

Mark schemes

Q1.

[AO1 = 2 AO2 = 2]

Award **up to 2 marks** for **each** definition of abnormality as follows:

1 mark for outlining one relevant definition of abnormality.

PLUS

1 mark for explaining how the statement(s) in the figure are designed to assess the definition of abnormality outlined.

Possible content:

- failure to function adequately – where an individual fails to cope with the demands of everyday life. Failure to maintain eye contact could be an example of no longer conforming to interpersonal rules which is one way someone can fail to function adequately/experiencing severe distress would prevent someone from coping so would be failing to function adequately/not washing yourself and skipping meals could be an example of an individual not coping so they could be failing to function adequately
- deviation from social norms – where an individual fails to behave in a socially acceptable way. Failure to maintain eye contact, not washing yourself and skipping meals all deviate from social norms
- deviation from ideal mental health – where an individual fails to meet the criteria for good mental health. Failure to maintain eye contact may be an example of lack of environmental mastery and therefore deviating from ideal mental health. Often feeling distressed could represent a failure to resist stress and therefore deviating from ideal mental health
- statistical infrequency – a behaviour which is rare/uncommon. Often feeling distressed would be rare and therefore statistical infrequency.

[4]

Q2.

[AO3 = 3]

3 marks for a clear and coherent evaluation of one definition of abnormality.

2 marks for an evaluation of one definition of abnormality with some clarity and/or coherence.

1 mark for a limited or muddled evaluation of one definition of abnormality.

Possible content:

- deviation from social norms – eccentric behaviours are not necessarily abnormal; social norms vary with time and with culture
- statistical infrequency – fails to account for behaviour that is statistically rare but desirable; some disorders are not statistically rare; issue of who decides where the cut-off point is
- failure to function adequately – many mental disorders do not cause personal distress; some behaviours are maladaptive but not a sign of

- psychological abnormality
deviation from ideal mental health – the criteria are too demanding – most people would be judged abnormal based on this definition; many of the criteria reflect Western cultural norms of psychological ‘normality’.

Credit other relevant evaluation including positive evaluations.

[3]

Q3.

[AO1 = 2 AO2 = 2]

Outline content:

First mark is essential for any credit for the outline

1st mark for stating abnormality is the absence of criteria for good mental health (as in physical illness)

Accept alternative wording

1 further mark for any valid elaboration eg.

- Jahoda proposed criteria of ‘optimal living’
- identification/knowledge of criteria, eg. resistance to stress; accurate perception of reality; working towards self-actualisation; positive view of self; lack of dependence on others; ability to adapt
- the more criteria are absent, the more serious the abnormality.

Credit other valid points.

Possible application

2 marks for clear and effective application to the scenario

1 mark for limited / muddled application to the scenario

- Dave’s difficulty in concentrating at work may affect his ability to reach his potential/self-actualise
- Dave does not share his friends’ view which suggests his perception of reality/himself may not be accurate
- Dave is experiencing anxiety which suggests he does not easily cope with stress.
- Dave does not seem to have a positive view of self eg. about his body shape

Credit other valid application points.

[4]

Q4.**[AO3 = 5]**

Level	Marks	Description
3	4-5	The evaluation of failure to function adequately is clear and generally detailed. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology
2	2-3	The evaluation of failure to function adequately is evident. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions.
1	1	The evaluation of failure to function adequately is limited. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible evaluation:

- recognises the patient's perspective/experience is important in defining abnormality
- provides a threshold for professional help for those who need it most
- failure to function may be a normal reaction to a traumatic event, eg a bereavement
- can rely on a subjective assessment (though there have been attempts to make judgements more objective, eg Global Assessment of Functioning)
- can use more objective measures of failing to function adequately eg. poor attendance data at school/work
- some people appear to function perfectly normally despite being seriously ill/disturbed, eg Harold Shipman; some depressed patients
- overlap/comparison with other definitions, eg deviation from social norms.

Credit other valid points.

[5]

Q5.**[AO1 = 6 AO3 = 6]**

Level	Marks	Description
4	10-12	Outlines of statistical infrequency and deviation from ideal mental health as definitions of abnormality are accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is effective. Minor detail and/or expansion is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear and coherent. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	7-9	Outlines of statistical infrequency and deviation from ideal mental health as definitions of abnormality are evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used appropriately.
2	4-6	Limited outline(s) of statistical infrequency and/or deviation from ideal mental health as definitions of abnormality is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. OR one definition at level 3/4.
1	1-3	Outline(s) of statistical infrequency and/or deviation from ideal mental health as definitions of abnormality are very limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. Or one definition at level 1/2.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- statistical infrequency/deviation from statistical norms: abnormal behaviour is that which is rare/uncommon/anomalous; this definition focuses on the quantity of behaviour measured in standard deviations from the mean rather than the quality
- deviation from ideal mental health: absence of signs of mental health used to judge abnormality; description of (Jahoda's) criteria – accurate perception of reality; self-actualisation; resistance to stress; positive attitude towards self; autonomy/independence; environmental mastery; the more criteria someone fails to meet, the more abnormal they are.

Credit other relevant content.

Possible evaluation:

- statistical infrequency/deviation from statistical norms: 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 ideal mental health: positive, holistic approach to diagnosis; criteria for mental health are too demanding/unrealistic – most people

would be judged abnormal based on this definition because they would fail at least one criterion at some point; culture bias – many of the criteria reflect Western cultural norms of psychological ‘normality’, eg value placed on independence/autonomy

- comparison/overlap with other definitions – deviation from social norms, failure to function adequately
- use of evidence to support/challenge definitions
- implications for diagnosis and/or treatment.

Credit other relevant evaluation.

[12]

Q6.

[AO1 = 6]

Level	Marks	Description
3	5-6	Knowledge of statistical infrequency and failure to function adequately is clear and generally well detailed. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology.
2	3-4	Knowledge of statistical infrequency and/or failure to function adequately is evident. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions. OR one definition at Level 3
1	1-2	Knowledge of statistical infrequency and/or failure to function adequately is limited. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. OR one definition at Level 1/2
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

Statistical infrequency:

- abnormality is defined as behaviour or characteristics that are rare/uncommon/unusual
- occupies the extreme ends of a normal distribution curve,
- uses up-to-date statistics
- examples of criteria/behaviours/disorders are creditworthy only if used in elaboration of the definition
- eg low IQ defined as intellectual disability disorder; OCD as a rare disorder.

Credit examples conveyed through a diagram, eg distribution of IQ scores.

Failure to function adequately:

- abnormality is defined as the inability to cope with everyday living
- examples of criteria/behaviours/disorders are creditworthy only if used in elaboration of the definition
- eg Rosenhan and Seligman criteria (eg irrationality, observer discomfort)
- behaviours such as not being able to hold down a job, maintain a

- relationship, personal hygiene, etc
- failure to follow interpersonal rules.

Credit other relevant content.

One definition at level 3, maximum of **3** marks.

[6]

Q7.

[AO1 = 6 AO3 = 10]

Level	Mark	Description
4	13-16	Knowledge of statistical infrequency and deviation from social norms is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	9-12	Knowledge of statistical infrequency and deviation from social norms is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	5-8	Limited knowledge of statistical infrequency and/or deviation from social norms is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions. OR one definition only at Level 3/4.
1	1-4	Knowledge of statistical infrequency and/or deviation from social norms 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 only at Level 1/2.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content

Statistical infrequency:

- abnormality is defined as behaviour or characteristics that are rare/uncommon/unusual
- occupies the extreme ends of a normal distribution curve, eg low IQ defined as intellectual disability disorder
- relies on the use of up-to-date statistics.

Deviation from social norms:

- all societies make collective judgments about what counts as 'normal'/usual/typical behaviour
- any behaviour that does not conform to accepted/expected standards is abnormal

- norms vary from culture to culture.

Accept other valid points.

Possible discussion:

- many diagnoses of illness involve some reference to statistics
- difficult to know where the line is between statistically normal and abnormal/subjective interpretation
- some statistically infrequent behaviour is desirable/highly regarded, eg high IQ
- not all behaviour that deviates from social norms is a sign of illness, eg speeding
- norms are culturally relative so difficult to determine universal signs of illness
- social norms definition could be used/abused as an instrument of social control
- social norms change over time (lack of temporal validity)
- neither definition is satisfactory on its own – comparison with alternatives, eg failure to function, deviation from ideal mental health.

Accept other valid points.

[16]

Q8.**[AO3 = 4]**

Level	Mark	Description
2	3-4	Evaluation is relevant, generally well-explained and focused on the deviation from ideal mental health definition. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of specialist terminology.
1	1-2	Evaluation is relevant although there is limited explanation and/or limited focus on the deviation from ideal mental health definition. Specialist terminology is not always used appropriately or is absent.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible evaluation:

- comprehensive criteria for mental health
- based on similar models of physical health – but mental health may not be the same
- criteria are too demanding – most of us would be defined as unhealthy
- Western individualist bias.

Accept other valid points.

[4]