



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2016

**PSYCHOLOGY - NEW AS COMPONENT 1
B290U10-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2016 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

AS PSYCHOLOGY - COMPONENT 1

SUMMER 2016

MARK SCHEME

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	TOTAL
1	6			6
2	8			8
3	8			8
4		5		5
5		5		5
6			10	10
7	8		10	18
8	10		10	20
TOTAL	40	10	30	80

Q.1 (a) Briefly explain the cognitive assumption of the computer analogy. (2)

Credit could be given for brief explanation of:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take in information, store and retrieve. • Hardware-mind. • Software- cognitive processes. • Multi- Store Model. 	
Marks	AO1
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefly explained. • Use of appropriate terminology.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation is superficial or muddled. • Little use of terminology.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

(b) Explain the behaviourist assumption that behaviour is learnt through conditioning. (4)

Credit could be given for explanation of:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pavlov and Classical Conditioning learning through association and/or • Skinner and Operant Conditioning learning through reinforcement. 	
Marks	AO1
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation and level of accuracy is thorough and clearly linked to psychology. • Effective use of appropriate terminology.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation and level of accuracy is reasonable and linked to psychology. • Good use of appropriate terminology.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation and level of accuracy is basic. • Link to psychology may not be clear. • Some use of appropriate terminology.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumption is identified only. • Explanation is superficial. • No link to psychology. • Very little use of appropriate terminology.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

Q.2 (a) Identify **two** factors that Myers and Diener (1995) explored as possible influences on happiness in their study '*Who is happy?*' [2]

Credit could be given for identification of:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age • Gender • Race/Culture • Money • Traits can be included e.g. relationships 	
Marks	AO1
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 factors identified.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 factor identified.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

(b) Describe the conclusions drawn by Myers and Diener (1995) in their study '*Who is happy?*' [6]

Credit could be given for description of:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot determine how happy a person is based on their age, race, sex and income. • More informative to look at traits, supporting network, culture with positive outlook, engaged work/leisure and has a faith entailing social support , purpose and hope. • Research is positive as complements previous research that looked at depression, anxiety and physical and material well- being. • Practical applications in helping people re think priorities and understanding of what enhances human well-being. • Elements identified as part of theory of happiness- adaptation, cultural world view, values and goals. 	
Marks	AO1
5 – 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and level of accuracy is thorough. • Effective use of appropriate terminology. • There is range and depth.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and level of accuracy is reasonable. • Good use of appropriate terminology. • There is range and depth, but not in equal measure.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and level of accuracy is basic. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Range or depth.
1 – 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superficial or muddled description.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

Q.3 Describe the findings of Raine, A., Buschaum, M and LaCasse, L. (1997) *Brain Abnormalities in murderers indicated by positron emission tomography.* [8]

Credit **could** be given for description of:

BRAIN DIFFERENCES

- significant lower glucose metabolism in cortical regions between murderers and controls. in lateral and medial prefrontal cortex in both hemispheres.
- same for parietal glucose metabolism especially in angular gyrus.
- identical to controls in temporal lobe glucose metabolism.
- significantly higher on occipital lobe glucose metabolism.
- abnormal asymmetries of activity in murderers (left hemisphere lower than right) in amygdala, thalamus, and medial temporal lobe including the hippocampus.
- Bilaterally lower glucose metabolism in the corpus callosum than controls.
- As predicted no significant differences for the amount of midbrain and cerebellum activities between murders and controls. (areas linked to mental disorders).

PERFORMANCE ON CPT

- No difference in any aspect of behavioural performance on the continuous performance task (CPT).

OTHER DIFFERENCES

- Handedness, ethnicity and head injury – these not controlled for but ethnicity and head injury did not show any significant differences although left handedness 6/41 had less amygdala asymmetry and higher medial prefrontal activity than right handed murderers.
- Any other relevant finding.

Marks	AO1
7 – 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough description is provided. • There is range and depth.
5 – 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonably detailed findings are provided. • There is range and depth, but not in equal measure.
3 – 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic findings are provided.
1 – 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superficial findings are provided.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

Q.4 Explain why a psychologist following the biological approach would consider drug therapy OR psychosurgery as a suitable therapy. [5]

<p>Drug therapy Credit could be given for explanation of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physiological cause needing physiological treatment. • Based on medical model. • Issues with neurotransmitter levels. • Drug therapy acting as agonist or antagonists to readjust balance. • Examples of different drug treatments for different disorders. • Effectiveness of therapy. • Any other suitable explanation. 	<p>Psychosurgery Credit could be given for explanation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physiological cause needing physiological treatment. • Based on medical model. • Localisation of brain function. • Destroying or removing part of brain responsible for psychopathological behaviour. • Examples of different types of psychosurgery linked to specific brain functions. • Effectiveness of therapy. • Any other suitable explanation.
Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of knowledge linked to the approach and therapy is relevant. • Explanation and level of accuracy is thorough. • Effective use of appropriate terminology.
3 – 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of knowledge linked to the approach and therapy has some relevance. • Explanation and level of accuracy is reasonable. • Good use of terminology.
1 – 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of knowledge linked to the approach and therapy is superficial or muddled. • Explanation is basic. • Some use of appropriate terminology.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

Q.5 Relationships are just a result of unconscious processes.
 With reference to this statement describe how the psychodynamic approach explains why a relationship is formed. [5]

Credit **could** be given for description of:

- Cupboard Love Theory –Freud- psychosexual stages – need satisfaction-oral stage.
- Bowlby (e.g. attachment theory).
- Erikson (e.g. 8 Ages of Man psychosocial stages).
- Freud (e.g. Oedipus Complex).
- Freud (e.g. transference of earlier relationships).
- Any other suitable explanation.

NB The focus is on the generic concept of relationship formation – there is no need to identify particular types of relationship.

Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of knowledge to relationship formation is very well chosen. • Reference to the statement is clear. • Explanation and level of accuracy is thorough. • Effective use of terminology.
3 – 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of knowledge to relationship formation is appropriate. • There is some reference to the statement. • Explanation and level of accuracy is reasonable. • Good use of terminology.
1 – 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of knowledge to relationship formation is superficial. • Superficial reference to the statement. • Explanation is basic. • Some use of appropriate terminology.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

Q.6 Analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the psychodynamic approach.

[10]

Credit **could** be given for:

- Therapeutic basis.
- Focus on the individual.
- Evidence for basic assumptions and consequently the ethical grounding of the approach if there are issues with the reliability and validity of the assumptions.
- Methodologies used (e.g. reliance on self-reports).
- Unscientific/falsifiability.
- Usefulness (e.g. success of therapeutic applications).
- Specific comparison with the other approaches.
- Any other appropriate analysis.

NB There is no definitive list of strengths and / or weaknesses as it is subjective and one issue can be presented as being both.

Marks	AO3
9 – 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thorough analysis made of both the strengths and weaknesses with well-developed and balanced arguments. • Clearly linked to the psychodynamic approach. • Structure is logical throughout. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
6 – 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable analysis made of both strengths and weaknesses with well-developed and balanced arguments.. • Clearly linked to the psychodynamic approach. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
3 – 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic analysis is made of both strengths and weaknesses OR Reasonable analysis of either strengths or weaknesses. • Comments may be generic with no link to psychodynamic psychology through use of examples. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1 – 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengths and /or weaknesses are identified only. • There are no examples to support. • No conclusion.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted

Q.7 (a) Describe the components of Aversion therapy OR Systematic Desensitisation [8]

<p>Aversion Therapy Credit could be given for description of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on classical conditioning. • Pairing an adverse stimulus with undesirable behaviour. • Modern therapies also use operant conditioning and rewards for abstinence. • Covert sensitisation. • Any other relevant component. 		<p>Systematic Desensitisation Credit could be given for description of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on classical conditioning. • Counterconditioning. • Desensitisation hierarchy. • In vivo and in vitro desensitisation. • Any other relevant component. 	
Marks		AO1	
7 – 8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and level of accuracy is thorough. • Depth and range. • Effective use of terminology. • The structure is logical. 	
5 – 6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and level of accuracy is reasonable. • Depth and range of material used, but not in equal measure • Good use of terminology • The structure is mostly logical 	
3 – 4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and level of accuracy is basic. • Depth or range. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • The structure is reasonable. 	
1 – 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description and level of accuracy is superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks clarity. 	
0		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted. 	

Credit could be given for evaluation of:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usefulness and application (with reference to identifiable examples and / or research). • Success rates in treating various conditions (e.g. appropriateness for all mental health). • Comparability to other therapies (another behaviourist therapy or from another approach). • Ethics of the process (e.g. the relationship between client and therapist/ control). • Validity of the assumption on which therapy is based. • Evolution of psychology and the changes in cultural context. • Any other appropriate evaluation. 	
Marks	AO3
9 – 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thorough evaluation with well-developed and balanced arguments. • Evaluative comments are evidently relevant to the context. • Structure is logical throughout. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.
6 – 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable evaluation with well-developed and balanced arguments. • The evaluative comments show some relevance to the context. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
3 – 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic evaluation. • Arguments are reasonable but may be one-sided. • The evaluative comments made tend to be generic and not appropriately contextualised. • There is a reasonable structure. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1 – 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A superficial evaluation. • Evaluative comments are superficial. • Answer lacks structure. • No conclusion.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

- Q.8 'Eye-witness misidentification is the greatest contributing factor to wrongful convictions proven by DNA.' The Innocence Project.
With reference to psychological knowledge discuss whether we should rely on the testimony of eye-witnesses. [20]

This debate is linked to the cognitive approach. However, the materials used in the responses may be taken from any approach and perspective within psychology. Some reference could also be made to economic, social and political evidence (as long as it is explicitly linked to the psychological issue).

Credit **could** be given for description of:

- Studies on unreliability of eye-witness testimony e.g. Loftus and Palmer and Leading Questions
- Studies on reliability of eye-witness testimony e.g. Yuille and Cutshall, Geisselman-Cognitive Interview.
- Theories indicating that memory is not an accurate representation e.g. Bartlett's Reconstructive Memory and Schema Theory, Repression and False Memories.
- Theories indicating that memory is accurate e.g. Flashbulb Memory.
- Description of Individual differences- age, ethnicity, specific disorders (face blindness etc). Any other appropriate material.

Marks	AO1
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exemplars used are well chosen to support the points made. • Level of accuracy is thorough. • There is depth and range to material included. • Effective use of terminology throughout.
7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exemplars used are appropriate. • Level of accuracy is reasonable. • There is depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology.
4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exemplars may not always be appropriate. • Level of accuracy is basic. • There is depth or range only in material used. • There is some use of appropriate terminology.
1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exemplars are limited and not always made relevant. • Level of accuracy is superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

Credit **could** be given for discussion of:

- Appropriateness of the application of laboratory based evidence to real life experience.
- Ethical and moral implications of relying on eye witness testimony.
- Influence of the evidence on political decisions (e.g. laws to limit the sole use of eye witness testimony).
- Age of witnesses, childhood honesty and suggestibility of older and younger people.
- Individual differences – cultural, autism, face recognition.
- Improving reliability of memory in eye witnesses – Cognitive Interview, Jury Checklists.
- Objective and subjective evaluation of the research (must be contextualised) to reach a conclusion.
- Any other appropriate analysis.

Marks	AO3
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thorough discussion is made of both sides of the debate. • Evaluative comments are evidently relevant to the context. • Depth and range of material • Structure is logical throughout. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable discussion is made of both sides of the debate. • Evaluative comments show some relevance to the context. • Depth and range of material, but not in equal measure. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic discussion of both sides of the debate <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a reasonable discussion of only one side of the debate. • Evaluative comments are generic and not appropriately contextualised. • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A superficial discussion is made of the debate. • Evaluative comments are superficial. • Answer lacks structure. • No conclusion.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.