



---

# **GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME**

---

**AUTUMN 2021**

**A LEVEL  
PSYCHOLOGY – COMPONENT 3  
A290U30-1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2021 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.

**GCE A LEVEL PSYCHOLOGY – COMPONENT 3**

**AUTUMN 2021 MARK SCHEME**

**SECTION A**  
**Implications in the Real World**

**Addictive Behaviours**

1. (a) Describe **one** biological explanation of addictive behaviours. [10]

Credit **could** be given for:

Candidates are likely to choose from those identified by the specification.

**Addiction Genes:**

- Focus has been on the role of the D2 dopamine receptor (DRD2) and in particular the A1 variant of this gene.
- Those who are more closely related to an individual with addictive behaviours often show similar traits (Goldman, 2005).
- A difference noted between different stimuli (for example hallucinogens compared to cocaine) provides a strong argument for heritability.

**Dopamine:**

- Description will involve the mesolimbic pathway. A behaviour or substance that is addictive encourages the release of dopamine in the VTA (Ventral Tegmental Area) of the brain.
- Such action leads to pleasure experienced in the NAc (Nucleus accumbens – reward pathway).
- For addicts the systems appear to respond to negative maladaptive behaviours – ones that can harm us – rather than the behaviours that are good for us. Volkow suggests that the dopamine reward pathway clearly helps initially to develop the addiction which is further strengthened by changes in the frontal cortex.

**Disease of the brain:**

- NIDA (National Institute on Drug Abuse) introduced the idea of addiction being a brain disease, as it is tied to changes in brain structure and function.
- The individual with the addictive behaviour is a victim of it.
- It is estimated that between 25%-50% of people with substance use problems appear to have a severe, chronic disorder.
- Any other appropriate biological explanation.

Marks	AO1
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of one biological explanation of addictive behaviours is thorough and accurate.</li> <li>• Depth and range included.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology throughout.</li> <li>• Logical structure.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of one biological explanation of addictive behaviours is reasonably detailed and accurate.</li> <li>• There is depth and range, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> <li>• Mostly logical structure.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of one biological explanation of addictive behaviours is basic.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Reasonable structure.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of one biological explanation of addictive behaviours is superficial.</li> <li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

- (b) 'Social psychological explanations are ineffective in providing a clear explanation for addictive behaviours.'

With reference to this statement, evaluate social psychological explanations of addictive behaviours. [15]

<b>AO2</b>	
Credit <b>could</b> be given for AO2:  Reference to the statement through comments made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates illustrating the 'effectiveness' of social psychological explanations of addictive behaviours through reference to strengths of these explanations.</li> <li>• Candidates illustrating the 'ineffectiveness' of social psychological explanations of addictive behaviours through reference to weaknesses of such these explanations.</li> <li>• Assessment of the statement in the light of research / conclusions drawn from social psychological investigations or alternative explanations into addictive behaviours.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate reference.</li> </ul>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary made is thoroughly applied to the statement throughout.</li> <li>• The evidence used is well-chosen and applied effectively to the statement.</li> <li>• The details / reference to scenario is accurate.</li> </ul>
<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary made is reasonably applied to the statement although there are some aspects which are not applied.</li> <li>• Appropriate evidence used and applied to the statement.</li> <li>• The details are mostly accurate.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary made shows superficial application to the statement.</li> <li>• Evidence used but superficially linked to the statement.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation made is not applied to the statement.</li> <li>• No attempt at application.</li> </ul>

### AO3

Credit **could** be awarded for:

Candidates are likely to choose from those identified by the specification:

- Co-morbidity with mental illness
- Peer pressure
- Role of the media

#### **Co-Morbidity with mental illness**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Magidson *et. al.* (2012), Conway *et. al.* (2006).
- Examples of refuting evidence: Difficulties of accurate diagnosis leading to often missed diagnoses (NIDA, 2008).

#### **Peer pressure**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Simons-Morton *et. al.* (2010); Maxwell, (2002); Neighbours *et. al.* (2007).
- Examples of refuting evidence: Ennett *et. al.* (1994); Kobus (2003).

#### **Role of the media**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Pechmann *et. al.* (1999).
- Examples of refuting evidence: Methodological issues of research into role of the media – given that most is correlational. In addition most research in this area lacks population validity.

#### **Generally**

- It is very possible that students may bring in supporting studies from other explanations of addictive behaviour as a way of illustrating weakness in these social psychological explanations.
- Evaluation could also be extended by the failure of social psychological explanations to consider other plausible factors that underpin the behaviour (e.g. biological factors e.g. dopamine or addiction genes). Failure to consider individual differences (cognitive biases, field dependence, Lang's addictive personality traits) which might equally have a profound influence on the showing of addictive behaviours.
- Any other appropriate evaluation.

N.B. Methodological criticisms of studies that are used to support explanations is a valid form of evaluation – only if the evaluation is linked back to its impact on the validity of the explanation.

Marks	AO3
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A thorough evaluation is made of social psychological explanations of addictive behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable evaluation is made of social psychological explanations of addictive behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic evaluation is made of social psychological explanations of addictive behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth or range only in material used.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• A basic conclusion is reached.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A thorough evaluation is made of only <b>one</b> social psychological explanation of addictive behaviours.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superficial evaluation of social psychological explanations of addictive behaviours.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• There is no conclusion.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable evaluation is made of only <b>one</b> social psychological explanation of addictive behaviours.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

## Autistic spectrum behaviours

2. (a) Deborah has recently been diagnosed with autistic spectrum behaviour. Deborah's parents have noticed that her behaviour and linguistic patterns are different to other children of her age.

Describe how the characteristics of Deborah's behaviour would be different to other children. [15]

Credit **could** be given for:

- Prevalence in males rather than females. Its incidence (approx. one in 1000 people).
- Limited imagination.
- Poor / limited speech development.
- Intolerance to change.
- High level of specialism in certain intellectual tasks.
- Irregular / unusual responses to stimuli / situations.
- Very repetitive / ritualistic behaviour.
- Social and emotional reciprocity.
- Non-verbal communication.
- Relationship formation / maintenance difficulties.
- Any other relevant characteristics of autistic spectrum behaviour.

Marks	AO1
<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descriptions of the characteristics of ASD are thorough and accurate.</li> <li>• Depth and range included.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology throughout.</li> <li>• Logical structure.</li> </ul>
<b>6-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descriptions of the characteristics of ASD are reasonably detailed and accurate.</li> <li>• There is depth and range, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> <li>• Mostly logical structure.</li> </ul>
<b>3-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descriptions of the characteristics of ASD are basic.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Reasonable structure.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the characteristics of ASD are superficial.</li> <li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>



Credit **could** be given for:

Reference to the scenario of Deborah and her parents in helping them decide if the behaviours shown are those of autistic spectrum behaviours. Such reference could be made through:

- References to Deborah's behaviours, the parent's observations of behaviours as the characteristics are described.
- Referring to Deborah / Deborah's parents / the behaviours she might have shown as examples of the characteristics being described.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>A02</b>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commentary is thoroughly applied to the scenario throughout.</li><li>• The evidence used is well – chosen and applied effectively to the statement.</li><li>• There is depth and range to the evidence used.</li><li>• The details / reference to statement are accurate.</li></ul>
<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commentary is reasonably applied to the scenario although there are some aspects which are not applied.</li><li>• Appropriate evidence used and applied to the scenario.</li><li>• There is depth or range to the evidence used.</li><li>• The details are mostly accurate.</li></ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commentary shows superficial application to the scenario.</li><li>• Evidence used but superficially linked to the scenario.</li></ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description made is not applied to the scenario.</li><li>• No attempt at application.</li></ul>

- (b) Briefly evaluate **one** individual differences explanation of autistic spectrum behaviours. [5]

<p>Credit <b>could</b> be given for:</p> <p>The likely focus in responses here will be structured by those found in the specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theory of mind</li> <li>• Weak central coherence theory</li> <li>• Gender differences</li> </ul> <p>There are a range of ways in which evaluation could be effectively constructed:</p> <p><b><u>Theory of Mind</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of supporting evidence: Baron-Cohen <i>et. al.</i> (1985; 2001), Golan <i>et. al.</i> (2007).</li> <li>• Examples of refuting evidence: Tager-Flusberg (2007), Frith <i>et. al.</i> (1994), Fletcher-Watson (2014).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Weak Central Coherence Theory</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of supporting evidence: Frith (1989), Happe <i>et. al.</i> (2006), Shah <i>et. al.</i> (1993).</li> <li>• Examples of refuting evidence: Gallace <i>et. al.</i> (2008), Martinez-Sanchis (2014).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Gender Difference</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of supporting evidence: Baron Cohen (2005), Knickmeyer <i>et. al.</i> (2006), Falter <i>et. al.</i> (2008).</li> <li>• Examples of refuting evidence: Ignorance of strong genetic basis / diathesis stress explanation.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Generally</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies that are used to support other explanations can be used as evidence against the explanation being evaluated (e.g. Bailey <i>et. al.</i> (2005) – genetic influences; Kennedy <i>et. al.</i> – amygdala dysfunction; Kanner (1943) – Refrigerator Mother. Baron-Cohen (2009) – Gender difference.</li> <li>• Any other relevant evaluation points.</li> </ul>	
Marks	AO3
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A thorough evaluation is made of one individual differences explanation of autistic spectrum behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology used throughout.</li> </ul>
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable evaluation is made of one individual differences explanation of autistic spectrum behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic evaluation is made of one individual differences explanation of autistic spectrum behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth or range in material used.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

(c) Briefly evaluate **one** biological explanation of autistic spectrum behaviours. [5]

<p>Credit <b>could</b> be given for:</p> <p>The likely focus in responses here will be structured by those found in the specification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amygdala dysfunction</li> <li>• Chloride ions at birth</li> <li>• Genetic predisposition</li> </ul> <p>There are a range of ways in which evaluation could be effectively constructed:</p> <p><b><u>Amygdala Dysfunction</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of supporting evidence: Nordahl <i>et. al.</i> (2012), Baron-Cohen <i>et. al.</i> (2000), Kennedy <i>et. al.</i> (2009).</li> <li>• Examples of refuting evidence: Problems of consistency of findings: Howard <i>et. al.</i> (2000), Pierce <i>et. al.</i> (2001), Herbert <i>et. al.</i> (2003). Problem of simplification: Paul <i>et. al.</i> (2010).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Chloride ions at birth</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of supporting evidence: Ben-Ari (2012).</li> <li>• Examples of refuting evidence: Ignorance of strong genetic basis / diathesis stress explanation.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Genetic predisposition</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of supporting evidence: Bailey <i>et. al.</i> (1995), Szatmari (1999), Colvert <i>et. al.</i> (2015).</li> <li>• Examples of refuting evidence: Ignorance of interaction between genetic and environmental factors (Diathesis stress) Landrigan (2010). Benvenuto (2009).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Generally</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies that are used to support other explanations can be used as evidence against the explanation being evaluated (e.g. Baron-Cohen <i>et. al.</i> (2001) theory of mind, Shah and Frith (1993) weak central coherency theory; Kanner (1943) – Refrigerator Mother. Baron-Cohen (2009) – Gender difference.</li> <li>• Any other relevant evaluation points.</li> </ul>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A thorough evaluation is made of one biological explanation of autistic spectrum behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology used throughout.</li> </ul>
<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable evaluation is made of one biological explanation of autistic spectrum behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic evaluation is made of one biological explanation of autistic spectrum behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth or range only in material used.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

## Bullying behaviours

3. (a) Describe CAPSLE (Creating A Peaceful School Learning Environment) as a method of modifying bullying behaviours. [10]

Credit <b>could</b> be given for:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating a peaceful school learning environment was developed by Stuart Twemlow and Frank Sacco as a form of anti-bullying intervention.</li> <li>• The programme is designed to reduce student aggression, victimisation, and aggressive bystander behaviour.</li> <li>• It aims to improve the capacity of students to interpret their own behaviours with greater self-reflection and mentally appreciate the beliefs, wishes and feelings of others.</li> <li>• It is a technique that is built upon the psychodynamic social systems model.</li> <li>• The method of modification has several underlying assumptions (cognitive, psychodynamic, whole school approach and a need to focus on the primary years).</li> <li>• Core elements of creating a peaceful school learning environment centre around: a positive climate campaign, classroom management plan, physical education programme, peer or adult mentoring and reflection time.</li> <li>• Any other relevant description.</li> </ul>	
Marks	AO1
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of CAPSLE as a method of modifying bullying behaviours is thorough and accurate.</li> <li>• Depth and range included.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology throughout.</li> <li>• Logical structure.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of CAPSLE as a method of modifying bullying behaviours is reasonably detailed and accurate.</li> <li>• There is depth and range, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> <li>• Mostly logical structure.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of CAPSLE as a method of modifying bullying behaviours is basic.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Reasonable structure.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of CAPSLE as a method of modifying bullying behaviours is superficial.</li> <li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

- (b) 'Biological explanations fully explain bullying behaviours.'

With reference to this statement, evaluate biological explanations of bullying behaviours. [15]

The likely focus in responses here will be structured by those found in the specification:

- Bullying genes
- Evolved gender differences
- Any other appropriate explanation e.g. Hormones

There are a range of ways in which evaluation could be effectively constructed:

#### **Bullying Genes**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Coccaro *et. al.* (1997), Soo Rhee *et. al.* (2002), Han Brunner (1993), Baughman *et. al.* (2012), Ball (2008).
- Examples of refuting evidence: Frazzetto *et. al.* (2007) (diathesis stress). Vassos *et. al.* (2014) (no one singular gene).

#### **Evolved Gender Differences**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Volk, (2012), Leenaars *et. al.* (2008), Owens *et. al.* (2000), Wang *et. al.* (2009), Craig *et. al.* (2009).
- Examples of refuting evidence: Methodological issues in use of self-reports in research – Connolly *et. al.* The Post Hoc nature of evolutionary psychology and its research.

#### **Hormones**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Phillips *et. al.* (2004), Mazur and Booth (1998).
- Examples of refuting evidence: Simpson (2001), Harrison *et. al.* 2000).

#### **Generally**

- Studies that are used to support other explanations can be used as evidence against the biological explanation being evaluated. For example, Kokkinos *et. al.* (2016) can be used to illustrate issue of individual difference through the research on Narcissistic personality.
- The studies of Leenaars (2008) and Gini *et. al.* (2006) can be used to show how biological explanations ignore the important influence of Theory of Mind.
- Research by Chester *et. al.* (2015) and Hymel *et. al.* (2005) in the area of Social Psychology can illustrate how biological explanations ignore the impact of cultural difference and moral disengagement respectively.
- Any other relevant evaluation points.

Marks	AO3
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A thorough evaluation is made of biological explanations of bullying behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable evaluation is made of biological explanations of bullying behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic evaluation is made of biological explanations of bullying behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth or range only in material used.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• A basic conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superficial evaluation is made of biological explanations of bullying behaviours.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• There is no conclusion.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

<b>AO2</b>	
<p>Credit <b>could</b> be given for:</p> <p>Reference to the statement through comments made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates illustrating the 'fullness of explanation' of biological explanations of bullying through reference to strengths of such explanations.</li> <li>• Candidates illustrating the 'limited nature' of these biological explanations of bullying through reference to weaknesses of such explanations.</li> <li>• Assessment of the statement in the light of research / conclusions drawn from biological investigations or alternative explanations into bullying behaviours.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate reference.</li> </ul>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary made is thoroughly applied to the statement throughout.</li> <li>• The evidence used is well-chosen and applied effectively to the statement.</li> <li>• The details / references to statement are accurate.</li> </ul>
<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary made is reasonably applied to the statement although there are some aspects which are not applied.</li> <li>• Appropriate evidence used and applied to the statement.</li> <li>• The details are mostly accurate.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary made shows superficial application to the statement.</li> <li>• Evidence used but superficially linked to the statement.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary made is not applied to the statement.</li> <li>• No attempt at application.</li> </ul>

## Criminal behaviours

4. (a) Describe the characteristics of criminal behaviours. [10]

Credit **could** be given for:

- Andrews and Bonta (1998) offer an insight into what criminal behaviour is and includes: An act prohibited by law and punished by the state. An action considered to be a violation of moral or religious code. An action that violates norms of society. An action that causes serious psychological stress and damage to a victim.
- Chase (2016) suggests common characteristics of career criminals include: rationalisation, entitlement, asocial value system, sentimentality, impulsivity, family dysfunction, invincibility, power centric, easily distracted, cognitively lazy.
- Gibbons (1990)
- ONS definition
- Characteristics of identified criminals.
- Any other appropriate characteristic of criminal behaviours.

It is important for examiners to assess the degree to which the candidate actually provides characteristics of criminal behaviours or 'criminals', rather than just characteristics of crime more generally.

Marks	AO1
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the characteristics of criminal behaviours is thorough and accurate.</li> <li>• Depth and range included.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology throughout.</li> <li>• Logical structure.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the characteristics of criminal behaviours is reasonably detailed and accurate.</li> <li>• There is depth and range, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> <li>• Mostly logical structure.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the characteristics of criminal behaviours is basic in detail, there may be some inaccuracies.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Reasonable structure.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the characteristics of criminal behaviours is superficial.</li> <li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>



(b) 'Criminal behaviour is so varied that no one explanation can fully explain it.'

With reference to this statement, evaluate **one** explanation of criminal behaviours.

[15]

Credit **could** be given for:

Reference to the statement through comments made:

- Candidates illustrating the statement that 'no one explanation can fully explain' criminal behaviours through reference to weaknesses of the explanation examined.
- Candidates illustrating the 'plausibility' of explaining criminal behaviour through one explanation of criminal behaviours through reference to strengths of the explanation examined.
- Assessment of the statement in the light of research / conclusions drawn from investigations or alternative explanations into criminal behaviours.
- Any other appropriate reference.

Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary is thoroughly applied to the statement throughout.</li> <li>• The evidence used is well – chosen and applied effectively to the statement.</li> <li>• Details are accurate.</li> </ul>
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary used is reasonably applied to the statement although there are some aspects which are not applied.</li> <li>• Appropriate evidence used and applied to the statement.</li> <li>• Details are mostly accurate.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary used shows superficial application to the statement.</li> <li>• Evidence is described but not applied.</li> <li>• There may be some inaccuracies throughout.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary made is not applied to the statement.</li> <li>• No attempt at application.</li> </ul>

Credit **could** be given for AO3:

The likely focus in responses here will be structured by those found in the specification:

**Biological**

- Disinhibition hypothesis.
- Inherited criminality.
- Role of the amygdala.

**Individual Differences**

- Eysenck's criminal personality.
- Intelligence factors.
- Psychopathic personality.

**Social Psychological**

- Differential association theory.
- Gender socialisation.
- Normalisation theory.

There are a range of ways in which evaluation could be effectively constructed:

**Biological**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Raine (1993; 2004), Tiihonen *et. al.* (2015), Crowe (1972), Mednick *et. al.* (1987) (inherited criminality). Coccaro *et. al.* (2007), Gaspic *et. al.* (2011), Pardini *et. al.* (2014) (Amygdala).
- Examples of refuting evidence: Lack of ability to explain full range of crimes (Findlay, 2011). Deterministic nature of biological explanations. Problems of cause and effect. Reductionism – reducing criminal behaviour down to role of amygdala – ignorance of the important role of orbitofrontal cortex.

**Individual Differences**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Eysenck, (1967, 1978), Dunlop *et. al.* (2012), Zuckerman (1987) – Eysenck's criminal personality; Kohlberg, (1969, 1972), Colby *et. al.* (1983), Schonenberg *et. al.* (2014), Kennedy *et. al.* (1992), Gudjonsson *et. Al.* (2007), Chien-An Chen *et. al.* (2007) - intelligence / cognitive factors.
- Examples of refuting evidence: Gilligan (1982), Denton (2005) – cognitive / intelligence factors; Lack of a singular personality (Mischel *et. al.* (1982). Lack of reliability of personality tests Borreli (2017) – Eysenck's criminal personality / psychopathic personality.

**Social Psychological**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Osbourne *et. al.* (1979), Akers *et. al.* (1979) (differential association). Sutherland (1949), Heidensohn (1985), Dabbs (1987) (gender socialisation).
- Examples of refuting evidence: Cox *et. al.* (2014) differential association theory not testable, in addition to not being able to explain all forms of criminal behaviour. Ignorance of important hormonal differences between males and females and subsequent influence on the showing of aggressive (criminal) behaviours.

**Generally**

- Negative evaluation of any explanations can also be achieved by reference to supporting studies of other approaches or comparisons between them to emphasise difference or ignorance of specific causes.
- Any other relevant evaluation points.

Marks	AO3
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A thorough evaluation is made of one explanation of criminal behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable evaluation is made of one explanation of criminal behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth and range but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic evaluation is made of one explanation of criminal behaviours.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• A basic conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superficial evaluation of one explanation of criminal behaviours.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• There is no conclusion.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

## Schizophrenia

5. (a) Describe social psychological explanations of schizophrenia. [10]

Credit **could** be given for:

The likely focus in responses here will be structured by those found in the specification:

- Cultural norms.
- Dysfunctional families.
- Expressed emotion.

### **Cultural norms**

- Differences exist between cultures in the prevalence of schizophrenia and the experience of it. For example, Bauer (2001) showed that there were cultural differences in the types of hallucination but also on the patterns of these between cultures.
- Culture influences the ways individuals communicate and manifest symptoms of schizophrenia, it will affect their style of coping, their support systems as well as their willingness to seek treatment. (Goater *et. al.*, 1999).

### **Dysfunctional families**

- The main focuses of this explanation lie within Bateson *et. al.* 's (1956) view of double bind with the symptoms of schizophrenia illustrated by a patient being the result of communication difficulties between children and their parents.
- It is argued by Bateson that symptoms of schizophrenia were a means of escaping from the contradictory issues of double bind situations.

### **Expressed emotion**

- In order to understand relapse of some patients, Brown (1959) looked at the amount of 'expressed emotion' by families of individuals that have schizophrenia. Key components of expressed emotion being: positive regard, warmth, emotional overinvolvement, hostility and critical comments.
- Brown argued, based upon a study of 156 men, relapse of a patient was strongly connected to the type of home the men were discharged to. Where critical comments, hostility and emotional overinvolvement were high, and warmth and positive regard were low were familial factors that could contribute toward the relapse of the condition, emphasising not biological factors but social factors determining condition.

Marks	AO1
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descriptions of social psychological explanations of schizophrenia are thorough and accurate.</li> <li>• Depth and range included.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology throughout.</li> <li>• Logical structure.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descriptions of social psychological explanations of schizophrenia are reasonably detailed and accurate.</li> <li>• There is depth and range, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> <li>• Mostly logical structure.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descriptions of social psychological explanations of schizophrenia are basic in detail, there may be some inaccuracies.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Reasonable structure.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of only one social psychological explanation of schizophrenia is thorough and accurate.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology throughout.</li> <li>• Logical structure.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descriptions of social psychological explanations of schizophrenia are superficial.</li> <li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of only one social psychological explanation of schizophrenia is reasonably detailed and accurate.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> <li>• Mostly logical structure.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

- (b) 'Schizophrenia is too complex to be treated by one single method of modification.'

Evaluate cognitive behavioral therapy as a method of modifying schizophrenia with reference to this statement.

[15]

Credit <b>could</b> be given for:	
Reference to the statement through comments made:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates illustrating the way in which schizophrenia is 'too complex to be treated by one single method of modification' through reference to weakness of CBT as a method of modifying behaviour.</li> <li>• Candidates illustrating the way in which schizophrenia is not 'too complex to be treated by one single method of modification' through reference to strengths of CBT as a method of modifying behaviour.</li> <li>• Assessment of the statement in the light of research / conclusions drawn from investigations or alternative methods of modifying schizophrenic behaviour</li> <li>• Any other appropriate reference.</li> </ul>	
Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary is thoroughly applied to the scenario throughout.</li> <li>• The evidence used is well – chosen and applied effectively to the scenario.</li> <li>• Details are accurate.</li> </ul>
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary used is reasonably applied to the scenario although there are some aspects which are not applied.</li> <li>• Appropriate evidence used and applied to the scenario.</li> <li>• Details are mostly accurate.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary used shows superficial application to the scenario.</li> <li>• Evidence is described but not applied.</li> <li>• There may be some inaccuracies throughout.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary made is not applied to the statement.</li> <li>• No attempt at application.</li> </ul>

Credit **could** be given for:

- Examples of supporting evidence: Kuipers *et. al.* (1997); Tarrrier *et. al.* (2004). Kuipers (1998) cost effective alternative to antipsychotics.
- Examples of refuting evidence: Jauhar *et. al.* (2014), Morrison *et. al.* (2014) – contradictory findings. Royal College of Psychiatrists (2014) – unequal access to treatment. Tarrrier (2004) short but not long-term benefits. Most effective forms of treatment involve a combination of CBT and antipsychotic medication.
- It is very possible that students may bring in supporting studies from other modifications for schizophrenia as a way of illustrating weakness in the current method of modification being evaluated.
- Any other appropriate evaluation.

Marks	AO3
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A thorough evaluation is made of cognitive behavioural therapy.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable evaluation is made of cognitive behavioural therapy.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic evaluation is made of cognitive behavioural therapy.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• Depth or range of material.</li> <li>• A basic conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superficial evaluation is made of cognitive behavioural therapy.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• There is no conclusion.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

## Stress

6. (a) Describe the characteristics of stress.

[10]

Credit **could** be given for:

- Stress is often defined in terms of a physical and psychological tension that is often caused by a variety of stimuli; it is often the case that characteristics of stress can be similarly split in to two broad areas of focus:
- Psychological response to stress – premised on the idea of often how we react to stress depends on how it is seen or perceived. Commonly it is said by those that adhere to a transactional model (Folkman, 1984) – that there is clear interaction between the environment and the individual. Can the individual deal with the stressor with the resources available? Do they have the means to be able to combat the stress? This assessment determines the likelihood of showing a stress response.
- Physical response to stress – Based on the ideas advanced by Selye (1936) through his General Adaptation Syndrome. Physiological responses are noted when in the presence of a stressor. Cortisol and adrenaline are released making us prepared for a fight or flight response.
- Stress can be viewed in a number of different forms: Acute stress – Most common – short term and immediate threat. Chronic stress – stressor present over a long period of time. Episodic acute stress – repeated instances of short-term stress.

Marks	AO1
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the characteristics of stress is thorough and accurate.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology throughout.</li> <li>• Logical structure.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the characteristics of stress is reasonably detailed and accurate.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> <li>• Mostly logical structure.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the characteristics of stress is basic in detail, there may be some inaccuracies.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Reasonable structure.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the characteristics of stress is superficial.</li> <li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>



- (b) Briefly explain how biological explanations could be applied to modifying stress. [5]

Credit <b>could</b> be given for AO2:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through the application of biological explanations to a method of modifying stress.</li> <li>• Candidates may use for example their study of the body's response to acute stressors to a method of modifying stress such as biofeedback.</li> <li>• Illustrating / explaining how through being attached to various equipment an individual can monitor and be aware of the activity of the ANS. For example their heartbeat, breathing patterns and sweat gland activity. By learning strategies to control these responses and monitoring how these change, modification of stress is possible.</li> </ul>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The way in which biological explanations could be applied to modifying stress has been clearly explained.</li> <li>• The details are accurate.</li> </ul>
<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The way in which biological explanations could be applied to modifying stress has been explained.</li> <li>• The details are accurate.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The way in which biological explanations could be applied to modifying stress has been superficially explained.</li> <li>• There may be some inaccuracies throughout.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commentary made modification of stress.</li> <li>• No attempt at application.</li> </ul>

(c) Evaluate **one** individual differences explanation of stress.

[10]

It is likely that candidates will select one from those identified from the specification:

- Hardiness.
- Self-efficacy.
- Type A, type B personalities.

Credit **could** be awarded for:

### **Hardiness**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Kobasa *et. al.* (1979), Maddi (1987, 2013), Bartone, (1999), Shepperd (1991). Benefits of this through application to hardiness training (Maddi, 1998).
- Examples of refuting evidence: Funk (1992). Problems of measuring hardiness and the concern of socially desirable responses combined with a number of different assessment scales mean that comparison between studies is fraught with difficulty.

### **Self-efficacy**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Lazarus and Folkman, 1984, Zajacova *et. al.*, 2005.
- Examples of refuting evidence: Feltz (1982), Borkovec (1976). In follow up research applying Banduras concept of self-efficacy have failed to find such a relationship between perceived self-efficacy and stress response.

### **Type A, type B personalities**

- Examples of supporting evidence: Rosenman *et. al.* (1976), Haynes *et. al.* (1982), Friedman (1975)
- Examples of refuting evidence: Ragland *et. al.* (1988), Helman (1987), Hecker *et. al.* (1988). Limitations of this explanation as evidenced by inconsistent evidence, issues of gender bias and cultural bias.

### **Generally**

- Reference to supporting studies from alternative explanations: For example: Leor *et. al.* (1966) – Adrenaline and acute stress; Helm *et. al.* (2000) – cortisol and chronic stress; Cohen *et. al.* (1993) – Life Events; Bouteyre *et. al.* (2007). It is very possible that students may bring in these supporting studies in from other explanations as a way of illustrating weakness in individual difference explanation of stress being evaluated.
- Any other appropriate evaluation.

Marks	AO3
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A thorough evaluation is made of one individual differences explanation of stress.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Depth and range of material.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable evaluation is made of one individual differences explanation of stress.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical</li> <li>• Depth and range of material but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic evaluation is made of one individual differences explanation of stress.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• Depth or range of material.</li> <li>• A basic conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superficial evaluation is made of one individual differences explanation of stress.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• There is no conclusion.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

**SECTION B**  
**Controversies**

*Answer one of the questions*

**Ethical costs of conducting research**

7. 'Psychologists endeavour to make sure that there are minimal ethical costs of their research on humans.'  
Discuss the extent to which you agree with this statement. [25]

This question is focused on applying knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures in theoretical and practical context when handling qualitative and quantitative data.

This question is synoptic, credit should therefore be given for content from across the range of concepts, theories, research and approaches studied in the course. Furthermore, it is important for examiners to ensure that the evidence used by candidates is used appropriately and linked to the statement made.

The statement discusses **human participants**, examiners should be aware of the candidate's ability to shape their responses to fit this statement.

Candidates <b>might</b> refer to:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before guidelines were introduced, the work of Zimbardo (prison simulation), Milgram (study of obedience), Watson's study of Little Albert as examples of studies that had big social impacts as well as ethical costs to those that took part.</li> <li>• The difficulty for psychologists to be able to study valid behaviour without the need to deceive.</li> <li>• The difficulty / friction between infringing guidelines and making substantive advances in knowledge (e.g. developmental psychology and relationship qualities).</li> <li>• The use of animals as an alternative to using humans.</li> </ul>	
Mark	AO2
<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence used is well-chosen.</li> <li>• Details are accurate throughout.</li> <li>• There is depth and range to material.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> <li>• Clear reference to the statement.</li> </ul>
<b>6-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence used is appropriate.</li> <li>• Details may have minor inaccuracies.</li> <li>• There is depth and range to material, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> <li>• Reasonable reference to the statement.</li> </ul>
<b>3-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence used is not always made relevant to comments made.</li> <li>• There may be significant inaccuracies.</li> <li>• There is depth or range only in material used.</li> <li>• There is some use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• References to the statement are basic and/or superficial.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence used is not appropriate to the comments made.</li> <li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• No reference to the statement.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

This question is focused mainly on analysing, interpreting and evaluating scientific information, ideas and evidence, including in relation to issues, to develop and refine practical design and procedures.

This question really centres on whether psychological research continues to benefit society and individuals even when advances in knowledge often involve costs to those involved. The candidate needs to assess the extent to which this statement is true, concluding appropriately based upon the evidence presented.

Indicative direction of argument <b>might</b> be:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite guidelines unethical research is still conducted (e.g. David Reimer; Aversion Project; Bystander research; quality of attachment research. Case of Genie.</li> <li>• The vague nature of the ethical guideline of deception.</li> <li>• The BPS / APA guidelines have ensured that there is not a litany of cases of bad practice, and human dignity is ensured through robust guidelines to researchers.</li> <li>• Ethical assessment of studies before they are performed ensures a review of the impact of study on both society and individuals concerned.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate evaluation points.</li> </ul>	
An overall conclusion is expected.	
The points above are indicative of content, but any other points that appropriately add to the discussion should be credited appropriately.	
Marks	AO3
13-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sophisticated and articulate interpretation of the issue.</li> <li>• Thoroughly well developed and balanced discussion.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are evidentially relevant to the context.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A thorough interpretation of the key issue.</li> <li>• Discussion is well-developed and balanced.</li> <li>• The evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the analysis of evidence.</li> </ul>
7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable interpretation of the key issue.</li> <li>• Discussion is reasonable but may be one-sided.</li> <li>• The evaluative comments made tend to be generic (not in context).</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• A basic conclusion is made based on the analysis of the evidence.</li> </ul>
4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be some misinterpretation regarding the key issue.</li> <li>• Discussion is basic but creditworthy.</li> <li>• Answer does not move beyond assertions.</li> <li>• Structure is basic.</li> <li>• Any conclusion may be contradictory with the flow of the answer.</li> </ul>
1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no engagement with the issue beyond simple rewording.</li> <li>• Limited discussion or no sense of argument.</li> <li>• Limited or no evaluation.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• No conclusion.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

## Cultural bias

### 8. 'Cross cultural studies remove cultural bias from psychology.'

Using your knowledge of psychology, discuss the extent to which this statement is true. **[25]**

This question is synoptic, and therefore the material used by candidates in this debate can be drawn from any area of psychology. Examiners should expect candidates to draw on psychological concepts, research, evidence, studies or theories from any approach studied in their course.

Candidates **could** refer to:

A clear and consistent reference to the quotation through:

- Judging if psychology is culturally biased through comparison to other disciplines.
- Examining research that is and is not cross cultural (ethnocentric).
- Examining origins of psychological research from singular cultures.
- Impact of continuing cultural bias on the psychological approaches.
- Other relevant examples that contribute to this debate from different areas of study.

Mark	AO2
<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence used is well-chosen.</li> <li>• Details are accurate throughout.</li> <li>• There is depth and range to material.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> <li>• Clear reference to the statement.</li> </ul>
<b>6-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence used is appropriate.</li> <li>• Details may have minor inaccuracies.</li> <li>• There is depth and range to material, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> <li>• Reasonable reference to the statement.</li> </ul>
<b>3-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence used is not always made relevant to comments made.</li> <li>• There may be significant inaccuracies.</li> <li>• There is depth or range only in material used.</li> <li>• There is some use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• References to the statement are basic and/or superficial.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence used is not appropriate to the comments made.</li> <li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• No reference to the statement.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

Indicative direction of argument **might** be:

**Supporting Argument**

- Reference to and analysis of studies / research that have been conducted cross culturally.
- Is psychology biased – or simply showing that difference exists between cultures?
- Increasingly non-western societies now contribute towards the academic discipline of psychology, gradually the subject is becoming less ethnocentric.
- Tests / procedures that have been used in psychology (e.g. IQ tests) that were previously culturally biased – are now culture free.
- Any other appropriate evaluation point.

**Against Argument**

- The relative cost of cross-cultural research making such techniques not possible in every instance – hence removal of bias not possible from psychology.
- Sheer range of research conducted in psychology that is ethnocentric.
- The fact that research represents particular historical or social contexts.
- Clear evidence of beta bias in theories / explanations in psychology.
- Any other appropriate evaluation point.

An overall conclusion is expected.

The points above are indicative of content, but any other points that appropriately add to the discussion should be credited appropriately.

Marks	AO3
13-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sophisticated and articulate interpretation of the issue.</li> <li>• Thoroughly well developed and balanced discussion.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are evidentially relevant to the context.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A thorough interpretation of the key issue.</li> <li>• Discussion is well-developed and balanced.</li> <li>• The evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the analysis of evidence.</li> </ul>
7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable interpretation of the key issue.</li> <li>• Discussion is reasonable but may be one-sided.</li> <li>• The evaluative comments made tend to be generic (not in context).</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• A basic conclusion is made based on the analysis of the evidence.</li> </ul>
4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be some misinterpretation regarding the key issue.</li> <li>• Discussion is basic but creditworthy.</li> <li>• Answer does not move beyond assertions.</li> <li>• Structure is basic.</li> <li>• Any conclusion may be contradictory with the flow of the answer.</li> </ul>
1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no engagement with the issue beyond simple rewording.</li> <li>• Limited discussion or no sense of argument.</li> <li>• Limited or no evaluation.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• No conclusion.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>