



---

# **GCE AS MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2017**

**AS (NEW)  
PSYCHOLOGY - UNIT 1  
2290U10-1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2017 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 AS PSYCHOLOGY

### Unit 1

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	TOTAL
1	10			10
2	8			8
3		5		5
4			10	10
5	6		8	14
6			12	12
7	10	5		15
8	6			6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>

## WJEC GCE AS PSYCHOLOGY - UNIT 1

### SUMMER 2017 MARK SCHEME

1. Describe the methodology **and** procedures of Bowlby's (1944) research 'Forty-four juvenile thieves: Their characters and home-life'. **[10]**

Credit <b>could</b> be given for description of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use of case studies.</li><li>• Characteristics of sample, e.g. 44 thieves, 44 emotionally disturbed children as control group, involvement of mothers.</li><li>• Information gathered by Bowlby and colleagues, e.g. intelligence test, emotional attitude, interview by social worker, use of school reports.</li><li>• Ongoing therapy process lasting six months or more.</li><li>• Any other appropriate description.</li></ul>	
Marks	AO1
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description and level of accuracy is thorough.</li><li>• Depth and range are displayed.</li><li>• Effective use of appropriate terminology.</li></ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable.</li><li>• Depth and range is displayed, although not necessarily in equal measure.</li><li>• Good use of appropriate terminology.</li></ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description and level of accuracy is basic.</li><li>• Depth or range.</li><li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li></ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description and level of accuracy is superficial.</li><li>• Little use of appropriate terminology.</li></ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li><li>• No response attempted.</li></ul>

2. Using examples from psychology, describe **two** assumptions of the biological approach. **[4+4]**

<p>Credit <b>could</b> be given for descriptions of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evolutionary influences: natural selection, sexual selection, fight or flight response, parental investment theory.</li> <li>• Localisation of brain function: lobes of the brain, Charles Whitman, Phineas Gage.</li> <li>• Neurotransmitters: process of neurotransmission, serotonin and depression, dopamine and schizophrenia.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate assumption.</li> </ul>	
Marks (per assumption)	AO1
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is thorough and clearly linked to psychology.</li> <li>• Effective use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable and linked to psychology.</li> <li>• Good use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is basic.</li> <li>• Link to psychology may not be clear.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption is identified only.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description is superficial.</li> <li>• No link to psychology.</li> <li>• Little use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

3. A psychology student suggests to his teacher that one of the problems with the behaviourist approach is that it is too simplistic. Explain why this might be considered a strength **OR** a weakness of the behaviourist approach. **[5]**

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

- Focus on nurture over nature, ignores factors such as genetics that might affect behaviour.
- Reductionist approach, focus on stimulus response, allows investigation of one factor to develop treatments and parsimonious explanations.
- Use of animals, makes the knowledge gathered too simplistic to apply to human behaviour.
- Any other appropriate strength or weakness.

Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of knowledge linked to the behaviourist approach is relevant.</li> <li>• Explanation and level of accuracy is thorough.</li> <li>• Exemplars used are well-chosen.</li> </ul>
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of knowledge linked to the behaviourist approach has some relevance.</li> <li>• Explanation and level of accuracy is reasonable.</li> <li>• Appropriate exemplars are used.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of knowledge linked to the behaviourist approach is superficial or muddled.</li> <li>• Explanation is basic.</li> <li>• Exemplars not always made relevant.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

4. Compare and contrast the cognitive and psychodynamic approaches in terms of their similarities and differences. **[10]**

<p>Credit <b>could</b> be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scientific nature, e.g. investigative methods used, unscientific nature of psychodynamic compared to scientific methods of cognitive approach.</li> <li>Determinism, e.g. use of soft determinism in cognitive compared to psychic determinism of psychodynamic.</li> <li>Nature/Nurture, e.g. both taken into account by both approaches.</li> <li>Nomothetic/Idiographic e.g. idiographic approach taken by psychodynamic compared to nomothetic for cognitive.</li> <li>Applications to therapy, e.g. use of talking therapy.</li> <li>Any other appropriate similarities and differences.</li> </ul>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO3</b>
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thorough discussion is made of both the similarities and differences.</li> <li>Depth and range are displayed.</li> <li>Structure is logical throughout.</li> <li>An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable discussion is made of both the similarities and differences.</li> <li>Depth and range is displayed, although not necessarily in equal measure.</li> <li>Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>A reasonable conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic discussion is made of the similarities and differences.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable discussion is made of the similarities or differences.</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 analysis is made of the similarities and differences.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic analysis is made of similarities or differences.</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>

5. (a) Describe the conclusions made by Loftus and Palmer (1974) in their research '*Reconstruction of automobile destruction: an example of the interaction between language and memory*'. [6]

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

- "The way a question is asked can enormously influence the answer that is given".
- Effects lasted for a week.
- Two kinds of information suggested for memory: perception of event, information after the event. The two sources become integrated over time.
- Link to Carmichael et al. (1932) and Daniel (1972), role of verbal labels.
- Any other appropriate description.

Marks	AO1
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and accuracy of conclusions is thorough.</li> <li>• Depth and range are displayed, although not necessarily in equal measure.</li> <li>• Effective use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and accuracy of conclusions is reasonable.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• Good use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of conclusions is superficial or limited.</li> <li>• Little use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>



- (b) Discuss the ethical issues **and** social implications of Loftus and Palmer's (1974) research '*Reconstruction of automobile destruction: an example of the interaction between language and memory*'. **[8]**

<p>Credit <b>could</b> be given for discussion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ethical Issues: use of deception to prevent demand characteristics, risk of harm due to viewing car crashes, lack of valid consent.</li> <li>• Social Implications: use of eyewitness testimony in court, impact on previous convictions, cost of retrials, interview techniques used by police.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate discussion.</li> </ul>	
Marks	AO3
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of the research in relation to ethical issues and social implications is thorough.</li> <li>• Depth and range are displayed.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> </ul>
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of the research in relation to ethical issues and social implications is reasonable and shows some coherence.</li> <li>• Depth and range is displayed, although not necessarily in equal measure.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> </ul>
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of the research in relation to ethical issues and social implications is appropriate but basic.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable discussion of the research in relation to ethical issues OR social implications.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments made tend to be generic and not contextualised.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of ethical issues and/or social implications is superficial.</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>

6. Critically evaluate Raine, Buchsbaum and LaCasse's (1997) research '*Brain abnormalities in murderers indicated by positron emission tomography*'. [12]

<p>Credit <b>could</b> be given for evaluation of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methodological Issues, e.g. use of quasi-experimental method, unable to determine cause and effect.</li> <li>• Validity Issues, e.g. use of PET scans.</li> <li>• Ethical Issues, e.g. valid consent, right to withdraw.</li> <li>• Sampling Issues, e.g. use of murderers, control group.</li> <li>• Social implications, e.g. use within the justice system.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate evaluation.</li> </ul>	
Marks	AO3
10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation is thorough.</li> <li>• Depth and range are displayed.</li> <li>• Developed and balanced arguments are made.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation is reasonable.</li> <li>• Depth and range is displayed, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Arguments are reasonable but may be one-sided.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation is basic.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments made tend to be generic and not contextualised.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• A basic conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation is superficial. Material is muddled.</li> <li>• Answer does not move beyond assertions.</li> <li>• No conclusion.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

7. (a) Explain why a psychologist from the positive approach would view mindfulness **OR** quality of life therapy as an appropriate therapy. **[5]**

<p>Credit <b>could</b> be given for explanations of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of character strengths.</li> <li>• Free will approach to therapy.</li> <li>• Effectiveness.</li> <li>• Link to assumptions.</li> <li>• Reference to other therapies.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate explanation.</li> </ul>	
Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of knowledge linked to the approach and therapy is relevant.</li> <li>• Explanation and level of accuracy is thorough.</li> <li>• Exemplars used are well-chosen.</li> </ul>
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of knowledge linked to the approach and therapy has some relevance.</li> <li>• Explanation and level of accuracy is reasonable.</li> <li>• Appropriate exemplars are used.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application of knowledge linked to the approach and therapy is superficial or muddled.</li> <li>• Explanation is basic.</li> <li>• Exemplars are not always made relevant.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

- (b) Describe the main components of mindfulness **OR** quality of life therapy. **[10]**

<div> <b>Mindfulness</b> </div>		<div> <b>Quality of Life Therapy</b> </div>
Credit <b>could</b> be given for description of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meditation and mindful breathing processes.</li> <li>• Specific examples such as Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) and the .b schools programme.</li> <li>• Role of informal practice.</li> <li>• Role of therapist.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate description.</li> </ul>		Credit <b>could</b> be given for description of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Quality of Life Inventory.</li> <li>• CASIO model (Five Paths to Happiness).</li> <li>• Three Pillars.</li> <li>• Role of therapist.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate description.</li> </ul>
Marks	AO1	
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is thorough.</li> <li>• Depth and range are displayed.</li> <li>• Effective use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Logical structure.</li> </ul>	
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable.</li> <li>• Depth and range is displayed, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> </ul>	
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is basic.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> </ul>	
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is superficial.</li> <li>• 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>	

8. Using examples from psychology, explain the behaviourist assumption of 'behaviour learnt through conditioning.' **[6]**

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

- Classical conditioning; reflexive response, use of neutral stimulus, Pavlov's dogs, aversion therapy.
- Operant conditioning; consequences of actions, reinforcement and punishment, Skinner's rats, token economies.
- Any other appropriate explanation.

Marks	AO1
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation and accuracy is thorough and clearly linked to examples from psychology.</li> <li>• Effective use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation and accuracy is reasonable and linked to examples from psychology.</li> <li>• Good use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation is basic.</li> <li>• Link to examples from psychology may not be clear.</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>