

Activity 7: Mark scheme

Paper 3

Describe the cognitive explanation of schizophrenia, as outlined by Frith (1992). [4]

Award 1–2 marks for a basic answer with some understanding of the topic area. There will be limited reference to the question.

Award 3–4 marks for a detailed answer with clear understanding of the topic area. There will be detailed reference to the question.

For example:

- The cognitive explanation of schizophrenia states that schizophrenia is caused by a problem of faulty information processing. Frith suggested specifically that people with schizophrenia may have faulty 'metacognitive' processes and have difficulty reflecting on thoughts, emotions and behaviours. This could be linked with theory of mind and the way that people with schizophrenia struggle to understand the behaviour of others. They may also have problems with attention and with generating self-initiated actions as well as problems recognising their own 'inner speech' which may explain auditory hallucinations.

Other appropriate responses should also be credited.

Discuss one strength and one weakness of one way of measuring leadership. [6]

Answers could include:

- The LPI rating uses scales and it would be appropriate to identify both strengths and weaknesses, such as the ease with which such scales can be administered, the fact that they produce quantitative data and that this data can then be used in comparisons with others as well as to measure change. Weaknesses include the problem of knowing that everyone interprets the scale in the same way and the fact that respondents will be subject to social desirability bias.

Mark according to the levels of response criteria below:

Level 3 (5–6 marks)

- Candidates will show a clear understanding of the question and will discuss at least one strength and one weakness.
- Candidates will provide a good explanation with clear detail.

Level 2 (3–4 marks)

- Candidates show an understanding of the question and will discuss one appropriate weakness in detail or one appropriate strength in detail.
- Candidates will provide a good explanation.

Level 1 (1–2 marks)

- Candidates will show a basic understanding of the question and will attempt a discussion of either a strength or a weakness.
- Candidates will provide a limited explanation.

Level 0 (0 marks)

No response worthy of credit.

Paper 4

Fear of blood and injections are common phobias. Explain how a different phobia can be explained through conditioning. [4]

Award 1–2 marks for a basic description.

Award 3–4 marks for a detailed description with elaboration.

Guidance:

- Any phobia is acceptable
- Candidates can choose a well-known example.

Basic answer

- A loud noise was made every time Albert saw a white rat, (1) and he learned to associate the fear of the noise with the rat. (1)

Detailed answer

- Little Albert's fear of rats was created by repeated association (1) of the sight of the rat with a loud noise that elicited a fear response. (1) He would then show a fear response just on sight of the rat, without the loud noise (1) although he was not afraid of the rat at the start of the experiment. (1)

Design a study to investigate worker preference for job rotation and or job enrichment. [10]

Level 4 (9–10 marks)

- The design is appropriate to the named investigation and is based on thorough psychological knowledge.
- The design is accurate, coherent and detailed, and it tests the proposed investigation competently.
- Four or five design features are included. The features are clearly applied to the design throughout the answer and the candidate clearly understands the main features involved in designing an investigation.
- The response has proposed an appropriate design, has applied a range of relevant methodological design features with competence and shown clear understanding.

Level 3 (7–8 marks)

- The design is appropriate to the named investigation and is based on good psychological knowledge.
- The design is accurate, coherent and detailed, and it tests the proposed investigation competently.
- Two or three design features are included. The features are often applied to the design and the candidate shows good understanding in places.
- The response has proposed an appropriate design, has applied some relevant methodological design features and has shown good understanding.

Level 2 (4–6 marks)

- The design is mostly appropriate to the named investigation and is based on psychological knowledge.
- The design is mostly accurate, coherent and detailed in places and it tests the proposed investigation.
- Design features are limited in their understanding.

Level 1 (1–3 marks)

- The design may not be appropriate to the named investigation and use of terminology is sparse or absent. Basic psychological understanding is shown.
- The design lacks coherence and is limited in understanding.
- One or two appropriate design features are identified but incorrectly applied.
- The response lacks detail.

0 – no response worthy of credit

Additional guidance:

- Candidates may choose any method (most likely a questionnaire).
- Five or more features of the chosen method and study design are expected.