

OXFORD

INTERNATIONAL
AQA EXAMINATIONS

INTERNATIONAL AS PSYCHOLOGY PS01

Unit 1 Introductory Topics in Psychology

Mark scheme

June 2022

Version: 1.0 Final Mark Scheme



2 2 6 X P S 0 1 / M S

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

Copyright information

Oxford AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for Oxford AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: Oxford AQA 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 © 2022 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	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
01	<p>Which of the following parts of the working memory model controls and coordinates the other parts of the model?</p> <p>Shade one box only.</p> <p>A Central executive B Episodic buffer C Phonological loop D Visuo-spatial sketchpad</p> <p>Answer = A (Central executive)</p>	<p>1</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks												
02	<p>The multi-store model of memory consists of the sensory register, short-term memory and long-term memory.</p> <p>Describe one or more features of the sensory register.</p> <p>Possible content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receives information from sense organs/receptors. • Constantly bombarded with environmental information. • Directs attention to some incoming information which it then passes on to STM. • Unlimited capacity. • Modality-specific system, each of the five senses is stored in its own store/register (eg iconic for sight and echoic for sound). • Loses information quickly as it only stores information for milliseconds/fraction of a second (iconic) to a few seconds (echoic). <p>Credit other relevant content.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Description of one or more features of the sensory register is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td>3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Description of one or more features of the sensory register is limited, vague or muddled. The answer lacks clarity. Use of terminology is either absent or inappropriate.</td> <td>1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No creditable content.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	2	Description of one or more features of the sensory register is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3–4	1	Description of one or more features of the sensory register is limited, vague or muddled. The answer lacks clarity. Use of terminology is either absent or inappropriate.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>4</p> <p>AO1 = 4</p>
Level	Description	Marks												
2	Description of one or more features of the sensory register is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3–4												
1	Description of one or more features of the sensory register is limited, vague or muddled. The answer lacks clarity. Use of terminology is either absent or inappropriate.	1–2												
0	No creditable content.	0												

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
03	<p>One type of long-term memory is procedural memory.</p> <p>Name one other type of long-term memory.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • semantic • episodic • declarative. 	<p>1</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
04.1	<p>Briefly describe the expected difference in capacity between Andrew’s short-term memory and his long-term memory.</p> <p>Award marks as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for stating that Andrew’s LTM would have a larger capacity than his STM (or STM will have a smaller capacity than LTM) • 1 mark for stating that Andrew’s STM would be expected to hold 7 +/-2 (5–9) items • 1 mark for stating that we would expect his LTM could not be measured (due to its vast capacity). 	<p>3</p> <p>AO2 = 3</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
04.2	<p>Briefly describe the expected difference in duration between Andrew’s short-term memory and his long-term memory.</p> <p>Award marks as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for stating that the duration of Andrew’s STM would be much shorter than the duration of his LTM (or information would stay in his LTM longer than STM) • 1 mark for stating that the duration of Andrew’s STM would only be around 18–60 seconds • 1 mark for stating that the duration of Andrew’s LTM would be expected to last for years/for a lifetime. 	<p>3</p> <p>AO2 = 3</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
05	<p>Evaluate the use of the cognitive interview as a way of enhancing the accuracy of eyewitness testimony.</p> <p>Possible evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cognitive interview is a time-consuming process. Police officers must be specially trained in how to use the cognitive interview. The training requires funding and takes police officers off the streets in order to be trained. Many police forces do not offer more than an hour of training, resulting in a less effective cognitive interview process. • Research evidence, (eg Kohnken et al’s (1999) meta-analysis), has shown that cognitive interviews consistently provide more correct information than standard interviews. • Although the amount of correctly recalled information increases there is also an increase in incorrectly recalled information as well (Kohnken et al, 1999). • All techniques (report everything, context reinstatement, change the order and change perspective) are useful, eg Milne and Bull (2002) found that each, by itself, produced more information than a standard interview. However, they found a combination of report everything and context reinstatement produced the best recall overall. • Credit evaluation of the Enhanced cognitive interview. <p>Credit other relevant evaluations.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 1128 1294 1765"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="284 1128 437 1193">Level</th> <th data-bbox="437 1128 1160 1193">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1160 1128 1294 1193">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1193 437 1361">3</td> <td data-bbox="437 1193 1160 1361">Evaluation of the cognitive interview is mostly thorough and effective. The answer is clear and organised. There is some effective use of specialist terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1193 1294 1361">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1361 437 1529">2</td> <td data-bbox="437 1361 1160 1529">Evaluation of the cognitive interview is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1361 1294 1529">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1529 437 1697">1</td> <td data-bbox="437 1529 1160 1697">Evaluation of the cognitive interview is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1529 1294 1697">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1697 437 1765">0</td> <td data-bbox="437 1697 1160 1765">No creditable content.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1697 1294 1765">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Evaluation of the cognitive interview is mostly thorough and effective. The answer is clear and organised. There is some effective use of specialist terminology.	5–6	2	Evaluation of the cognitive interview is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4	1	Evaluation of the cognitive interview is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO3 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Evaluation of the cognitive interview is mostly thorough and effective. The answer is clear and organised. There is some effective use of specialist terminology.	5–6															
2	Evaluation of the cognitive interview is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4															
1	Evaluation of the cognitive interview is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
<p>06.1</p>	<p>Describe post-event discussion as a factor affecting the accuracy of eyewitness testimony.</p> <p>Possible content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occurs when witnesses discuss what they have seen with other people, eg a co-witness. Post-event discussion may influence eyewitnesses due to memory contamination (where they mix the information obtained from the conversation with their own) or memory conformity (where they believe the other person may have a better memory of the event than their own). Description of relevant research evidence into post-event discussion, eg Gabbert’s (2003) research showing that if participants discussed a crime after each had seen it from a different angle, they would incorrectly remember information they could not have seen. <p>Credit other relevant content.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 898 1294 1603"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="288 904 437 969">Level</th> <th data-bbox="442 904 1158 969">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1163 904 1289 969">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 976 437 1133">3</td> <td data-bbox="442 976 1158 1133">Description of post-event discussion as a factor affecting the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1163 976 1289 1133">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 1140 437 1335">2</td> <td data-bbox="442 1140 1158 1335">Description of post-event discussion as a factor affecting the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1140 1289 1335">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 1341 437 1536">1</td> <td data-bbox="442 1341 1158 1536">Description of post-event discussion as a factor affecting the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1341 1289 1536">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 1543 437 1603">0</td> <td data-bbox="442 1543 1158 1603">No creditable content.</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1543 1289 1603">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Description of post-event discussion as a factor affecting the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6	2	Description of post-event discussion as a factor affecting the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4	1	Description of post-event discussion as a factor affecting the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO1 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Description of post-event discussion as a factor affecting the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6															
2	Description of post-event discussion as a factor affecting the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4															
1	Description of post-event discussion as a factor affecting the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
<p>06.2</p>	<p>Evaluate research into the accuracy of eyewitness testimony.</p> <p>Possible evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research into eyewitness testimony is not realistic/lacks ecological validity, eg use of videos of car accidents or crimes as experimental stimuli, therefore it does not reflect experience during which EWT occurs in real-life. • Research may be considered unethical as it involves showing crimes or accidents. • Research has important implications for dealing with witnesses of incidents, eg police realise importance of preventing witnesses from discussing the event. • Research often uses limited samples, eg small numbers of participants, only men, often done in the USA. Results can be said to lack (population) validity and cannot be generalised to the wider population/whole world. <p>Credit other relevant evaluations.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 898 1294 1570"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="284 898 437 965">Level</th> <th data-bbox="437 898 1160 965">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1160 898 1294 965">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 965 437 1133">3</td> <td data-bbox="437 965 1160 1133">Evaluation of research into the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is mostly thorough and effective. The answer is clear and organised. There is some effective use of specialist terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 965 1294 1133">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1133 437 1335">2</td> <td data-bbox="437 1133 1160 1335">Evaluation of research into the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1133 1294 1335">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1335 437 1496">1</td> <td data-bbox="437 1335 1160 1496">Evaluation of research into the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1335 1294 1496">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1496 437 1570">0</td> <td data-bbox="437 1496 1160 1570">No creditable content.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1496 1294 1570">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Evaluation of research into the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is mostly thorough and effective. The answer is clear and organised. There is some effective use of specialist terminology.	5–6	2	Evaluation of research into the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4	1	Evaluation of research into the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO3 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Evaluation of research into the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is mostly thorough and effective. The answer is clear and organised. There is some effective use of specialist terminology.	5–6															
2	Evaluation of research into the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4															
1	Evaluation of research into the accuracy of eyewitness testimony is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Section B: Social Psychology

Total for this section: 30 marks

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
07	<p>Name one variable affecting conformity that was investigated by Asch.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • group size • task difficulty • unanimity. <p>Credit other relevant variables such as confidence of participant/individual differences, written responses and withdrawal of a partner.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
08	<p>Briefly outline one limitation of Asch's research into conformity.</p> <p>Award marks as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 marks for a clear and coherent limitation with some elaboration • 1 mark for a limited or muddled limitation. <p>Possible limitations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited sample of participants used (all male, US, students) so the study lacks (population) validity. • Artificial nature of the task does not reflect real-life conformity/lacks ecological validity (sitting in a room with others and judging the lengths of lines is not an everyday task). • Findings might not be relevant today (child of its time/lacking temporal validity) as it reflects the culture of America in the 1950s. • Ethical concerns related to the study such as deception (participants believed they were taking part in a study on visual perception), protection from harm (participants were confused/stressed/anxious/embarrassed). <p>Credit other relevant limitations.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>AO3 = 2</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
09.1	<p>Explain the type of conformity shown by Oliver in the experiment.</p> <p>Award marks as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for identifying that Oliver is showing internalisation • 1 mark for explaining that Oliver is conforming publicly and privately • 1 mark for elaboration that Oliver agrees with the group when asked and then tries to use the group's suggestions to solve the problem (even though he's no longer with them). 	<p>3</p> <p>AO2 = 3</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
09.2	<p data-bbox="284 315 1203 349">Explain the type of conformity shown by Sarah in the experiment.</p> <p data-bbox="284 383 632 416">Award marks as follows:</p> <ul data-bbox="284 450 1270 633" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="284 450 1043 483">• 1 mark for identifying that Sarah is showing compliance<li data-bbox="284 483 1206 544">• 1 mark for explaining that Sarah only conforms publicly but privately maintains her own views/beliefs<li data-bbox="284 544 1270 633">• 1 mark for elaborating that Sarah agrees with the group when asked, but then uses her own ideas to solve the problem when she's no longer with them.	3 AO2 = 3

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
<p>10.1</p>	<p>Milgram carried out research into variables that affect obedience.</p> <p>Describe the findings of Milgram's research into both proximity and location.</p> <p>Possible content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity – when Milgram brought the learner into the same room as the teacher, obedience rates reduced (fell from 65% to 40%). • Proximity – when the experimenter/authority figure left the room and gave instructions via telephone/speaker, obedience rates reduced (fell to 20.5%). • Proximity – when the teacher had to physically place/force the learner's hand onto a shock plate, obedience rates reduced (fell to 30%). • Location – when Milgram changed the setting/location from Yale university to a run-down office block in a local town (Bridgeport), obedience rates reduced (fell to 47.5%). <p>Credit other relevant information.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 936 1294 1704"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="284 936 437 1001">Level</th> <th data-bbox="437 936 1160 1001">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1160 936 1294 1001">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1001 437 1169">3</td> <td data-bbox="437 1001 1160 1169">Description of the findings of Milgram's research into proximity and location are generally well detailed and appropriate. The answer is mostly clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1001 1294 1169">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1169 437 1404">2</td> <td data-bbox="437 1169 1160 1404">Description of the findings of Milgram's research into proximity and/or location is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. Or just one situational variable at Level 3.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1169 1294 1404">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1404 437 1639">1</td> <td data-bbox="437 1404 1160 1639">Description of the findings of Milgram's research into proximity and/or location is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. Or just one situational variable at Level 2.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1404 1294 1639">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1639 437 1704">0</td> <td data-bbox="437 1639 1160 1704">No creditable content.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1639 1294 1704">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Description of the findings of Milgram's research into proximity and location are generally well detailed and appropriate. The answer is mostly clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6	2	Description of the findings of Milgram's research into proximity and/or location is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. Or just one situational variable at Level 3 .	3–4	1	Description of the findings of Milgram's research into proximity and/or location is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. Or just one situational variable at Level 2 .	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO1 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Description of the findings of Milgram's research into proximity and location are generally well detailed and appropriate. The answer is mostly clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6															
2	Description of the findings of Milgram's research into proximity and/or location is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. Or just one situational variable at Level 3 .	3–4															
1	Description of the findings of Milgram's research into proximity and/or location is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. Or just one situational variable at Level 2 .	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
<p>10.2</p>	<p>Explain two limitations of Milgram’s research into obedience.</p> <p>Possible limitations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milgram’s research lacks (population) validity as he primarily tested American males, research into obedience in other countries and/or females have often shown different results (cultural and gender bias). • Methodological issues of Milgram’s research, eg possibility of demand characteristics, lacking ecological validity. • Discussion of ethical issues of Milgram’s research in terms of deception, protection from harm, informed consent and lack of withdrawal. <p>Credit other relevant limitations.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 770 1294 1574"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="284 770 440 837">Level</th> <th data-bbox="440 770 1161 837">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1161 770 1294 837">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 837 440 1005"> <p>3</p> </td> <td data-bbox="440 837 1161 1005"> <p>Explanation of two limitations of Milgram’s research into obedience is generally thorough and effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. There is some effective use of specialist terminology.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1161 837 1294 1005"> <p>5–6</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1005 440 1272"> <p>2</p> </td> <td data-bbox="440 1005 1161 1272"> <p>Explanation of one or two limitations of Milgram’s research into obedience is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</p> <p>Or just one limitation at Level 3.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1161 1005 1294 1272"> <p>3–4</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1272 440 1503"> <p>1</p> </td> <td data-bbox="440 1272 1161 1503"> <p>Explanation of one or two limitations of Milgram’s research into obedience is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</p> <p>Or just one limitation at Level 2.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1161 1272 1294 1503"> <p>1–2</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1503 440 1574"> <p>0</p> </td> <td data-bbox="440 1503 1161 1574"> <p>No creditable content.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1161 1503 1294 1574"> <p>0</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	<p>3</p>	<p>Explanation of two limitations of Milgram’s research into obedience is generally thorough and effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. There is some effective use of specialist terminology.</p>	<p>5–6</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Explanation of one or two limitations of Milgram’s research into obedience is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</p> <p>Or just one limitation at Level 3.</p>	<p>3–4</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Explanation of one or two limitations of Milgram’s research into obedience is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</p> <p>Or just one limitation at Level 2.</p>	<p>1–2</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>No creditable content.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>6</p> <p>AO3 = 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
<p>3</p>	<p>Explanation of two limitations of Milgram’s research into obedience is generally thorough and effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. There is some effective use of specialist terminology.</p>	<p>5–6</p>															
<p>2</p>	<p>Explanation of one or two limitations of Milgram’s research into obedience is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</p> <p>Or just one limitation at Level 3.</p>	<p>3–4</p>															
<p>1</p>	<p>Explanation of one or two limitations of Milgram’s research into obedience is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</p> <p>Or just one limitation at Level 2.</p>	<p>1–2</p>															
<p>0</p>	<p>No creditable content.</p>	<p>0</p>															

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
11	<p>Describe and evaluate the agentic state as an explanation for obedience. Possible description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals start in an autonomous state, where they take responsibility for their own actions. • When an individual obeys an authority figure they stop taking responsibility for their own behaviour. • When around an authority figure an agentic shift occurs where an individual moves from an autonomous state to an agentic state. • Diffusion of responsibility occurs which frees an individual from the demands of their conscience. • Binding factors such as denial might keep an individual in the agentic state by allowing them to discount/minimise/ignore the damaging effects of their behaviour. <p>Credit other relevant information.</p> <p>Possible evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some suggest that it is an incomplete explanation of obedience 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 (eg we often do not find 100% obedience). • Can explain real life crimes of obedience, eg My Lai massacre (Kelman and Hamilton, 1989). • Research evidence used to support/criticise the explanation, eg Milgram (1963), Blass and Schmitt (2001). • Methodological issues with research into this explanation, eg use of artificial tasks and laboratory experiments, issues with samples related to generalisability, etc. <p>Credit other relevant evaluations.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 1272 1294 2047"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="284 1272 437 1341">Level</th> <th data-bbox="437 1272 1160 1341">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1160 1272 1294 1341">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1341 437 1543">3</td> <td data-bbox="437 1341 1160 1543">Knowledge of the agentic state as an explanation of obedience 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="1160 1341 1294 1543">7–9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1543 437 1776">2</td> <td data-bbox="437 1543 1160 1776">Knowledge of the agentic state as an explanation of obedience 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="1160 1543 1294 1776">4–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1776 437 1977">1</td> <td data-bbox="437 1776 1160 1977">Knowledge of the agentic state as an explanation of obedience 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="1160 1776 1294 1977">1–3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1977 437 2047">0</td> <td data-bbox="437 1977 1160 2047">No creditable content.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1977 1294 2047">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Knowledge of the agentic state as an explanation of obedience 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 the agentic state as an explanation of obedience 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 the agentic state as an explanation of obedience 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.	0	<p>9</p> <p>AO1 = 5 AO3 = 4</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Knowledge of the agentic state as an explanation of obedience 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 the agentic state as an explanation of obedience 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 the agentic state as an explanation of obedience 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.	0															

Section C: Psychopathology

Total for this section: 30 marks

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
12	<p>Briefly outline the deviation from social norms definition of abnormality.</p> <p>Award marks as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 marks for a clear and accurate outline of the deviation from social norms definition of abnormality • 1 mark for a weak, muddled or limited outline. <p>Possible content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behaviour is abnormal if it goes against the expectations of a society/culture. • Social norms are usually unwritten ‘rules’ of a culture but could be explicit. • Credit use of an example to demonstrate the idea of deviating from social norms. <p>Credit other relevant information.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
13	<p>Wendy has a phobia of dogs. When she was 8 years old she was bitten by a dog. Wendy now runs away when she sees a dog. She avoids going into parks where she might see dogs.</p> <p>Using your knowledge of the two-process model, explain Wendy’s phobia of dogs.</p> <p>Possible content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wendy’s phobia has developed through classical conditioning. • She has formed an association between the neutral stimulus (dog) and the fear/pain response (unconditioned response) following being bitten (unconditioned stimulus) as a child. • The conditioned response of fear elicits whenever she sees a dog (conditioned stimulus). • Her phobia of dogs is maintained by operant conditioning (negative reinforcement). • By running away/escaping whenever she sees a dog and avoiding places where she is likely to see a dog, such as parks; she is avoiding or escaping an unpleasant situation/emotions which makes her feel less fearful/anxious (avoidance learning). <p>Credit other relevant information.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 1128 1294 1933"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="284 1128 438 1193">Level</th> <th data-bbox="438 1128 1160 1193">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1160 1128 1294 1193">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1193 438 1361">3</td> <td data-bbox="438 1193 1160 1361">Application of the two-process model as an explanation of Wendy’s phobia of dogs is generally detailed and appropriate. The answer is mostly clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1193 1294 1361">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1361 438 1630">2</td> <td data-bbox="438 1361 1160 1630">Application of the two-process model as an explanation of Wendy’s phobia of dogs is relevant but detail/application is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. Or either CC or OC at level 3.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1361 1294 1630">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1630 438 1865">1</td> <td data-bbox="438 1630 1160 1865">Application of the two-process model as an explanation of Wendy’s phobia of dogs is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. Or either CC or OC at level 2.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1630 1294 1865">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1865 438 1933">0</td> <td data-bbox="438 1865 1160 1933">No creditable content.</td> <td data-bbox="1160 1865 1294 1933">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Application of the two-process model as an explanation of Wendy’s phobia of dogs is generally detailed and appropriate. The answer is mostly clear with appropriate use of terminology.	5–6	2	Application of the two-process model as an explanation of Wendy’s phobia of dogs is relevant but detail/application is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. Or either CC or OC at level 3 .	3–4	1	Application of the two-process model as an explanation of Wendy’s phobia of dogs is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. Or either CC or OC at level 2 .	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>6</p> <p>AO2= 6</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Application of the two-process model as an explanation of Wendy’s phobia of dogs is generally detailed and appropriate. The answer is mostly clear with appropriate use of terminology.	5–6															
2	Application of the two-process model as an explanation of Wendy’s phobia of dogs is relevant but detail/application is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology. Or either CC or OC at level 3 .	3–4															
1	Application of the two-process model as an explanation of Wendy’s phobia of dogs is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. Or either CC or OC at level 2 .	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
14	<p>Identify two characteristics of depression.</p> <p>Award 1 mark each for any two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduced activity/productivity levels • disruption to sleep (increased or decreased amount) • disruption to eating (eat more or less) • low mood • anger • poor concentration • loss of interest in everyday activities (eg hobbies) • negative/irrational beliefs <p>Credit any other relevant characteristics of depression.</p>	<p>2</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
15	<p>Describe and evaluate cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) as a treatment for depression.</p> <p>Possible content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBT focuses on the cause of depression being related to irrational thought processes/negative schemas and therefore works by trying to change these into more rational ones. • Credit information about the treatment sessions, eg CBT involves several (usually around six or more) weekly sessions which often last around 1 hour. • CBT involves challenging irrational thoughts by asking the person to gather/present evidence to support irrational thoughts, any evidence presented is discussed in relation to its validity. • Person as scientist – people are challenged to put their irrational thoughts to the test. • Person is often set 'homework'. • People are often asked to keep a diary and record events and situations where negative thinking occurred which are then discussed at the next therapy session. • Credit information given in relation to REBT. <p>Credit other relevant information.</p> <p>Possible evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting/contradicting research evidence, eg March et al (2007). • CBT has long-term effectiveness as it attempts to address the cause of the depression, that being a person's irrational thought processes. • The success of CBT is often said to depend more on the quality of the person-therapist relationship than the actual therapy techniques themselves. • People require a high level of commitment and motivation in order to engage well with CBT, this is often a significant issue for (severely) depressed people. 	<p>20</p> <p>AO1 = 8</p> <p>AO3 = 12</p>

- CBT suggests an element of blame on the person for their own condition, ie the reason why they have depression is due to their irrational thought processes which now need addressing.
- Some critics suggest that CBT focuses too much on the person's present circumstances and there is some benefit to exploring a person's past for the potential cause, (eg childhood trauma).
- CBT relies heavily on a person's accurate self-reporting their thoughts and emotions, this is unreliable and difficult to verify/validate.
- Credit critical comparison with potential alternative treatments for depression, eg the advantages/disadvantages of CBT in comparison to anti-depressants.

Credit other relevant evaluations.

Level	Description	Marks
4	Description of cognitive behavioural 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.	16–20
3	Description of cognitive behavioural therapy 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.	11–15
2	Limited description of cognitive behavioural therapy is present. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately.	6–10
1	Description of cognitive behavioural 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.	1–5
0	No creditable content.	0

PS01 grid

	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
Section A				
01	1			1
02	4			4
03	1			1
04.1		3		3
04.2		3		3
05			6	6
06.1	6			6
06.2			6	6
Section B				
07	1			1
08			2	2
09.1		3		3
09.2		3		3
10.1	6			6
10.2			6	6
11	5		4	9
Section C				
12	2			2
13		6		6
14	2			2
15	8		12	20
Unit total	36	18	36	90