GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2018

A LEVEL (NEW)
PSYCHOLOGY - COMPONENT 1
A290U10-1

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2018 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 1

SUMMER 2018 MARK SCHEME

1. Describe 'behaviour learnt through conditioning' and **one** other assumption of the behaviourist approach. **[4+4]**

This question is focused on demonstrating knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Classical conditioning; learning through association, UCS, UCR, NS, CS, CR, work of Pavlov in classically conditioning dogs to salivate to the sound of a bell.
- Operant conditioning; learning through reinforcement, positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement, punishment, extinction, work of Skinner with rats and/or pigeons.
- Blank slate; tabula rasa, behaviour learnt as a result of environmental interactions, nurture over nature, environmental determinism.
- Humans and animals learn in similar ways; laboratory research, extrapolation, work of Pavlov and/or Skinner, use of theory in therapy e.g. token economies, aversion therapy and systematic desensitisation.

- Any other appropriate assumption clearly related to the behaviourist approach.

N.B. a diagram with an example for the classical conditioning assumption is creditworthy.
N.B. the second assumption offered cannot be conditioning.

Marks (per assumption)	AO1
4	• Description and level of accuracy is thorough and clearly linked to psychology. • Effective use of appropriate terminology.
3	• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable and linked to psychology. • Good use of appropriate terminology.
2	• Description and level of accuracy is basic. • Link to psychology may not be clear. • Some use of appropriate terminology.
1	• Assumption is identified only. • Description is superficial. • No link to psychology. • Very little use of appropriate terminology.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

2. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the positive approach. **[10]**

This question is focused on applying knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures in a practical context when handling data.
Credit **could** be given for: • Role of free will e.g. humans as 'self-regulating' and not determined by other influences. • Successful applications e.g. education, workplace, armed forces. • Subjective nature of research e.g. how is happiness measured? • Usefulness e.g. therapy. • Only approach to consider mental health rather than mental illness. • Use of scientific methods e.g. neuroscience. • Links to humanistic psychology e.g. use of qualitative methods. 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	• Evaluation and level of accuracy of strengths and weaknesses is thorough. • Exemplars used are well chosen. • Depth and range are displayed. • Effective use of appropriate terminology. • Logical structure. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
6-8	• Evaluation and level of accuracy of strengths and weaknesses is reasonable. • Appropriate exemplars are used. • Depth and range is displayed, but not in equal measure. • Good use of appropriate terminology. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.
3-5	• Evaluation and level of accuracy of strengths and weaknesses is basic. • Exemplars not always made relevant. • Depth or range. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is reached. **OR** • Evaluation and level of accuracy of strengths **or** weaknesses is thorough. • Exemplars used are well chosen • Depth and range are displayed. • Effective use of appropriate terminology. • Logical structure. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
1-2	• Evaluation and level of accuracy is superficial. • Exemplars identified but not made relevant. • Little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure. • No conclusion. **OR** • Evaluation and level of accuracy of strengths or weaknesses is reasonable. • Appropriate exemplars are used. • Depth and range is displayed, but not in equal measure. • Good use of appropriate terminology. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

3. Describe the findings and conclusions of Loftus and Palmer's (1974) research *'Reconstruction of automobile destruction: an example of the interaction between language and memory'*. **[10]**

This question is focused on demonstrating knowledge and understanding of scientific procedures.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Experiment 1 findings; estimated speeds with the five levels of the independent variable.

Verb	**MPH**
Smashed	40.8
Collided	39.3
Bumped	38.1
Hit	34.0
Contacted	31.8

- Participants estimated that the vehicles had been travelling fastest when the verb 'smashed' was used.
- These findings demonstrate that a single word within a question can markedly affect a witness's answer to that question.
- Leading questions (in this case a single word), can distort a person's memory for an event.

- Experiment 2 findings; number of participants responding to the question 'Did you see any broken glass?'

Verb condition			
	Smashed	**Hit**	**Control**
Yes	16	7	6
No	34	43	44

- When the verb 'smashed' was used, participants were over twice as likely to report seeing broken glass than when the word 'hit' was used and compared to the control condition.
- Leading questions (in this case a single word) can distort a witness's memory for an event.
- Leading questions can affect a person's memory for the event one week later.
- People's accuracy for reporting the details of a complex event is easily distorted through the use of leading questions.

Major inaccuracies = omissions, wrong integer number.

Minor inaccuracies = wrong/missing decimal point.

Conclusions:

- The findings indicate that the form of the question can affect a witness's answer to the question.
- The actual speed of the vehicles had little effect on the participants reporting of speed.
- Loftus and Palmer suggested that different speed estimates could be a result of response-bias factors. For example, a subject is uncertain whether to say 30mph or 40mph and the verb 'smashed' biases their response towards the higher estimate. However, the results of Experiment 2 suggest that this was not the case.
- Loftus and Palmer also suggested that the question form causes a change in the subject's memory of the accident. The verb 'smashed' may change a subject's memory such that they 'see' the accident as being more severe than it actually was.
- Any other appropriate findings or conclusions.

N.B. Extended bullet points rather than full paragraphs can be credited.
N.B. Only findings and conclusions referred to in the original article can be credited.

Marks	AO1
9-10	• Description and level of accuracy is thorough. • Depth and range included. • Effective use of terminology. • Logical structure.
6-8	• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable. • Depth and range, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	• Description and level of accuracy is basic. • Depth or range. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Reasonable structure.
1-2	• Description and level of accuracy is superficial. • Very little use of terminology. • Answer lacks structure.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

4. (i) Apply your knowledge of 'evolutionary influences' to explain **one** behaviour. **[5]**

(ii) Apply your knowledge of 'neurotransmitters' to explain **one** behaviour. **[5]**

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">This question is focused on applying knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures in a practical context</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Credit could be given for:</td></tr>
<tr><td>Evolutionary influences:

• Role of genes and theory of natural selection and survival of the fittest.
• Altruism.
• Environment of evolutionary adaptiveness (EEA).
• Behaviour measured scientifically.
• Discussion on the role of determinism as opposed to free will in explaining one behaviour.
• Credit can be given for application of assumptions to relationship formation.
• Any other appropriate application.

N.B. Both human and non-human animal behaviour can be credited.
N.B. If more than one behaviour is provided, examiners must mark all and credit the highest marked one.</td><td>Neurotransmitters:

• Role of presynaptic and postsynaptic neurons.
• Role of specific neurotransmitters in explaining behaviour.
• Behaviour measured scientifically.
• Discussion on role of determinism as opposed to free will in explaining one behaviour.
• Credit can be given for application of assumptions the relationship formation.
• Any other appropriate application.

N.B. Both human and non-human animal behaviour can be credited.
N.B. If more than one behaviour is provided, examiners must mark all and credit the highest marked one.</td></tr>
</table>

Marks	AO2
4-5	• Explanation and level of accuracy is thorough. • Exemplars used are well chosen • Depth and range are displayed. • Effective use of appropriate terminology. • Logical structure. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
2-3	• Explanation and level of accuracy is reasonable. • Appropriate exemplars are used. • Depth and range is displayed, but not in equal measure. • Good use of appropriate terminology. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.
1	• Explanation and level of accuracy is superficial. • Exemplars identified but not made relevant. • Little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure. • No conclusion.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

5. Evaluate the methodology and procedures of Bowlby's (1944) research '*Forty-four juvenile thieves: Their characters and home-life*'. **[8]**

This question is mainly focused on analysing, interpreting and evaluating scientific information, ideas and evidence in relation to making judgements and reaching conclusions
Credit **could** be given for: • Use of case study method e.g. lack of generalisation, researcher bias, specific details of a unique group of people. • Use of a control group enhanced study. • Lacked control over factors such as; education, peers, success of therapy etc. • Use of qualitative data e.g. issues with memory. • Use of children in research e.g. ethical issues, accuracy of information. • At the end of the two-hour examination by a social worker, psychologist & psychiatrist, a case conference was held in which information and impressions were pooled and also school and other reports considered - raised reliability through inter-rater methods. • In many cases weekly interviews continued over six months or more in-depth information gained from building up a relationship with the participant and mother. • Any other appropriate evaluation of methodology and procedures.

Marks	AO3
7-8	• A thorough evaluation. • Clearly linked to the classic research. • Examples are well chosen to support the point made. • Arguments are well-developed and balanced throughout. • Structure is logical. • Depth and range. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
5-6	• A reasonable evaluation. • Clearly linked to the classic research. • Examples are appropriate. • Arguments are developed. • Structure is mostly logical. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
3-4	• Basic evaluation. • Examples are not always relevant. • Arguments are not developed. • Structure is reasonable. • Depth or range. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1-2	• Superficial evaluation. • There are no examples to support. • Answer lacks structure. • No conclusion.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted

6. Compare **and** contrast the biological approach and the cognitive approach. **[10]**

This question is mainly focused on analysing, interpreting and evaluating scientific information, ideas and evidence in relation to making judgements and reaching conclusions
Credit **could** be given for: • Application of assumptions to real life. • Inability to measure emotions/behaviours. • The scientific nature of the approaches. • Reductionist issues. • Validity of methodologies used by both approaches (laboratory experiments, controlled observations). • Deterministic view held by both approaches. • Usefulness (e.g. success of therapeutic applications). • Relevance to today's society. • Nature/nurture debate. • Comparison of therapies. • Judgement on the overall comparison of both approaches. • Any other appropriate analysis. N.B. The above issues could be noted as similarities and / or differences by a candidate.

Marks	AO3
9-10	• A thorough evaluation evidently relevant to the context. • Arguments are well-developed and balanced throughout. • Structure is logical. • Depth and range. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
6-8	• A reasonable evaluation with some relevance to the context. • Arguments are developed. • Structure is mostly logical. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
3-5	• Basic evaluation which is generic and not appropriately contextualised. • Arguments are not developed. • Structure is reasonable. • Depth or range. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1–2	• Superficial evaluation. • There are no examples. • Answer lacks structure. • No conclusion.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

7. (a) Describe the main components of dream analysis **OR** psychodrama. **[10]**

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">This question is focused on demonstrating knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Credit could be given for:</td></tr>
<tr><td>Dream Analysis:
• Dreams as revealing inner desires of the ID.
• Wish fulfilment e.g. primary process thought.
• Dream symbolism but not all dreams have symbolism.
• Manifest and latent content (use of dreamwork).
• Role of the patient and therapist in therapy.
• Any other relevant component.</td><td>Psychodrama:
• History of psychodrama as the first group therapy.
• Use of roles in therapy e.g. protagonist, audience, director etc.
• Role reversal e.g. encouraging protagonists awareness of others.
• Use of mirror technique.
• Doubling; making protagonist feelings conscious.
• Any other relevant component.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Marks</td><td>AO1</td></tr>
<tr><td>9-10</td><td>• Description and level of accuracy is thorough.
• Depth and range included.
• Effective use of terminology.
• Logical structure.</td></tr>
<tr><td>6-8</td><td>• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable.
• Depth and range, but not in equal measure.
• Good use of terminology.
• Mostly logical structure.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3-5</td><td>• Explanation and level of accuracy is basic.
• Depth or range.
• Some use of appropriate terminology.
• Reasonable structure.</td></tr>
<tr><td>1-2</td><td>• Explanation and level of accuracy is superficial.
• Very little use of terminology.
• Answer lacks structure.</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>• Inappropriate answer given.
• No response attempted.</td></tr>
</table>

(b) 'Psychodynamic therapies are ineffective and unethical.'

With reference to the above statement, discuss the psychodynamic therapy you described in part (a), using psychological knowledge and research. **[10]**

This question is focused on applying knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures in a practical context when handling data.	
Credit **could** be given for:	
Dream Analysis • Protection from psychological harm; emotional distress from past events being brought into the open. • Unethical balance of therapist control over patient, therapist as correct in their interpretation. • Overreliance of patient on therapist. • Confidentiality; patient details need to remain confidential. • False memory syndrome; patient may falsely blame someone for events that did not take place. • Any other appropriate ethical issue.	**Psychodrama** • Protection from psychological harm; may cause embarrassment, anxiety, bring up events that the patient is not able or ready to deal with. • Protection from physical harm; patient may harm others in the process of acting out their emotions. • Suitable support after therapy to protect the patient from harm e.g. private time for the patient and therapist. • Confidentiality; all patients personal details should remain anonymous. • Therapist professionalism; therapists should adhere to ethical guidelines created for psychodrama therapy. • Any other appropriate ethical issue.

Marks	AO2
9-10	• Discussion and level of accuracy is thorough. • Exemplars used are well chosen. • Depth and range are displayed. • Logical structure. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
6-8	• Discussion and level of accuracy is reasonable. • Appropriate exemplars are used. • Depth and range is displayed, but not in equal measure. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.
3-5	• Discussion and level of accuracy is basic. • Exemplars not always made relevant. • Depth or range. • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1-2	• Discussion and level of accuracy is superficial. • Exemplars identified but not made relevant. • Answer lacks structure. • No conclusion.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

8. 'Eyewitnesses are incapable of remembering and recalling accurate information of an event, therefore eyewitness accounts are always unreliable and should never be used in criminal convictions.'

Discuss to what extent you agree with this statement. You should demonstrate your understanding of psychological knowledge and research in your response. **[24]**

This question is focused on demonstrating knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures.
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: • Research by Loftus / Loftus and Palmer. • Use of children as eyewitnesses. • Reconstructive memory. • Work of The Innocence Project. • Gary Wells' guidelines on gathering eyewitnesses. • Face recognition. • Repression (psychodynamic), Amnesia and age (biological). • Any other appropriate material.

Marks	AO1
10–12	• Description and level of accuracy is thorough. • Exemplars are well chosen. • There is depth and range to material included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • The structure is logical.
7–9	• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable. • Exemplars are appropriate. • There is depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • The structure is mostly logical.
4–6	• Description and level of accuracy is basic. • Exemplars may not always be appropriate. • There is depth or range only in material used. • There is some use of appropriate terminology. • There is a reasonable structure.
1–3	• Description and level of accuracy is superficial. • Exemplars not always made relevant. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

Question 8 continued:

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

Credit **could** be given for:

- Analysis of the influence of the evidence on political decisions (e.g. wrongful convictions and cost, death sentence).
- Improving reliability (e.g. cognitive interview, jury checklist).
- Use of DNA evidence.
- Ethical implications of eyewitness statements.
- Influence from the media.
- Real perpetrators being free in society due to inaccurate eyewitness accounts.
- Evaluation of methods of research (e.g. lab based studies).
- Cultural differences in use of eyewitnesses.
- Conclusion to the debate. Overall agreement or disagreement with the statement.

- Any other appropriate discussion.

Marks	AO3
10–12	• A thorough discussion is made of both sides of the debate. • Clear reference to the statement. • Evaluative comments are evidently relevant to the context. • Structure is logical throughout. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on analysing and interpreting the evidence presented.
7–9	• A reasonable discussion is made of both sides of the debate. • Reasonable reference to the statement. • Evaluative comments show some relevance to the context. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on analysing and interpreting the evidence presented.
4–6	• A basic discussion of both sides of the debate OR a reasonable discussion is made of only one side of the debate. • Reference to the statement is superficial. • Evaluative comments are generic and not appropriately contextualised. • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1–3	• A superficial discussion is made of the debate. • No reference to the statement. • Evaluative comments are superficial. • Answer lacks structure. • No conclusion.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.