GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2017

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

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.

A LEVEL PSYCHOLOGY - COMPONENT 1

SUMMER 2017 MARK SCHEME

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	TOTAL
1	8			8
2	10			10
3			8	8
4		10		10
5	10	10		20
6			10	10
7			10	10
8	12		12	24
TOTAL	40	20	40	100

MARK SCHEME

1. Using examples from psychology describe **two** assumptions of the psychodynamic approach. **[4+4]**

Credit **could** be given for explanations of:
- Influence of childhood experiences e.g. psychosexual stages (oral, anal, phallic, latent, genital), libido, fixations that may become evident in adult life.
- The unconscious mind e.g. Freud's iceberg (conscious mind as visible, unconscious mind as hidden), Freudian slips, use of defence mechanisms (keeping traumatic events in the unconscious mind).
- Tripartite personality e.g. ID (pleasure principle), Ego (reality principle), Superego (morality principle).

- Any other appropriate assumption.

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. • Explanation is superficial. • No link to psychology. • Very little use of appropriate terminology.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

2

2. Describe the procedures of Watson and Rayner's (1920) research '*Conditioned emotional reactions'.* **[10]**

> Credit **could** be given for:
> - Key elements – Albert's confrontation with various animals and objects, emotional and sound tests, visual recordings, transference of conditioned response to other objects/animals, equipment used, role of the researchers, information on time frame of behaviours.
> - Any other appropriate description of procedures.
> - Extended bullet points rather than full paragraphs can be credited.
>
> NB Only procedures 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 | • Explanation and level of accuracy is basic.
• Depth or range.
• Some use of appropriate terminology.
• Reasonable structure. |
> | 1-2 | • Explanation and level of accuracy is superficial.
• Very little use of terminology.
• Answer lacks structure. |
> | 0 | • Inappropriate answer given.
• No response attempted. |

3

3. Evaluate **one** strength and **one** weakness of the cognitive approach. **[4+4]**

Credit **could** be given for: • Scientific nature of the approach, e.g. use of brain scans. • Focus on the individual. • Rejection of biological factors, e.g. role of genes. • Determinist, e.g. schemas. • Usefulness, e.g. therapy. • Mediational processes/mental processes in explaining behaviour. • Successful applications, e.g. social cognition. • Comparison to machines /lack of consideration for emotions and social factors. 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
4	• Strength/ Weakness is identified, evaluated and has detailed reference to the approach.
3	• Strength/Weakness is identified, evaluated and there is some link to the approach. **OR** • Strength/Weakness is identified, briefly evaluated and has detailed reference to the approach.
2	• Strength/ Weakness is identified and briefly evaluated, with no link/ superficial link to the approach.
1	• Strength/ Weakness identified only.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

4

4. Apply your knowledge of the assumptions of the behaviourist approach to explain **one** human behaviour. **[10]**

	Credit **could** be given for:
	• Any human behaviour can be credited.
	• Classical Conditioning theory.
	• Operant Conditioning theory (e.g. role of reinforcement, punishment).
	• Social Learning Theory.
	• All human behaviour as learnt (tabula rasa).
	• The role of observation.
	• Human behaviour must be measured scientifically.
	• Discussion on role of determinism as opposed to free will in explaining one human behaviour.
	• Credit can be given for application of assumptions to relationship formation.
	• No credit is given for description of research using non-human animals, unless a comparison point is made with human behaviour.
	• Any other appropriate application.

Marks	AO2
9-10	• Explanation and level of accuracy is thorough. • Exemplars used are well chosen. • Depth and range are displayed. • Effective use of appropriate terminology. • Logical structure.
6-8	• 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.
3-5	• Explanation and level of accuracy is basic. • Exemplars not always made relevant. • Depth or range. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Structure is reasonable.
1-2	• Explanation and level of accuracy is superficial. • Exemplars identified but not made relevant. • Little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

5. (a) Describe the main components of drug therapy **OR** psychosurgery. **[10]**

Credit **could** be given for:	
Drug Therapy	**Psychosurgery**
• Use of antipsychotics (typical and atypical).	• Various procedures (e.g. prefrontal lobotomy, transorbital, DBS).
• Use of antidepressants (e.g. SSRI's, SNRI NASSA's, Tricyclics, MAOI's).	• Neurosurgery for mental disorders.
• Use of anti-anxiety drugs (e.g. BZ's, BB's).	• Medical model – mental illness treated in the same way as physical illness.
• Role in treating specific mental disorders, (e.g. schizophrenia, depression, stress).	• Role in treating specific mental disorders, (e.g. OCD, depression).
• History of drug therapy (e.g. typical, atypical, targeting serotonin).	• History of psychosurgery (e.g. trepanning).
• Any other relevant component.	• Any other relevant component.

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.

(b) 'Biological therapies are successful in treating mental illness.' **[10]**

With reference to the above statement, discuss the effectiveness of the biological therapy you described in part (a), using psychological knowledge and research.

Credit **could** be given for:	
Drug Therapy • Side effects. • Issues of addiction. • Treating symptoms, not cause. • Length of treatment. • Comparison with other therapies. • Historical developments. • Issues, e.g. reductionism. • Improved ability to function. • Any other relevant evaluation.	**Psychosurgery** • Side effects. • Limited use for mental disorders. • Treating symptoms, not cause. • Historical developments. • Comparison with other therapies. • Length of treatment. • Issues, e.g. determinism. • Improved ability to function. • Any other relevant evaluation.

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

6. Evaluate Myers & Diener's (1995) research '*Who is happy?'* in relation to ethical issues and social implications. **[10]**

Credit **could** be given for:	
Ethical Issues	Social Implications
• Anonymous data. • Intrusion of privacy with the 'beeper' research. • Ethical issue of raising individual dissatisfaction.	• Less focus on mental illness due to focus on mental health. • Positive impact to increasing workforce happiness and productivity. • Could lead to prejudice/ stereotypes e.g. collectivist cultures as less happy, married versus non-married individuals. • Less focus on role of biology in treatments. • Gives individual's intrinsic motivation to take control of their own happiness.

• Any other appropriate ethical issue or social implication evaluated.

Marks	AO3
9-10	• 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.
6-8	• 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.
3-5	• 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.

7. Compare **and** contrast the psychodynamic approach and the positive approach. **[10]**

Credit **could** be given for: • Relevance to today's society/outdated theories. • Ethnocentrism (both based mainly on Western ideology). • Application of assumptions to real life. • Inability to measure emotions/behaviours. • The scientific nature of the approaches. • Validity of methodologies used by both approaches (case studies, self-reports). • Deterministic versus free will view held by both approaches. • Usefulness (e.g. success of therapeutic applications). • Comparison of therapies. • Judgement on the overall comparison of both approaches. • Any other appropriate analysis. NB The above issues could be noted as similarities and/or differences by a candidate.	

Marks	AO3
9-10	• A thorough evaluation. • 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.
6-8	• A reasonable evaluation. • 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.
3-5	• 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.

9

8. **'**Neuroscience is ethical.'   **[24]**

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

This question is focused on demonstrating knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, processes, techniques and procedures.

This debate is linked to the biological 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, legal, social and political evidence (as long as it is explicitly linked to the psychological issue).

Credit **could** be given for:
• Description of neuroscience.
• History of neuroscience (in relation to psychology).
• Work of Raine (1997).
• Work of Libet (1985).
• Work of Fuchs (2006)
• Uses of neuroscience e.g. neuromarketing, prediction of mental illness, psychopharmacology, mood and attention enhancement, further education on the brain etc.
• 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.

8. **(cont'd)**

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:
- Reliability and validity of neuroscience techniques e.g. is it consistent across users?, reliability of being able to predict future mental illness etc.
- Impact on the justice system e.g. predicting crime and sentencing laws.
- Impact on education e.g. intelligence tests used to support or deny entry to schools.
- Ethical implications of eyewitness statements.
- Influence from the media.
- Issues of reductionism, free will, determinism etc.
- Use of neuroethics in neuroscience research.
- Ethical issues e.g. privacy, confidentiality, protection from harm.
- Issues of extrapolation from animal research
- Conclusion to the debate. Overall agreement or disagreement with the quote.

- 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.