

**OXFORD**

INTERNATIONAL  
AQA EXAMINATIONS

---

# INTERNATIONAL AS PSYCHOLOGY

## PS01

Unit 1 Introductory Topics in Psychology

---

Mark scheme

June 2023

---

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 © 2023 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><b>The working memory model has the following components: the central executive, phonological loop, visuo-spatial sketchpad and episodic buffer.</b></p> <p><b>Describe two components of the working memory model.</b></p> <p><b>For any two components award marks as follows:</b>  <b>2 marks</b> for a clear, elaborated description of a component of the working memory model.  <b>1 mark</b> for a limited/vague/muddled description.</p> <p><b>Possible content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central executive – supervises and controls the whole working memory system including the sub-systems. Allocates information to sub-systems for further processing. Has a limited capacity and processes information in any sensory modality.</li> <li>• Visuo-spatial sketchpad – processes visual information in terms of shape and colour. Also processes spatial information in regards to our spatial awareness (where objects are around us). Has a limited capacity.</li> <li>• Phonological loop – processes auditory information. It is broken up into the phonological store (inner ear), which holds the sounds you hear, and the articulatory process (inner voice), which is involved in maintenance rehearsal. Has a limited capacity (what can be said in 2 seconds).</li> <li>• Episodic buffer – brings together information from the other sub-systems. Provides the main link between working memory and long-term memory.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant material.</p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p><b>AO1 = 4</b></p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
02	<p><b>Lee is driving with his friend James in a car.</b></p> <p><b>“It is strange,” Lee says. “I can clearly remember my first driving lesson and how difficult it was trying to drive the car. But now, after driving for years, I can do it without thinking.”</b></p> <p><b>James replies, “I love driving and I remember that, as a child, I could name every make and model of the cars we passed on the road.”</b></p> <p><b>Outline three types of long-term memory. Briefly explain how each type of memory is shown in the conversation between Lee and James.</b></p> <p><b>For each type of long-term memory, award marks as follows:</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for an accurate outline for <b>each</b> type of long-term memory.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> No marks for just naming types of long-term memory.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>AO1 = 3</b> <b>AO2 = 3</b></p>

	<p><b>For each application of long-term memory to the scenario, award marks as follows:</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for an accurate explanation of that type of long-term memory in relation to the context of the stem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Memory of a (personal) event that occurred in someone’s life (1 mark), Lee could clearly remember his first driving lesson (1 mark).</li> <li>• An action/muscle-based memory (1 mark), Lee can drive the car (without thinking) (1 mark).</li> <li>• Memory for factual information/general knowledge (1 mark), James could name every make and model of cars as a child (1 mark).</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
<b>03</b>	<p><b>Describe and evaluate the multi-store model of memory.</b></p> <p><b>Possible content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linear model of memory consisting of three (unitary) stores: sensory register, STM and LTM.</li> <li>• Information is taken in from the environment via our senses and enters the sensory register.</li> <li>• Sensory register has an unlimited capacity, duration of milliseconds and codes information in a modality-specific way.</li> <li>• Information passes into the STM if it is paid attention to.</li> <li>• STM has a capacity of 7 +/-2 (5–9) items, a duration of 18–30 seconds and codes information in a mainly acoustic way.</li> <li>• Information is kept in STM via the use of maintenance rehearsal/rehearsal loop but if information is rehearsed enough it enters LTM.</li> <li>• LTM has an unlimited capacity, duration of 47 years to a lifetime and codes information in a mainly semantic way.</li> <li>• Information from LTM must be retrieved and passed back into STM in order to be recalled.</li> <li>• Credit description of how information can be lost/forgotten at each store.</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of research studies as support for the existence of different stores as suggested by MSM, eg Jacobs (1887), Peterson &amp; Peterson (1959), Bahrick (1975), Baddeley (1966), Glanzer and Cunitz (1966), Drachman and Sahakian (1979), Squire (1993), etc.</li> <li>• Use of case studies to provide support (eg HM); and/or criticise (eg KF) the multi-store model.</li> <li>• Criticism of the linear structure of the model in regard to storing information in LTM, eg lots of everyday information is stored in LTM without active rehearsal/rehearsal loop being required. Brown and Kulik (1977) – flashbulb memory.</li> <li>• Model has been a useful starting point for memory research, eg first model to incorporate three different stores.</li> <li>• Credit comparison with WMM provided it is used as an evaluation of MSM.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant material.</p>	<p><b>20</b></p> <p><b>AO1 = 8</b> <b>AO3 = 12</b></p>

<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>4</b>	Knowledge of the multi-store 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.	<b>16–20</b>
<b>3</b>	Knowledge of the multi-store model 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.	<b>11–15</b>
<b>2</b>	Limited knowledge of the multi-store 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 multi-store 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.	<b>0</b>

**Section B: Social Psychology**

**Total for this section: 30 marks**

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
04	<p>The following statements refer to types of conformity.</p> <p>Which two statements describe compliance?</p> <p>Shade two boxes only.</p> <p><b>Answer key:</b> C – Conforming publicly but not privately</p> <p><b>Answer key:</b> E – Conforming publicly with a temporary change in behaviour</p>	<p>2</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
05.1	<p><b>Describe informational influence as an explanation for conformity.</b></p> <p><b>Possible content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conforming due to the desire to be right/correct.</li> <li>• Using the behaviour of others for guidance when unsure of what to do/how to act.</li> <li>• Conforming with the majority as we presume they know more than we do.</li> <li>• Often results in internalisation, leading to a permanent change in behaviour.</li> </ul> <p>Credit use of relevant example.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Description of informational influence is detailed. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Description of informational influence is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Description of informational influence is present but there is little or no detail. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No creditable content.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Description of informational influence is detailed. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	Description of informational influence is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2	1	Description of informational influence is present but there is little or no detail. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.	1	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>3</p> <p>AO1 = 3</p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Description of informational influence is detailed. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3															
2	Description of informational influence is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2															
1	Description of informational influence is present but there is little or no detail. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.	1															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
05.2	<p><b>Describe normative influence as an explanation for conformity.</b></p> <p><b>Possible content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conforming due to the desire to be liked/fit in/accepted/gain approval by the group.</li> <li>• May also be done to avoid conflict/rejection by being different to everyone else.</li> <li>• Often results in compliance as people publicly agree but privately disagree just to fit in, usually results in a temporary change in behaviour.</li> </ul> <p>Credit use of relevant example.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="288 730 1302 1167"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="288 730 389 792">Level</th> <th data-bbox="389 730 1195 792">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1195 730 1302 792">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 792 389 887">3</td> <td data-bbox="389 792 1195 887">Description of normative influence is detailed. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1195 792 1302 887">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 887 389 981">2</td> <td data-bbox="389 887 1195 981">Description of normative influence is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.</td> <td data-bbox="1195 887 1302 981">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 981 389 1099">1</td> <td data-bbox="389 981 1195 1099">Description of normative influence is present but there is little or no detail. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.</td> <td data-bbox="1195 981 1302 1099">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="288 1099 389 1167">0</td> <td data-bbox="389 1099 1195 1167">No creditable content.</td> <td data-bbox="1195 1099 1302 1167">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Description of normative influence is detailed. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	Description of normative influence is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2	1	Description of normative influence is present but there is little or no detail. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.	1	0	No creditable content.	0	<p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>AO1 = 3</b></p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Description of normative influence is detailed. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3															
2	Description of normative influence is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2															
1	Description of normative influence is present but there is little or no detail. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.	1															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
05.3	<p><b>Evaluate normative and/or informational influence as explanations for conformity.</b></p> <p><b>Possible evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of research evidence to support explanations, eg Asch (1951), Sherif (1935), Jenness (1932), Darley and Latane (1968), etc.</li> <li>• Issues with individual differences within conformity, eg personality factors such as locus of control and nAffiliators, gender, culture.</li> <li>• Explanations suggest we conform due to normative or informational influence, but in reality we are likely to conform/be influenced by both at the same time.</li> <li>• Criticism of dual process dependency model in relation to not acknowledging the importance of belonging to a group. Hogg and Turner (1987) study.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant evaluations.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> credit methodological issues as long as the link to explanations for conformity is clear.</p>	<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>AO3 = 6</b></p>



<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>3</b>	Evaluation of explanations for conformity is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	<b>5–6</b>
<b>2</b>	Evaluation of explanations for conformity is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	<b>3–4</b>
<b>1</b>	Evaluation of explanations for conformity is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	<b>1–2</b>
<b>0</b>	No creditable content.	<b>0</b>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks												
<p><b>06</b></p>	<p><b>Jemina is with a group of five friends who are planning a day out. Jemina finds it difficult to tell them that she does not want to go. One of the friends suddenly says to the group, “I can’t go.” As soon as she hears this, Jemina tells the group that she is also unable to go.</b></p> <p><b>Using your knowledge of social support, explain Jemina’s behaviour.</b></p> <p><b>Possible content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At first Jemina was influenced by the apparent unanimity of the group and conformed with the plans being made despite not wanting to go (normative influence).</li> <li>• When one of the friends said they could not go, this gave Jemina a source of social support (as it broke this unanimity).</li> <li>• The friend saying they could not go acted as a model for Jemina, which made it easier for her to act in the way she wanted, ie not going on the day out.</li> <li>• Having social support also stopped Jemina feeling as if she was going to be the ‘odd one out’.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant material, such as research evidence eg Asch, if applied explicitly to Jemina’s behaviour.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 1055 1329 1491"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 1055 456 1117">Level</th> <th data-bbox="461 1055 1177 1117">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1182 1055 1329 1117">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1117 456 1267">2</td> <td data-bbox="461 1117 1177 1267">The application of how social support can explain Jemina’s behaviour is accurate with some detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1117 1329 1267">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1267 456 1417">1</td> <td data-bbox="461 1267 1177 1417">The application of how social support can explain Jemina’s behaviour is limited, vague or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1267 1329 1417">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1417 456 1491">0</td> <td data-bbox="461 1417 1177 1491">No creditable content.</td> <td data-bbox="1182 1417 1329 1491">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	2	The application of how social support can explain Jemina’s behaviour is accurate with some detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4	1	The application of how social support can explain Jemina’s behaviour is limited, vague or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p><b>4</b></p> <p><b>AO2= 4</b></p>
Level	Description	Marks												
2	The application of how social support can explain Jemina’s behaviour is accurate with some detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4												
1	The application of how social support can explain Jemina’s behaviour is limited, vague or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2												
0	No creditable content.	0												

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks									
07	<p><b>Describe and evaluate legitimacy of authority as an explanation for obedience.</b></p> <p><b>Possible content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most societies have a hierarchical structure.</li> <li>• People obey others who appear to have justified/authentic/recognised (legitimate) authority over them in a given situation (above us in the hierarchy).</li> <li>• When an authority figure is recognised as such, they gain social power.</li> <li>• Authority figures are presumed to know what they're doing as we think they are more knowledgeable/experienced.</li> <li>• Authority figures often have features to demonstrate their legitimacy, eg uniform.</li> <li>• Authority figures can use/abuse their position and power for destructive purposes.</li> <li>• Credit description of relevant studies (see below).</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of research evidence from variations of Milgram's (1963) studies, such as changing location (reduced legitimacy of authority) and the uniform variation where the experimenter did not wear a lab coat.</li> <li>• Use of other supporting research, eg Bickman (1974), Hofling (1966), studies into cultural differences in obedience using Milgram's procedures such as Kilham's (1974) study showing only 16% obedience in Australia compared to Mantell (1971) showing 85% in Germany.</li> <li>• The explanation suggests that we should 'blindly obey' those we see as legitimate authorities, however there are still individuals such as criminals, who show no obedience to these authority figures.</li> <li>• In Milgram's study, 35% of participants still disobeyed despite the presence of a legitimate authority figure.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant material.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> credit methodological issues as long as the link to legitimacy of authority is clear.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 1599 1294 2033"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Knowledge of legitimacy of authority 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>10–12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Knowledge of legitimacy of authority is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly</td> <td>7–9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	4	Knowledge of legitimacy of authority 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 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	Description	Marks									
4	Knowledge of legitimacy of authority 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 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 legitimacy of authority 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 legitimacy of authority 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.	<b>0</b>	

Section C: Psychopathology

Total for this section: 30 marks

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
08	<p><b>Fahad used to be an excellent student; he never missed a day of school. However, his family has become very worried about him. Fahad has recently stopped going to school and spends 22 hours a day in his bedroom. He has told his family that he is very afraid of the people he believes are watching him and trying to control his thoughts.</b></p> <p><b>Name one definition of abnormality. Explain how this definition can be applied to Fahad’s behaviour.</b></p> <p><b>Award 1 mark as follows:</b>  <b>1 mark</b> for an accurate named definition of abnormality.</p> <p><b>Award a further 3 marks as follows:</b>  <b>3 marks:</b> The application of the definition of abnormality to Fahad’s behaviour is detailed. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology  <b>2 marks:</b> The application of the definition of abnormality to Fahad’s behaviour lacks detail. The answer lacks clarity in places  <b>1 mark:</b> The application of the definition of abnormality to Fahad’s behaviour is briefly presented. The answer is very limited/vague/muddled.</p> <p><b>Possible content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statistical infrequency – Fahad shows statistically rare/uncommon behaviour to stay in his room 22 hours per day as very few people in society would stay in their room for this many hours every day.</li> <li>• Deviation from social norms – Fahad believing that people are watching and trying to control him violates the expected (unwritten) rules/norms of society as people do not usually believe/expect that others are watching and trying to control them.</li> <li>• Failure to function adequately – Fahad has stopped completing normal day-to-day tasks, such as going to school. He is also causing observer discomfort as his behaviour is causing his family to worry about him.</li> <li>• Deviation from ideal mental health – Fahad is unable to meet several of the criteria for mental health, such as not attending school (not showing self-actualisation); showing worry/fear about people watching and trying to control him (not resisting stress) and believing that people are watching and trying to control his thoughts (not showing an accurate perception of reality).</li> </ul>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p><b>AO1 = 1</b>  <b>AO2 = 3</b></p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
09.1	<p><b>One explanation of phobias is the two-process model.</b></p> <p><b>Briefly outline the two processes in this model.</b></p> <p><b>Award marks as follows:</b>  <b>1 mark:</b> learning a phobia via classical conditioning/association.</p> <p><b>1 mark:</b> maintaining a phobia via operant conditioning/reinforcement.</p> <p><b>Maximum of 1 mark</b> for just naming both classical and operant (conditioning).</p>	<p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>AO1 = 2</b></p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
09.2	<p><b>Evaluate the two-process model as an explanation of phobias.</b></p> <p><b>Possible evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation has provided a good understanding of phobias which has allowed for the development of effective behavioural treatments, such as systematic desensitisation and flooding.</li> <li>• Use of research evidence, such as Watson and Rayner (1920), Bandura and Rosenthal (1966), Munjack (1984), DiNardo (1988).</li> <li>• Not all phobias develop after a significant fearful incident (theory is deterministic). Shown in DiNardo (1988) who found as many individuals without a dog phobia who had experienced a fearful incident with a dog. Also, Munjack (1984) found the same for individuals not having a driving phobia but had suffered a traumatic experience in a car.</li> <li>• Alternative explanations can account for the development of phobias (theory simplifies explanation to a single cause = reductionist). Phobias could be biological (biological preparedness, genetic), caused by social learning (observing a role model become fearful), cognitive (phobias involve illogical and irrational thoughts which cannot be accounted for in the two-process model).</li> <li>• Lots of anecdotal evidence to support the explanation as many phobia sufferers can recall a significant event that triggered the phobia (explanation has intuitive appeal).</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant evaluation.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 1182 1294 1823"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Evaluation of the two-process model as an explanation of phobias is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td>5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Evaluation of the two-process model as an explanation of phobias is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td>3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Evaluation of the two-process model as an explanation of phobias is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td>1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No creditable content.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Evaluation of the two-process model as an explanation of phobias is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6	2	Evaluation of the two-process model as an explanation of phobias is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4	1	Evaluation of the two-process model as an explanation of phobias is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>AO3 = 6</b></p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Evaluation of the two-process model as an explanation of phobias is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6															
2	Evaluation of the two-process model as an explanation of phobias is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4															
1	Evaluation of the two-process model as an explanation of phobias 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												
10	<p><b>Describe how systematic desensitisation is used to treat phobias.</b></p> <p><b>Possible content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An anxiety hierarchy is created related to a person's phobic object. It is then ordered from least to most frightening.</li> <li>• Relaxation techniques (eg meditation) are taught to the person.</li> <li>• The person is gradually exposed to each stage of their hierarchy. The person only moves on to the next level once they can remain calm at the current stage.</li> <li>• Can be done in vivo/in vitro.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant material.</p> <p><b>Maximum of 1 mark</b> if there is no description of the procedure of systematic desensitisation.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 904 1294 1373"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="284 904 437 972">Level</th> <th data-bbox="442 904 1158 972">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1163 904 1294 972">Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 978 437 1140">2</td> <td data-bbox="442 978 1158 1140">The description of systematic desensitisation as a treatment of phobias is accurate with some detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td data-bbox="1163 978 1294 1140">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1146 437 1308">1</td> <td data-bbox="442 1146 1158 1308">The description of systematic desensitisation as a treatment of phobias is limited, vague or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1146 1294 1308">1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="284 1314 437 1373">0</td> <td data-bbox="442 1314 1158 1373">No creditable content.</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1314 1294 1373">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	2	The description of systematic desensitisation as a treatment of phobias is accurate with some detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4	1	The description of systematic desensitisation as a treatment of phobias is limited, vague or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p>4</p> <p><b>AO1 = 4</b></p>
Level	Description	Marks												
2	The description of systematic desensitisation as a treatment of phobias is accurate with some detail. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4												
1	The description of systematic desensitisation as a treatment of phobias is limited, vague or muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2												
0	No creditable content.	0												



Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
11.1	<p><b>Amena’s friends at work are worried about her. They have noticed she is finding it difficult to complete her work and is very unhappy. They ask Amena if she would like to join them for a meal. Amena tells them that she does not feel hungry and wants to go home to sleep. Amena’s friends convince her to see a doctor and she is diagnosed with depression.</b></p> <p><b>Outline two characteristics of depression shown by Amena.</b></p> <p><b>1 mark for any two of the following</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amena is unhappy (in work) showing a low mood.</li> <li>• Amena says she is not hungry showing a disruption to eating/appetite.</li> <li>• Amena says she wants to go home to sleep showing a disruption to sleeping (hypersomnia).</li> <li>• Amena has been struggling to complete work showing poor concentration/ difficulty focusing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Maximum of 1 mark</b> for naming two characteristics of depression.</p>	<p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>AO2 = 2</b></p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks
11.2	<p><b>Amena’s doctor asks her to describe her thoughts and feelings. Amena explains that she believes that she is not good at her job and nobody likes her. Amena also says that she does not believe that anything will ever change and that she will feel like this forever.</b></p> <p><b>Using your knowledge of Beck’s negative triad, explain Amena’s conversation with her doctor.</b></p> <p><b>For each of the three components of the negative triad, award marks as follows:</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> for a clear, elaborated application of the component of the negative triad to Amena’s beliefs.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for a limited/vague/muddled application.</p> <p><b>Application</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative view of the self/oneself – Amena believes/states that she is not good at her job.</li> <li>• Negative view of the future – Amena believes/states that nothing will change/improve, or she will feel like this forever.</li> <li>• Negative view of the world – Amena believes/states that nobody likes her.</li> </ul>	<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>AO2 = 6</b></p>

Question	Marking Guidance	Total Marks															
11.3	<p><b>Evaluate the cognitive explanation of depression.</b></p> <p><b>Possible evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of research evidence to support the cognitive explanation, eg Beck et al (1999), Lloyd &amp; Lishman (1975), Hammen &amp; Krantz (1976).</li> <li>• Important practical uses as the explanation has led to the development of CBT as a way of treating depression through changing thought processes.</li> <li>• The cognitive explanation does not distinguish between cause and effect factors.</li> <li>• Explanation cannot acknowledge/account for evidence showing biological links to depression, eg low serotonin in depressed patients and drug therapies that raise serotonin which in turn alleviate symptoms.</li> <li>• The cognitive explanation is unable to account for the manic phases seen in patients with bipolar depression.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant evaluation.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="284 902 1294 1507"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Evaluation of the cognitive explanation of depression is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td>5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Evaluation of the cognitive explanation of depression is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.</td> <td>3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Evaluation of the cognitive explanation of depression is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td> <td>1–2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No creditable content.</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Description	Marks	3	Evaluation of the cognitive explanation of depression is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6	2	Evaluation of the cognitive explanation of depression is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4	1	Evaluation of the cognitive explanation of depression is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2	0	No creditable content.	0	<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>AO3 = 6</b></p>
Level	Description	Marks															
3	Evaluation of the cognitive explanation of depression is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of specialist terminology.	5–6															
2	Evaluation of the cognitive explanation of depression is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places. There is some appropriate use of specialist terminology.	3–4															
1	Evaluation of the cognitive explanation of depression is very limited. The answer is vague/muddled. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	1–2															
0	No creditable content.	0															