Clinical Feedback

Clinical always has 2 x 8 marks, 1 x 20 marks.

Question	Marks	Feedback	Where / advice
1A - DSM Description	2 / 2	• Focus on the content of the DSM, i.e. describe how 2 of the sections of DSM 5 / what they contain	Book 2 pgs. 34-37 Diagnostic systems (DSM, ICD) **Always** comes up in some form (usually validity, reliability of diagnosis)
1B - DSM Evaluation	4 / 4	• Identify a strength / weakness • Justify it fully using evidence – X is a strength because …	
2A - 2 tailed hypothesis	2 / 2	• Hypothesis must be a prediction and non-directional (there will be a difference…) • Operationalise both IV and DV . IV = nurses with family members with MHD/without MHD, DV = willing to work in MH (yes/no on questionnaire)	Book 1 pg. 183 Will always come up (U1, 2 or 3)
2B - Reasons for Chi-Square	1 / 2	• Test of difference (between … and …) • Nominal data (frequency of …) • Independent groups (have member of family with MHD, don't have family member with MHD) NB: Chi-Square is not correlation – it's a difference test	Book 1 pg. 190-193, 200, 212 Any of the 4 tests will come up (U1, 2, or 3) Make sure you know: • Reasons why a particular test is used • How to use it / calculate it • How to interpret the results (critical / observed values)
2C - Chi-Square Calculation	4 / 4	• Check you give answers to 1 d.p. throughout. This is a typical twist to these kinds of questions – so check carefully.	
2D - Strength of investigation	2 / 2	• You must give details of the scenario – just using the name (Sakura) or missing out the scenario will get 0 marks. • Easy fix: mention 'willingness to work in MH' etc. • Questionnaires – look at the data being collected. Here – quantitative so it makes analysis more objective and will allow statistical testing.	Book 1 pg. 168-169 (questionnaires) Methods come up in all 3 exams The main methods are: • Self-report – questionnaires + interviews (168-169) • Experiments (184-189) • Case studies (196-197) • Correlation (198-199) • Twin and adoption studies (204-205) • Observation (206-208) • Animal experiments (210-211)
2E - Improvement to investigation	2 / 2	• Make sure this is an improvement and not a weakness	

		• Identify the improvement: ask yourself – if someone else read this – could they go and do what you suggest accurately? • Fully justify it using the scenario • Fully justify means expand: don't just say 'make more generalisable' – explain why it does/to whom	
3 - Evaluate non-bio explanation for depression	5 / 8	• Focus on Beck and Ellis • You can use theories such as social isolation, etc, but you need evidence to back them up • A01 = descriptions of Beck and Ellis theories • A03 = fully justified strengths and weaknesses of A01 A03 tip: point – a strength of … is, justify – this was shown in [researcher] who found that … • Evaluate needs an overall conclusion summarising your main A03 – don't throw this away, give some detail and, if you can, go a little further / give an alternative theory.	Book 2 pgs. 74-75 Depression – non-bio explanation Less likely to be essay topic 2025
4 - Discuss Cross-cultural	6 / 8	• Discuss = 4 * A01, 4 * A02 – doesn't need a conclusion • A01 = 4 * how CC research is conducted • A02 = 4 * application / issues with Ferenc's use of it	See clinical methods booklet for these methods: • cross-cultural • cross-sectional • longitudinal • meta-analysis
5 - Applied To What Extent	14 / 20	• A01 = give clear, detailed descriptions of the 4Ds • A02 = apply the 4Ds to Patti – you should also consider where the 4Ds don't apply • A03 = Point Justify the strengths and weaknesses of the 4 Ds – try to relate to Patti • Add an overall judgement / summary of your main strengths and weaknesses linked to the scenario Avoid drifting into the DSM / ICD classification systems – they don't serve the same purpose. The	Book 2 pgs. 32-33 4 Ds of diagnosis Often comes up

		4Ds can tell you if someone might be ill, but not what they've got.	

Unit 3 Feedback

Note that Unit 3 always has the same format of question styles and order.

Question	Marks	Feedback	Where / advice
1A - conclusions from data	4 / 4	Conclusion questions require you to: • Identify/explain your conclusion (1) • Justify it using data (1) There are usually 4-6 marks worth of conclusions in Part A	Always comes up – practice as many of these kinds of questions from U3 as you can
1B - Wilcoxon Calculation	1 / 4	• Calculate the differences – remove the 0 line • Ranking – ignore the sign when ranking (so -1 is the same as 1). • Start ranks from 1 upwards (never less than 1) • Use the ranks in the Rpos and Rneg columns – not the data • Wilcoxon is the smallest total	See U2 above
1C - Evaluation of questionnaires + scenario	4 / 4	• You must give details of the scenario – missing out the scenario will get 0 marks. • Easy strength of quant: objective and more reliable / less open to interpretation • Easy weakness of quant: can't tell you why someone give the opinion they did • It's very easy to give a totally correct answer technically and then lose all 4 marks because you didn't link to the scenario, e.g. 'use of questionnaires in the social media study was …'	See U2 above
2A - Stratified Sampling	2 / 2	• Identify different subgroups in university (courses) • Calculate %s of each subgroup in whole population • Sample randomly and proportionally from each subgroup (i.e. if 15% of the uni study English, use a random 15% of the English students)	Book 1 – pg. 170-171 Always comes up in U1/2/3 You need to know: random, opportunity, stratified, volunteer Make sure you can: • Explain how the sampling method works

			• Give 2 strengths, 2 weaknesses Practice application questions!
2B - Conclusions from data	2 / 2	Conclusion questions require you to: • Identify/explain your conclusion (1) • Justify it using data (1)	
2C - Mann-Whitney Significance Testing	2 / 2	For sig testing you get marks for: • Showing the comparison of the observed value (84) with the critical value (86) • Justifying what this means for the study (because 84 < 86 there is a significant difference between … give full details of conditions/IV	See U2 above
2D - Field experiment strength	2 / 2	• Identify a strength linked to this study • Fully justify it – why is it a strength – why does it provide ecological validity for this situation?	Book 1, pg. 186-189 Always comes up (lab, natural, field) Make sure you can: • Explain how the experiment type works • Give 2 strengths, 2 weaknesses Practice application questions
2E - Improvements to study	4 / 4	• Make sure these are improvements and not weaknesses • Identify the improvement: ask yourself – if someone else read this – could they go and do what you suggest accurately? • Fully justify it using the scenario Identify – don't just say 'get more data' – explain fully from where (range of uni and courses) Fully justify means expand: don't just say 'make more generalisable' – explain why it does/to whom	
3A - Meta analysis weakness	1 / 2	• Identify a weakness linked to this study	See clinical methods booklet

		• Fully justify it – why is it a weakness, e.g., why does using studies from 1980-2018 ignore the changes in advertising over time?	
3B - Research evidence and learning theories applied	5 / 6	Best approach to this question: • Apply SLT/OC/CC to the findings from the study • Use research evidence (Bandura, Skinner, Pavlov) to indicate whether the study findings agree or disagree with the research evidence • Repeat x 3 Note: • You don't need a conclusion • Avoid turning this into a Bandura or Pavlov essay – you only need a statement of the findings • You *can* use alternative explanations, but keep this to your 3rd apply/research evidence	Book 1 Will come in U1 and U3 Theories with evidence from: • Social: agency, social impact, social identity, realistic conflict • Cognitive: MSM, WMM, Reconstructive (schema) LTM, Episodic and Semantic LTM • Biological: aggression theories and research (evolution, brain structure, neurons, hormones) • Learning: OC, CC, SLT
4 - Baddeley and Rosenhan (scientific status)	11 / 16	A01 = 6 (3 Baddeley, 3 Rosenhan) • Get the right studies! • Baddeley – classic cognitive on encoding in STM and LTM • Rosenhan – classic clinical The only studies that will be asked here will come from: • Sherif (social – Robber's Cave) • Baddeley (cognitive – encoding in STM/LTM) • Raine (Biological - NGRI) • Watson and Rayner (Learning – Little Albert) A03 = whether study is scientific or not • Use G R A V (not Ethics – can be unethical and still scientific) • You can also use: hypothesis testing, falsifiability – any of the Psych as	Book 1: Social – Sherif – pgs. 48-49 Cognitive – Baddeley – pgs. 76-77 Biological – Raine – pgs. 110-110 Learning – W and R – pgs. 148-149 Book 2: Clinical – Rosenhan – pgs. 50-51 I and D Book 2: 17-27 (definitions, examples) This question could cover any of the I and D – so you need to know your classical studies really well. Very unlikely to be same I and D in 2025

			Science elements from the Learning Topic • Use Point – Justify for every evaluation point You need a conclusion summarising your main strengths and weaknesses (or use mini conclusions at the end of each study)	
5 - Cognitive Psych and Scenario	7	/ 12	A01 = 4 • At *least* 2 cog explanation and 1 non-cog alternative (for aggression). • Focus on what the explanation (MSM, WMM, reconstructive/schemas, episodic/semantic LTM) tells us about memory • Don't turn this into a War of Ghosts or WMM essay A02 = 4 • How the explanations from A01 fits or doesn't fit with the scenario with some detail – use the whole scenario, don't cross or miss out elements A03 = 4 • Strength / weakness of the A01 explanation – try to link to the scenario, e.g. Baddeley found that…, this suggests that … You need an overall conclusion – summarising your A03. If possible link your conclusion back to the scenario.	See 3B for what theories you need to cover This question will always focus on one explanation, but you can use *1* alternative as well as long as you cover the required explanation.
6 - Social Control	6	/ 20	A01 = 8 • Start with a clear, detailed definition of social control • Cover **multiple** areas of Psychology – don't get 'stuck' on social, look at	I and D Book 2: 17-27 (definitions, examples) This question could cover any of the I and D – revise the definitions fully

		• anything else relevant in the syllabus (e.g. Raine on NGRI, Rosenhan) • **Don't** turn this into a Milgram Sherif essay. • Explain what the researcher found linked to social control (e.g. Milgram discovered that you could get participants to obey despite their own moral beliefs if you made them believe it wasn't their responsibility or were obeying a legitimate authority) A03 = 12 • Assess the impact of your A01 – you will need to think of your own examples here • What good could come out of Milgram (Zimbardo used it to teach members of Harlem street gangs how to resist negative social influence)? • How could it be misused (increasing blind obedience in the army)? Include a final overall assessment of your A03 – where could social control be seen positively in Psych? Where could it be seen negatively?	You can use examples from any area from the syllabus Very unlikely to be same I and D in 2025