
INTERNATIONAL AS PSYCHOLOGY PS01

Unit 1: Introductory Topics in Psychology

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final



1 9 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

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	Outline and explain the type of long-term memory used by each student. Award marks as follows: <u>Amir</u> 1 mark for a correct outline of episodic memory eg memory for specific events/episodes of our life. Plus 1 mark for application to Amir eg Amir is using his episodic memory because he is recalling events he has experienced such as activities he did during his holiday. <u>Jane</u> 1 mark for a correct outline of semantic memory eg memory for knowledge of the world/facts. Plus 1 mark for application to Jane eg Jane is using her semantic memory as she is recalling her knowledge of a foreign language. <u>David</u> 1 mark for a correct outline of procedural memory eg memory for actions/skills. Plus 1 mark for application to David eg David is using his procedural memory because he is showing his teacher how to do something (ride his bike).	6 AO1=3 AO2=3

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks																											
02	Discuss one strength and one limitation of the cognitive interview. Possible strengths: • Witnesses recall more information than standard police interview techniques • Gives police a better chance of catching offenders as produces more reliable and valid eyewitness testimony • Use of supporting evidence for the effectiveness of cognitive interviews eg Kohnken <i>et al.</i> (1999), Geiselman <i>et al.</i> (1985), Fisher and Geiselman (1988), Milne and Bull (2002). Credit other relevant strengths. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Descriptor</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Discussion of the strength is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Discussion of the strength is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Discussion of the strength is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditable content.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table> Possible limitations: • Can produce a greater recall of inaccurate information making it less reliable. • Takes more time to conduct compared to standard interviews so may not be used • Requires specialist training so takes up police resources and may not be used Credit other relevant limitations. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Descriptor</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Discussion of the limitation is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Discussion of the limitation is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Discussion of the limitation is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.</td><td>1</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Discussion of the strength is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	Discussion of the strength is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2	1	Discussion of the strength is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1	0	No creditable content.	0	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Discussion of the limitation is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	Discussion of the limitation is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2	1	Discussion of the limitation is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1	6 (3+3) AO3=6
Level	Descriptor	Marks																											
3	Discussion of the strength is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3																											
2	Discussion of the strength is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2																											
1	Discussion of the strength is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1																											
0	No creditable content.	0																											
Level	Descriptor	Marks																											
3	Discussion of the limitation is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3																											
2	Discussion of the limitation is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2																											
1	Discussion of the limitation is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1																											

	0	No creditable content.	0	
--	----------	------------------------	----------	--

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
03	Which one of the following is a component of the working memory model? Answer: A (Episodic buffer)	1 AO1=1

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
04	Outline the central executive in the working memory model. Explain how the central executive might be involved when trying to listen to a story being read aloud and have a conversation at the same time. Award marks as follows: Up to 3 marks for correctly outlining the role of the central executive. 1 mark each for any three of the following: • An attention process • Pays attention to/monitors incoming information (from the senses) • Makes 'decisions' on incoming information in regards of how it is dealt with • Allocates incoming information to the appropriate slave system • Very limited storage • Uses the episodic buffer as additional storage. Plus Up to 3 marks for application to the scenario. 1 mark each for any three of the following: • Both the story and the conversation are attended to • Makes the decision to allocate both sets of information to the phonological loop • Both tasks involve processing sound so use the phonological loop • May send information about the story and/or conversation to the episodic buffer before making the decision to allocate to a slave system. Credit other relevant application.	6 AO1=3 AO2=3

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
05	Briefly explain one limitation of the central executive in the working memory model. Award marks as follows: 2 marks for a clear explanation of a limitation. 1 mark for a limited/vague/muddled explanation of a limitation. Possible content: • We do not fully understand how the central executive functions • Does not explain how the central executive pays attention/allocates to slave systems • Evidence for the central executive being much more complex than the working memory model suggests Credit other relevant limitations.	2 AO3=2

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks															
06	Describe the multi-store model of memory. Possible content: • Knowledge of the sensory register eg very limited duration, relatively large capacity and limited coding. Knowledge of different types of sensory registers such as iconic, echoic and haptic • Knowledge of the short-term memory store eg limited duration (around 18 seconds), limited capacity (5–9 items) and preference for acoustic coding • Knowledge of the long-term memory store eg very large duration (up to a lifetime), unlimited capacity and preference for semantic coding • Knowledge of differences between the features of each store in terms of duration, capacity and/or coding • Knowledge of how information passes through the model eg linear processing; processes involved such as attention, rehearsal and retrieval. Credit use of diagram. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Descriptor</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Knowledge of the multi-store model is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.</td><td>6 – 5</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Knowledge of the multi-store model is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.</td><td>4 – 3</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Knowledge of the multi-store model is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td><td>2 – 1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditable content.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Knowledge of the multi-store model is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	6 – 5	2	Knowledge of the multi-store model is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	4 – 3	1	Knowledge of the multi-store model is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	2 – 1	0	No creditable content.	0	6 AO1=6
Level	Descriptor	Marks															
3	Knowledge of the multi-store model is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	6 – 5															
2	Knowledge of the multi-store model is evident but with some inaccuracies/omissions. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	4 – 3															
1	Knowledge of the multi-store model is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	2 – 1															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks															
07	Using your knowledge of coding in long-term memory, explain what Ellie could do to help her remember the information. Content: • The information should be encoded semantically • Ellie should focus on the meaning of the information • This increases the chances of the information passing into the LTM • Also increases the chances of Ellie remembering it. Accept other coding processes e.g. auditory, visual etc <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>No creditable content.</td><td>0</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.	0	3 AO2=3
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.	0															

Section B: Social psychology

Total for this section: 30 marks

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks															
08	Describe internalisation as a type of conformity. Possible content: • A deep form of conformity leading to real change (conversion) • Where we believe that an opinion/viewpoint is correct • It leads to both a private and a public change of opinion/behaviour • May be long term or permanent. Credit other relevant content e.g. examples <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Descriptor</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Knowledge of internalisation is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Knowledge of internalisation is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Knowledge of internalisation is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditable content.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Knowledge of internalisation is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	Knowledge of internalisation is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2	1	Knowledge of internalisation is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1	0	No creditable content.	0	3 AO1=3
Level	Descriptor	Marks															
3	Knowledge of internalisation is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3															
2	Knowledge of internalisation is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2															
1	Knowledge of internalisation is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks															
09	Explain how compliance may have influenced Jenny's decision to stay in and cook. Possible content: - Jenny privately disagrees with her friends (the majority) - Even though she disagrees and does not want to stay in and cook, she does not want to be seen as being different - Jenny publicly says she wants to stay in and cook to go along with her friends even though privately she does not want to - Jenny complies to fit in/avoid being rejected. Credit other relevant application. <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>No creditable content.</td><td>0</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.	0	3 AO2=3
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.	0															

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks															
10	Outline findings of Asch's investigation into the effect of group size on conformity. Possible Content: - As Asch increased the number of confederates who gave the deliberate wrong answer, from one to three, the conformity rate for the genuine participant increased. - With one confederate there was 3% conformity, with two confederates there was 12.8% conformity and with three confederates there was 32% conformity - When Asch increased the number of confederates above three this had little effect on conformity rates. - A large group of 15 confederates led to a slight decrease in conformity rates <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Descriptor</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Knowledge of findings is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Knowledge of findings is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Knowledge of findings is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditable content.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Knowledge of findings is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	Knowledge of findings is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2	1	Knowledge of findings is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1	0	No creditable content.	0	3 AO1=3
Level	Descriptor	Marks															
3	Knowledge of findings is detailed and appropriate. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3															
2	Knowledge of findings is relevant but detail is lacking. The answer lacks clarity in places.	2															
1	Knowledge of findings is limited. The answer is vague/muddled.	1															
0	No creditable content.	0															

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks															
11	Briefly explain how the researcher could test the effect of task difficulty on the participant's conformity. Possible Content: • Make some maths problems easy and others difficult • Count the number of times the participant conformed/agreed/disagreed/gave the wrong answer. Credit other relevant application. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Descriptor</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Application to the study is detailed and appropriate with clear conditions and measurement of conformity. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Application to the study is relevant with conditions and/or measurement of conformity present 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>No creditable content.</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Application to the study is detailed and appropriate with clear conditions and measurement of conformity. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3	2	Application to the study is relevant with conditions and/or measurement of conformity present 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.	0	3 AO2=3
Level	Descriptor	Marks															
3	Application to the study is detailed and appropriate with clear conditions and measurement of conformity. The answer is clear with appropriate use of terminology.	3															
2	Application to the study is relevant with conditions and/or measurement of conformity present 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.	0															

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks															
12	Evaluate at least one explanation for conformity. Possible content: - Individual differences – some people are more likely to conform due to NSI or ISI than others eg people with a need for affiliation are more likely to conform due to NSI - 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 - The two-process approach of conformity being down to either NSI or ISI is oversimplistic. Both processes (dual process dependency model) are likely to be involved and it can be difficult to isolate the effect of each in experimentation - Use of supporting evidence for the existence of NSI and/or ISI e.g. Asch (1955), Lucas <i>et al.</i> (2006), Jenness (1932), Mori and Arai (2010) - Issues with the reliability of the findings of research meaning the explanation of conformity is weakened. eg use of artificial situations and laboratory experiments, use of artificial tasks, issues with samples related to generalisability etc. Credit other relevant evaluation. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th><th>Descriptor</th><th>Marks</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Evaluation of at least one explanation for conformity is mostly thorough and effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.</td><td>9 – 7</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Evaluation of at least one explanation for conformity is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.</td><td>6 – 4</td></tr> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Evaluation of at least one explanation for conformity is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.</td><td>3 – 1</td></tr> <tr> <td>0</td><td>No creditable content.</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Descriptor	Marks	3	Evaluation of at least one explanation for conformity is mostly thorough and effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	9 – 7	2	Evaluation of at least one explanation for conformity is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	6 – 4	1	Evaluation of at least one explanation for conformity is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	3 – 1	0	No creditable content.		9 AO3=9
Level	Descriptor	Marks															
3	Evaluation of at least one explanation for conformity is mostly thorough and effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	9 – 7															
2	Evaluation of at least one explanation for conformity is evident but lacks effectiveness in places. The answer lacks clarity and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	6 – 4															
1	Evaluation of at least one explanation for conformity is limited. The answer lacks clarity and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.	3 – 1															
0	No creditable content.																

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
13	Describe and evaluate Milgram's research into one or more situational variable(s) affecting obedience. Possible content: AO1 - Proximity – Milgram found that the closer he exposed participants to the consequences of their actions the less likely they were to obey. He carried out three proximity variations: - The teacher and the learner were in the same room, so the teacher could both see and hear the effects of their actions. Obedience rates dropped to 40% - The 'touch proximity' variation where the teacher had to force the hand of the learner onto the 'electroshock plate' when they responded incorrectly. Obedience rates dropped even further to 30% - The 'remote instruction' variation where the experimenter left the room and telephoned instructions to the teacher. Obedience rates dropped to 20.5% with some participant pretending to give shocks or giving weaker shocks - Location – Milgram changed the location of the experiment to a run-down building where the experimenter has less perceived authority. Obedience rates dropped to 47.5%. Credit other relevant description e.g. linking the agentic state to situational variables AO3 - Artificial situation and/or task leading to a lack of internal validity as participants may not have believed they were really giving electric shocks - Generalisability across western cultures as research has found similar findings in other western cultures eg Miranda <i>et al.</i> (1981) - Lack of evidence of generalisability in non-western cultures - Strengths of Milgram's use of highly controlled laboratory experiments - Wider implications of this research eg the obedience alibi - Use of supporting evidence for the influence of situational variables on obedience eg Bickman (1974) - Other issues with Milgram's research eg unrepresentative samples, ethical concerns etc. Credit other relevant evaluation.	9 AO1=4 AO3=5

	Level	Descriptor	Marks	
	3	Knowledge of Milgram's research into situational variable(s) is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is mostly effective. The answer is clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively.	9 – 7	
	2	Knowledge of Milgram's research into situational variable(s) 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.	6 – 4	
	1	Knowledge of Milgram's research into situational variable(s) 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.	3 – 1	
	0	No creditable content.		

Section C: Psychopathology

Total for this section: 30 marks

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
14	Outline three defining characteristics of depression. Refer to Chen in your answer. Award marks as follows: Up to 3 marks for correctly outlining characteristics of depression. 1 mark each for any three of the following: Behavioural: • Changes to energy/activity levels eg withdrawal from work • Changes to sleeping behaviour/patterns eg insomnia or hypersomnia • Changes to eating behaviour eg increased or decreased appetite • Increased aggression • Self-harm. Emotional: • Lowered mood/feeling sad • Increased feelings of anger • Lower self-esteem/self-loathing. Cognitive: • Poor concentration/difficulty making decisions • Negative thoughts eg dwelling on the negative or recalling more negative events • Absolutist thinking. Credit other relevant characteristics of depression. Plus Up to 3 marks for application to the scenario. 1 mark each for any three of the following: Behavioural: • Changes to energy levels as Chen is constantly tired • Changes to sleeping behaviour as Chen finds it difficult to stay asleep. Emotional: • Lowered mood/feeling sad as Chen reports feeling empty • Increased feelings of anger as Chen hates himself • Lower self-esteem/self-loathing as Chen hates himself for feeling this	6 AO1=3 AO2=3

	way. Cognitive: • Poor concentration as Chen is struggling to concentrate at work. Credit other relevant application.	
--	--	--

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
15	Briefly outline Beck's negative triad as an explanation of depression. 1 mark for each of the following: • Depressed patients have a negative view of/negative thoughts about/negative schema of • The world, the future and of the self. Credit the use of a diagram.	2 AO1=2

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
16	Briefly explain one limitation of Beck's negative triad as an explanation of depression. Award marks as follows: 2 marks for a clear explanation of a limitation 1 mark for a limited/vague/muddled explanation of a limitation. Possible content: • Oversimplistic as fails to take into account evidence from other explanations such as low levels of serotonin • Incomplete as it cannot explain all symptoms/types of depression • Issues with cause and effect – does the negative triad cause depression or is it an effect of depression. Credit other relevant limitations.	2 AO3=2

Question	Marking guidance	Total marks
17	Describe and evaluate at least two definitions of abnormality. Possible content: AO1 • Statistical infrequency – abnormal behaviour which is rare/uncommon. On characteristics which can be measured, any value which is more than 2 standard deviations away from the mean value is considered abnormal • Deviation from social norms – abnormal behaviour is that which goes against/contravenes unwritten rules/expectations in a given society/culture. Undesirable behaviour is seen as abnormal • Failure to function adequately – abnormal behaviour is that which causes personal dysfunction/an inability to cope with everyday life. Rosenhan and Seligman (1989) proposed seven features of personal dysfunction. The more of these features an individual exhibits the more likely they are to be classed as abnormal • Deviation from ideal mental health – abnormality occurs when we fail to meet prescribed criteria for psychological normality/wellbeing. Jahoda proposed six main characteristics of ideal mental health. The more characteristics an individual fails to meet, the further they are from psychological normality and thus the more abnormal they are. AO3 • Statistical infrequency – objective once the cut off has been decided, no value judgements are made, fails to account for behaviour that is statistically rare but desirable such as having a very high IQ, some disorders are not statistically rare, issue of who decides where the cut-off point is • Deviation from social norms – subjective, eccentric behaviours are not necessarily abnormal, social norms vary with time and with culture, could lead to human rights abuses • Failure to function adequately – takes into account the patient's perspective, can give the degree of abnormality, subjective, culture bound, issues with the features of personal dysfunction e.g. many mental disorders do not cause personal distress, many behaviours are maladaptive but not a sign of psychological abnormality etc • Deviation from ideal mental health – comprehensive definition, focus on positive achievements rather than negative failures, subjective, the criteria are too demanding – most people would be judged abnormal based on this definition, culture bound – many of the criteria only reflect the ideal of psychological 'normality' in Western cultures, lacks temporal validity • Possible implications for diagnosis and/or treatment. Credit other relevant material.	20 AO1=8 AO3=12

	Level	Descriptor	Marks
	4	Knowledge of definitions of abnormality is mostly accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion 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.	20 – 16
	3	Knowledge of definitions of abnormality is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective discussion. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.	15 – 11
	2	Limited knowledge of definitions of abnormality is present. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is occasionally used appropriately. Or one definition at Level 3/4.	10 – 6
	1	Knowledge of definitions of abnormality is very limited. Discussion 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 one definition at Level 2.	5 – 1
	0	No creditable content.	