-bbox="512 1323 1161 1563">Knowledge of operant conditioning is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. Application is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1323 1305 1563">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1563 512 1767">1</td> <td data-bbox="512 1563 1161 1767">Knowledge of operant conditioning is limited. Application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1563 1305 1767">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1767 512 1832">0</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="512 1767 1305 1832">No creditable content.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Knowledge of operant conditioning is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Application is mostly effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	5–6	2	Knowledge of operant conditioning is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. Application is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	3–4	1	Knowledge of operant conditioning is limited. Application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.		<p>6</p> <p>AO1=3 AO2=3</p>
Level	Descriptor	Marks																
3	Knowledge of operant conditioning is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Application is mostly effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	5–6																
2	Knowledge of operant conditioning is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. Application is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	3–4																
1	Knowledge of operant conditioning is limited. Application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2																
0	No creditable content.																	



Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks															
13		<p>Explain <b>one</b> strength of systematic desensitisation as a treatment for phobias.</p> <p><b>Possible strengths:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can be used with a diverse range of patients so it is more applicable.</li> <li>• Causes low anxiety and minimal trauma so has low refusal and attrition rates.</li> <li>• Comparison with other treatments eg is less traumatic for patients than flooding as it causes less anxiety.</li> <li>• Use of supporting evidence for the effectiveness eg Gilroy et al (2003), Willis and Edwards (1969).</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant strengths.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="405 846 1305 1346"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="405 846 512 909">Level</th> <th data-bbox="512 846 1158 909">Descriptor</th> <th data-bbox="1158 846 1305 909">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 909 512 1048">3</td> <td data-bbox="512 909 1158 1048">Explanation of the strength is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1158 909 1305 1048">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1048 512 1182">2</td> <td data-bbox="512 1048 1158 1182">Explanation of the strength is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.</td> <td data-bbox="1158 1048 1305 1182">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1182 512 1283">1</td> <td data-bbox="512 1182 1158 1283">Explanation of the strength is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.</td> <td data-bbox="1158 1182 1305 1283">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1283 512 1346">0</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="512 1283 1305 1346">No creditable content.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Explanation of the strength is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	Explanation of the strength is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2	1	Explanation of the strength is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1	0	No creditable content.		<p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>AO3=3</b></p>
Level	Descriptor	Marks																
3	Explanation of the strength is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3																
2	Explanation of the strength is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2																
1	Explanation of the strength is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1																
0	No creditable content.																	

Question	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks									
14		<p>Describe and evaluate cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) as a treatment for depression.</p> <p><b>Possible content:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenge negative/irrational thoughts of the negative triad.</li> <li>• Identification of negative thoughts by requiring the client to gather evidence of behaviours/incidents – ‘thought catching’.</li> <li>• Data gathering through homework assignments eg diary keeping to monitor events and identify situations in which negative thinking occurs so these can be targeted.</li> <li>• Hypothesis testing where the evidence gathered is compared with the thought expressed to check whether they match or not – patient as ‘scientist’.</li> <li>• Use of positive self-talk.</li> <li>• Reinforcement of positive thoughts; cognitive restructuring.</li> <li>• Rational confrontation as in Ellis’s REBT.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant description.</p> <p><b>Possible evaluation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBT programmes can be individualised, so CBT can be used with a wide variety of patients with different symptoms and needs.</li> <li>• CBT may not work for all eg for those depressed patients who lack motivation or attention to be able to engage with the process or with depressed patients who have very rigid attitudes and are resistant to change.</li> <li>• Success may not be due to the processes involved in CBT and thus it may not be any more effective than other psychological therapies eg may be due to the patients’ relationship with the therapist.</li> <li>• CBT emphasises the importance of changing cognitive processes but does nothing to change external factors such as poverty or abuse which may be causal factors in depression.</li> <li>• Use of evidence to support or refute the effectiveness of CBT eg March et al (2007), Keller et al (2000), Robinson et al (1990).</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="405 1536 1302 2042"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="405 1536 512 1601">Level</th> <th data-bbox="512 1536 1161 1601">Descriptor</th> <th data-bbox="1161 1536 1302 1601">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1601 512 1877">4</td> <td data-bbox="512 1601 1161 1877">Knowledge of cognitive behaviour therapy is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1601 1302 1877">10–12</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="405 1877 512 2042">3</td> <td data-bbox="512 1877 1161 2042">Knowledge of cognitive behaviour therapy is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1877 1302 2042">7–9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	4	Knowledge of cognitive behaviour therapy is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	10–12	3	Knowledge of cognitive behaviour therapy is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly	7–9	<p>12</p> <p>AO1=6 AO3=6</p>
Level	Descriptor	Marks										
4	Knowledge of cognitive behaviour therapy is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and focused. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	10–12										
3	Knowledge of cognitive behaviour therapy is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly	7–9										

			clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	
		<b>2</b>	Limited knowledge of cognitive behaviour therapy is present. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	<b>4–6</b>
		<b>1</b>	Knowledge of cognitive behaviour therapy is very limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	<b>1–3</b>
		<b>0</b>	No creditable content.	

**PS01 grid**

	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
<b>Section A</b>				
01		6		<b>6</b>
02			2	<b>2</b>
03			2	<b>2</b>
04	8		12	<b>20</b>
<b>Section B</b>				
05		3		<b>3</b>
06		3		<b>3</b>
07	1			<b>1</b>
08	2			<b>2</b>
09	4		5	<b>9</b>
10	6		6	<b>12</b>
<b>Section C</b>				
11	3			<b>3</b>
12.1	3	3		<b>6</b>
12.2	3	3		<b>6</b>
13			3	<b>3</b>
14	6		6	<b>12</b>
<b>Unit total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>90</b>