GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2019

PSYCHOLOGY - COMPONENT 3
A290U30-1

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2019 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.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

A LEVEL PSYCHOLOGY - COMPONENT 3

SUMMER 2019 MARK SCHEME

SECTION A
IMPLICATIONS IN THE REAL WORLD

Addictive Behaviour

1. (a) Describe the characteristics of addictive behaviours. [10]

Credit **could** be given for:

- Griffiths (2005) identification of 6 core characteristics of addictive behaviours:

1) Salience.
2) Mood Modification.
3) Tolerance.
4) Withdrawal Symptoms.
5) Conflict.
6) Relapse.

- Any other appropriate characteristic.

Mark	AO1
9-10	• Descriptions of characteristics of addictive behaviours are thorough and accurate. • Depth and range included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical structure.
6-8	• Descriptions of characteristics of addictive behaviours are reasonably detailed and accurate. • There is depth and range, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	• Descriptions of characteristics of addictive behaviours are basic. • Depth or range. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Reasonable structure.
1-2	• Description of characteristics of addictive behaviours are superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(b) Nigel works with people with a variety of addictive behaviours. One of his clients, Richard, has read about individual differences explanations and believes they fully explain his addiction. Nigel disagrees.

Evaluate individual differences explanations of addictive behaviour with reference to Nigel and Richard. [15]

AO2	
Credit could be given for: Application to the scenario could include Nigel and Richard and the fact that individual differences explanations do or do not fully explain behaviour. • Discussion of individual difference explanation of addictive behaviour with reference to Nigel. • Application of evaluation to Nigel to help him understand the effectiveness of the explanation. • Use of Nigel or Richard in giving examples that illustrate strengths / weaknesses of the individual differences explanation. • Any other appropriate application.	
Marks	**AO2**
5	• Evaluation made is thoroughly applied to the scenario throughout. • The evidence used is well-chosen and applied effectively to the scenario. • There is depth and range to the evidence used. • The details / reference to scenario are accurate.
3-4	• Evaluation made is reasonably applied to the scenario although there are some aspects which are not applied. • Appropriate evidence used and applied to the scenario. • There is depth or range to the evidence used. • The details are mostly accurate.
1-2	• Evaluation made shows superficial application to the scenario. • Evidence used but superficially linked to the scenario.
0	• Evaluation made is not applied to the scenario. • No attempt at application.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

AO3

Credit could be awarded for:

It is very likely that evaluative commentary will focus on or around those identified by the specification and thus could relate to personality or cognitive biases or field dependence.

Indicatively evaluative commentary might focus on:

- Supporting evidence, Griffiths (1994) Cognitive Biases; Guangheng Dong *et. al.* (2013) Personality.
- Evidence Against: Rozin *et. al.* (1993) – Personality;
- Methodological issues of the Griffiths study that impinges on the validity of the research findings of cognitive biases.
- 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 individual differences explanations. This is permissible but simple descriptions of these studies will receive little credit if they are not linked to a clear evaluation point.
- Evaluation could also be extended by ignorance of individual differences explanations of biological factors that underpin the behaviour (e.g. dopamine or addiction genes). Ignorance of social psychological factors (peer influence or role of the media) 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	• A thorough evaluation is made of individual differences explanations of addictive behaviour. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.
6-8	• A reasonable evaluation is made of individual differences explanations of addictive behaviour. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.
3-5	• Basic evaluation is made of individual differences explanations of addictive behaviour. • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is reached. OR • A thorough evaluation is made of one individual differences explanation of addictive behaviour. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.
1-2	• Superficial evaluation of individual differences explanations of addictive behaviour. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion. OR • A reasonable evaluation is made of one individual differences explanation of addictive behaviour. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Autistic Spectrum Behaviours

2. (a) Describe **one** biological explanation of autistic spectrum behaviours. [10]

Credit **could** be given for:

It is likely that candidates will provide in their response reference to those identified on the specification:

- Genetic predisposition
- Amygdala Dysfunction

- Genetic predisposition – follows the idea that there is a lot of published research suggesting that ASB runs in families and evidence suggests that if an individual has a sibling with ASB they are up to 20 times more likely (Szatmari, 1999) to be at risk of having it.
- Various forms of studies have been conducted in this area: family studies and twin studies. More able candidates will comment on the way in which there are key differences between simplex and multiplex ASB and differ these correctly.
- Further descriptive commentary could explain differences between syndromic and non-syndromic ASB.
- Amygdala dysfunction – this explanation either suggests that there are problems in the development of the amygdala – for example some studies focusing on growth – such studies often relating to amygdala volume in children (Nordahl, 2012) being larger than an otherwise normal child.
- Conversely other advocates of amygdala dysfunction explanations focus on the interaction that abnormal brain amygdala development as a child has on the functioning of the frontal cortex and associated systems often involved in social processing.

- Any other appropriate biological explanation.

Marks	AO1
9-10	• Description of one biological explanation of ASB is thorough and accurate. • Depth and range included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical structure.
6-8	• Description of one biological explanation of ASB is reasonably detailed and accurate. • There is depth and range, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	• Description of one biological explanation of ASB is basic in detail, and there may be some inaccuracies. • Depth or range. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Reasonable structure.
1-2	• Description of one biological explanation of ASB is superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(b) Patrick has autistic spectrum behaviour and wants to understand the potential causes of it. Patrick understands that social psychology can explain his behaviour, especially his interactions with others.

Evaluate social psychological explanations of autistic spectrum behaviours with reference to Patrick. [15]

Credit **could** be given for:

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

- Empathising – systemising theory.
- Refrigerator mother.
- Likely ways to tackle the question will see candidates use evidence that can support the explanation at hand for example Lawson (2004), Wakabayashi, 2007) [E-S]; Kanner (1943) [Refrigerator Mother].
- Evidence against that might question issues of validity of assessment methods in the case of ES or plainly the lack of actual supporting evidence for refrigerator mother.
- Candidates might also comment on the real-life applications that some explanations can have such as E-S and the – Baron-Cohen had E-S theory as a platform for his development of the 'Mindreading DVD' and the animation series 'Transporters'.
- Candidates can also achieve evaluation through reference to alternatives. But examiners should be aware that simple descriptions of alternatives are not credit worthy on their own. The expectation of a highly effective answer will be one that makes links to alternative explanations – but does so in a way that shows what is "ignored" by social psychological explanations.
- Any other appropriate social psychological explanation.

N.B. Candidates who simply provide descriptions of these explanations will not receive credit.

Marks	AO3
9-10	• A thorough evaluation is made of social psychological explanations of autistic spectrum behaviours. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.
6-8	• A reasonable evaluation is made of social psychological explanations of autistic spectrum behaviours. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.
3-5	• Basic evaluation is made of social psychological explanations autistic spectrum behaviour. • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is reached. OR • A thorough evaluation is made of one social psychological explanation of autistic spectrum behaviours. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.
1-2	• Superficial evaluation of evaluation is made of social psychological explanations autistic spectrum behaviour. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion. OR • A reasonable evaluation is made of one social psychological explanation of autistic spectrum behaviours. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Credit can be given for AO2:

Reference to the scenario through comments made:

- Referring to Patrick when evaluating social; psychological explanations of autistic spectrum behaviour.
- Applying the content of evaluations or examples used to Patrick.
- Any other appropriate application.

Marks	AO2
5	• Commentary is thoroughly applied to the scenario throughout. • The evidence used is well-chosen and applied effectively to the scenario. • There is depth and range to the evidence used. • The details / reference to scenario are accurate.
3-4	• Commentary is reasonably applied to the scenario although there are some aspects which are not applied. • Appropriate evidence used and applied to the scenario. • There is depth or range to the evidence used. • The details are mostly accurate.
1-2	• Commentary shows superficial application to the scenario. • Evidence used but superficially linked to the scenario.
0	• Evaluation made is not applied to the scenario. • No attempt at application.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Bullying Behaviour

3. (a) Mike, unlike his sister Caroline, is a persistent bully. He is often verbally and physically aggressive. One psychologist he visited suggested that the cause of his behaviours could be biological.

Describe **one** biological explanation of bullying behaviours with reference to the scenario above. [15]

Credit can be given for AO2: Reference to the scenario through comments made: • Referring to Mike when describing a biological explanation of bullying behaviour. • Applying the content of descriptions or examples used to Mike's behaviour. • Reference to Caroline not displaying bullying behaviours. • Any other appropriate application.
AO2

Marks	AO2
5	• Commentary is thoroughly applied to the scenario throughout. • The evidence used is well-chosen and applied effectively to the scenario. • There is depth and range to the evidence used. • The details / reference to scenario are accurate.
3-4	• Commentary is reasonably applied to the scenario although there are some aspects which are not applied. • Appropriate evidence used and applied to the scenario. • There is depth or range to the evidence used. • The details are mostly accurate.
1-2	• Commentary shows superficial application to the scenario. • Evidence used but superficially linked to scenario.
0	• Evaluation made is not applied to the scenario. • No attempt at application.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Credit for AO1 **could** be given for:

It is likely that most candidates will use / choose:

- Bullying genes
- Evolved gender differences
- Hormones

- Research that has examined the genetic basis to bullying behaviour has tended on the whole to look at aggressive behaviour.
- Research here has used a variety of different techniques – twin studies (Ball, 2008; Coccaro – 1997).
- Adoption studies (Soo Rhee, 2002). Genetic basis to certain personality types – dark triad (Paulus and Williams, 2002); low activity MAOA gene (Han Brunner, 1993).
- The focus of evolved gender difference originates from the work of Volk *et. al*. (2012) with a focus on the factors and strategies employed by males and females in bullying behaviour and the core differences in these strategies employed by the different genders – which they would argue has an evolutionary basis.
- Bullying can clearly benefit males and females differently in terms of ensuring reproduction but bullying also can establish dominance in separate ways for males and females also.
- Biochemical influence of behaviour is a further factor that might underlay the aggressive behaviours often observed in situations of bullying. Nelson (1995) reviewed how research into hormones influences aggressive behaviour. A positive correlation can be plotted when comparing level of androgens circulating in the body and aggressive behaviours shown (in this case by prisoners). Wagner *et. al.*'s (1979) research with mice, and Pillay's (2006) research with athletes further illustrate an interesting link between the role of hormones and aggression, especially the role of testosterone. Interesting links can be made to basel and reciprocal models of testosterone here. Of course, as Simpson (2001) notes aggressive behaviour is complex, multifaceted, and it would be wrong to ignore the strong impact of environmental stimuli also.
- Any other appropriate biological explanation.

Marks	AO1
9-10	• Description of one biological explanation of bullying behaviour is thorough and accurate. • Depth and range included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical structure.
6-8	• Description of one biological explanation of bullying behaviour is reasonably detailed and accurate. • There is depth and range, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	• Description of one biological explanation of bullying behaviour is basic. • Depth or range. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Reasonable structure.
1-2	• Description of one biological explanation of bullying behaviour is superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(b) Evaluate **one** social psychological explanation of bullying behaviours. [10]

Credit could be given for:

- Cultural differences
- Moral disengagement
- Any other appropriate explanation

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

- Presentation of research evidence to illustrate support explanations; Chester *et. al.* (2015); Li (2007) – cultural differences; Hymel *et. al.* (2005); Gini *et. al*. (2014) – moral disengagement; real world applications etc.

- Presentation of research evidence refuting explanations. (e.g. Diathesis stress raising the issue of not being able to explain bullying just through nurture alone; validity of bullying research through problematic definitions of both bullying, cultural differences may be overstated; contradictory evidence directly supporting or refuting the explanations (e.g. Helfenfinger 2012).

- Studies that are used to support other explanations can be used as evidence against the explanation being evaluated (e.g. Ball (2008) – genetic influences; Leenaars (2008) – evolved gender differences; Gini *et. al.* (2006) – ToM; Kokkinos *et. al.* (2016) – Narcissistic Personality.

- Comparative comments made from looking at alternative explanations. (E.g. the benefits of using biological explanations such as being able to clearly explain gender difference in bullying behaviour through evolutionary difference over psychological ones such as culture.

- Any other relevant evaluation points.

Marks	AO3
9-10	• A thorough evaluation is made of one social psychological explanation of bullying behaviour. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.
6-8	• A reasonable evaluation is made of one social psychological explanation bullying behaviour. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.
3-5	• Basic evaluation is made of one social psychological explanation bullying behaviour. • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1-2	• Superficial evaluation is made of one social psychological explanation bullying behaviour. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Criminal Behaviours

4. (a) Describe **one** individual differences explanation of criminal behaviours. [10]

Credit **could** be given for:

It is very likely that candidates will tend to focus and choose from those identified from the specification. These are:

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

- Hans Eysenck's (1967, 1978) theory of personality made up of dimensions of extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism, is a general theory of personality that can be applied to criminal behaviour. For example, through an extravert's need level for high levels of arousal, instability or their lack of empathy. The criminal behaviours shown by an individual were likely according to Eysenck to be the net outcome of a mix between one's innate personality traits and the environment in which the person was brought up.

- Intelligence – In the very early 1900's research into crime often categorised those who committed crimes as "feeble minded and mentally deficient". The issue of criminality and lower levels of measurable intelligence has excited much research both for an against the view. (Moffitt *et. al.*; Lynam *et. al.*; Stattin and Klackenberg-Larson),

- Psychopathic personality – Nathaniel Thornton advocated a view of the link between psychopathy and criminal behaviour. This is still a highly debated area, and as Silver (1999) says the features of psychopathy such as impulsivity, criminal versatility, callousness and lack of empathy are all important. A view not agreed with by all for example Cleckley who sees the criminal as consistently purposive, whereas the psychopaths seems hardly purposive at all.

N.B. The question requires a description of one explanation. In cases where candidates describe more than one, examiners should credit the better description. There is no evaluation component to this question, evaluation comments get no credit.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Marks	AO1
9-10	• Description of one individual differences explanation of criminal behaviour is thorough and accurate. • Depth and range included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical structure.
6-8	• Description of one individual differences explanation of criminal behaviour is reasonably detailed and accurate. • There is depth and range, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	• Description of one individual differences explanation of criminal behaviour criminal behaviour is basic in detail, there may be some inaccuracies. • Depth or range. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Reasonable structure.
1-2	• Description of one individual differences explanation of criminal behaviour criminal behaviour is superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(b) 'When modifying criminal behaviours, social implications are more important than ethical implications.'

Evaluate methods of modifying criminal behaviours with reference to this statement. [15]

Credit can be given for AO2:

Reference to the statement through comments made:

- Strengths and weaknesses of the method of modification that can be used to support (or refute) the statement.
- Assessment of the statement in the light of research / conclusions drawn from different methods of modification.
- Any other appropriate reference.

Marks	AO2
5	• Commentary is thoroughly applied to the statement throughout. • The evidence used is well – chosen and applied effectively to the statement. • Details are accurate.
3-4	• Commentary used is reasonably applied to the statement although there are some aspects which are not applied. • Appropriate evidence used and applied to the statement. • Details are mostly accurate.
1-2	• Commentary used shows superficial application to the statement. • Evidence is described but not applied. • There may be some inaccuracies throughout.
0	• Commentary made is not applied to the statement. • No attempt at application.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Credit **could** be given for:

Evaluation could take the form of:

It is likely that the range of responses for this question will largely be within the focus of the specification:

- Anger Management.
- Restorative Justice.

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

- Presentation of research evidence to illustrate support for the method of modification Landenberger and Lipsey, (2005), Taylor and Novaco (2006) – anger management; varied victim satisfaction surveys, Dignan (2005), Sherman and Strang (2007) restorative justice etc.
- Presentation of research evidence refuting explanations. Presenting the view that an alternative method of modification might be better to explain the benefits of one over the other. Studies such as those above that support one method of modification can be used as counter evidence against the other.
- Comparative comments made from looking at alternative methods of modification which emphasise the issues being ignored by the method of medication being evaluated in the response.

- Any other relevant evaluation points.

Marks	AO3
9-10	• A thorough evaluation is made of methods of modifying criminal behaviour. • Depth and range of material. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.
6-8	• A reasonable evaluation is made of methods of modifying criminal behaviour. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.
3-5	• Basic evaluation is made of methods of modifying of criminal behaviour. • Depth or range. • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is reached. OR • A thorough evaluation is made of one method of modifying criminal behaviour. • Depth and range of material. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.
1-2	• Superficial evaluation of methods of modifying of criminal behaviour. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion. OR • A reasonable evaluation is made of one method of modifying criminal behaviour. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Schizophrenia

5. (a) Evaluate **two** individual differences explanations of schizophrenia. [10]

Credit could be given for:

It is expected that candidates will refer to the following explanations as identified by the specification:

- Thought disorder
- Schizophrenogenic mother
- Sex differences.

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

- Presentation of research evidence to illustrate support for the method of modification Kasanin *et. al.* (1934) – psychodynamic approach (schizophrenogenic mother); Morrison (1988), Barch *et. al.* (1999), Frith (1992) cognitive approach – thought disorder. Goldstein (1988) – sex differences.
- Presentation of research evidence refuting explanations. Presenting the view that an alternative explanation might better explain the schizophrenia. Studies supporting such alternative explanations provide a good means of weakness for the current individual difference explanation.
- Studies such as Liem (1974) – Dysfunctional families [double bind], Vaughn and Leff (1976) – Dysfunctional families [expressed emotion]. Van Os (2005) Socio-cultural factors [urbanicity]; Jones et al (1994) Socio-cultural factors [social isolation]; Mc Carthy et al (1999) – structural abnormalities; Gottesman (1991), Heston, (1966), International Schizophrenia Consortium (2008) – Genetic explanation - can be used as counter evidence against the other.
- Particularly regarding psychodynamic explanations such as schizophrenogenic mother – limited usefulness in the explanation as it can't be used to develop an effective therapy to modify the behaviour.
- Comparative comments made from looking at alternative explanations which emphasise the issues being ignored by the individual differences explanations being evaluated in the response.
- Any other relevant evaluation points.

Marks	AO3
9-10	• A thorough evaluation is made of individual differences explanations of schizophrenia. • Depth and range of material. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.
6-8	• A reasonable evaluation is made of individual differences explanations of schizophrenia. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.
3-5	• Basic evaluation is made of individual differences explanations of schizophrenia. • Depth or range. • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is reached. OR • A thorough evaluation is made of one individual differences explanation of schizophrenia. • Depth and range of material. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.
1-2	• Superficial evaluation of individual difference explanations of schizophrenia. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion. OR • A reasonable evaluation is made of one individual differences explanation of schizophrenia. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(b) Edna is trying to understand what might have caused her to have schizophrenia. Her symptoms include hearing voices, being paranoid, disordered thinking and being less sociable. In a session with her psychologist, biological explanations were discussed.

Describe **one** biological explanation for schizophrenia, making reference to Edna's symptoms in your answer. [15]

Credit can be given for AO2:

Reference to the scenario through comments made:

- About the descriptive aspects of a biological explanation for schizophrenia with reference to Edna's symptoms.
- Examples of aspects of a biological explanation for schizophrenia as they apply to / refer to Edna.
- Any other appropriate application.

Marks	AO2
5	• Commentary is thoroughly applied to the scenario throughout. • The evidence used is well – chosen and applied effectively to the scenario. • Details are accurate.
3-4	• Commentary used is reasonably applied to the scenario although there are some aspects which are not applied. • Appropriate evidence used and applied to the scenario. • Details are mostly accurate.
1-2	• Commentary used shows superficial application to the scenario. • Evidence is described but not applied. • There may be some inaccuracies throughout.
0	• Commentary made is not applied to the statement. • No attempt at application.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Credit **could** be given for:

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

- Dopamine Hypothesis
- Enlarged Ventricles
- Cannabis influence on brain chemistry

- The dopamine hypothesis very basically states that individuals with schizophrenia have too much dopamine, the heightened level of dopamine has been associated with the showing of psychotic behaviours. Indeed, studies on non-psychotic patients who are given medication that increases dopamine levels showed very quickly the schizophrenic type behaviours (hallucinations / delusions). Later research has drilled down to particular receptor sites especially D1 – D5, especially D2.
- Other Biological psychologists have focused on the structure of the brain, and in particular have tried to make assessments of the "difference" of the schizophrenic brain to the non-schizophrenic brain. This view is not new, indeed Emil Kraeplin in his early work on schizophrenia (dementia praecox) saw it as an "organic" brain disease.
- Later research has focused on the enlargement of ventricles – (fluid filled cavities in both hemispheres) in cases of people with schizophrenia. Other research in a similar vein has assessed the impact of cortical atrophy – the loss of neurons in the cerebral cortex Other research has focussed on the possible impact of reversed cerebral asymmetry – and the structure difference between schizophrenic to non-schizophrenic – with schizophrenics having a larger right hemisphere to left hemisphere – which is revered in the normal population.
- Research might look at alternatives such as the cannabis influence on brain chemistry. Most current research presently suggests that drugs don't specifically cause schizophrenia – but increase the risk of developing it. Drugs in particular cannabis, but also cocaine, LSD and amphetamines would seem to be trigger factors in susceptible individuals. The effect that users seek are caused by the main psychoactive chemical in the drug, delta-9-tetrahydro-cannabinol (THC). It is clear from research of for example Hall and Degenhardt (2008) that regular cannabis use predicts an increased risk of schizophrenia.

- Any other appropriate biological explanation.

Marks	AO1
9-10	• Description of one biological explanation of schizophrenia is thorough and accurate. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical structure.
6-8	• Description of one biological explanation of schizophrenia is reasonably detailed and accurate. • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	• Description of one biological explanation of schizophrenia is basic in detail, there may be some inaccuracies. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Reasonable structure.
1-2	• Description of one biological explanation of schizophrenia is superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Stress

6. (a) Describe **two** individual differences explanations of stress. [10]

Credit **could** be given for:

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

- Hardiness.
- Type A, Type B personalities.
- Self-efficacy.
- Kobasa *et. al.* suggested that those a hardy personality (control, commitment, challenge) seemed to give such individually with a way (pathway) that will allow them to rebuff stress, and as a result less likely to show stress related illness, research evidence (Kobassa (1979) has shown that in comparative tests those who illustrate characteristics above experience stress without demonstrating stress related illness.
- Other psychological research has investigated certain personality types and its link to stress (or lack of) related illness. Friedman and Rosenhan (1950s) suggested that a type A personality was an individual characterised by competitiveness and hostility toward others, unlike Type B personality for whom showed greater calmness and expression emotion.
- Research in this area since Friedman and Rosenhan's original suggestion has implicated Type A personality types as being those more likely to illustrate stress related illness (e.g. Western Collaborative Group study, 1976) as demonstrated by development of heart disease and subsequent heart attack.
- Self-efficacy refers to one's belief about one's ability to handle and deal with stressful situations. Research has shown that possessing high levels of self-efficacy acts to decrease an individual's potential for experiencing negative stressful feeling and increasing their sense of control (Mills et al 2008).
- Any other appropriate individual differences explanation.

Marks	AO1
9-10	• Description of two individual differences explanations of stress are thorough and accurate. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical structure.
6-8	• Description of two individual differences explanations of stress are reasonably detailed and accurate. • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	• Description of two individual differences explanations of stress are basic in detail, there may be some inaccuracies. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Reasonable structure. OR • Description of one individual differences explanation of stress is thorough and accurate. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical structure.
1-2	• Description of two individual differences explanations of stress are superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure. OR • Description of one individual differences explanation of stress is reasonably detailed and accurate. • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

(b) 'Biological explanations of stress are limited.'

Evaluate biological explanations of stress with reference to this statement.

[15]

Credit **could** be given for:

It is likely that the candidates will tend to choose form those explanations that are found in the specification:

- Adrenaline
- Evolutionary adaption
- Stress genes

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

- Presentation of research evidence to illustrate support the explanation behaviour being evaluated – for example: Adrenaline – Leor et al (1996); in addition varied biological / physiological evidence that examines evolutionary adaption and the fight an flight response. Heim et al (2000) link to high / low levels of cortisol (1996); National Academy of Sciences (2013) research into genetic influences on stress.

- Presentation of contrary evidence for example: stress might not always be a causal factor (Dimsdale, 2008). Issue of cause and effect (Liu *et. al.*, 2015) – with regard adrenaline research and also research into cortisol. In addition, research studies that have been used to support opposing explanations can be used against these biological ones for example: Shepperd, (1991); Maddi (2013) – Hardiness; Friedman, (1975) – Type A / B; Cohen *et. al.* (1993) – life events; Bouteyre *et. al.* (2007).

- Comparative comments made from looking at alternative explanations emphasising aspects that are ignored.

- Any other relevant evaluation points.

Marks	AO3
9-10	• A thorough evaluation is made of biological explanations of stress. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.
6-8	• A reasonable evaluation is made of biological explanations of stress. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.
3-5	• Basic evaluation is made of biological explanations of stress. • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is reached. OR • A thorough evaluation is made of one biological explanation of stress. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based upon evidence presented.
1-2	• Superficial evaluation is made of biological explanations of stress. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion. OR • A reasonable evaluation is made of one biological explanation of stress. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the evidence presented.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Credit can be given for AO2:

Reference to the statement through comments made about:

- Strengths and weaknesses of the explanations with reference to the statement.
- The statement in embedded in the evaluative points made.
- The statement is referred to in examples as evaluative contributions made. For example, making reference to the statement in relation to research that might indicate that biological explanations are adequate and hence not limited. Alternatively making reference to the statement in comparing the biological explanation of stress to alternative and equally plausible explanations such as individual difference or social psychological explanations emphasising its weakness and thus agreeing with the statement.

Marks	AO2
5	• Commentary is thoroughly applied to statement throughout. • The evidence used is well – chosen and applied effectively to the statement. • There is depth and range to the evidence used. • The details / reference to statement is accurate.
3-4	• Commentary used is reasonably applied to statement although there are some aspects which are not applied. • Appropriate evidence used and applied to statement. • There is depth or range to the evidence used. • The details are mostly accurate.
1-2	• Commentary used shows superficial application to statement. • Evidence used but not superficially linked to statement.
0	• Commentary made is not applied to statement. • No attempt at application.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

SECTION B

CONTROVERSIES

Answer one of the questions

7. 'Psychology continues to suffer from sexism'.

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 sexist through comparison to other disciplines.
- Examining research that does / does not illustrate sexism within the discipline of psychology.
- Examining origins of sexist research from within psychology.
- Impact of sexism from the psychological approaches.
- Other relevant examples that contribute to this debate from different areas of study.

Mark	AO2
9-10	• Evidence used is well-chosen. • Details are accurate throughout. • There is depth and range to material. • Effective use of terminology. • Clear reference to the statement.
6-8	• Evidence used is appropriate. • Details may have minor inaccuracies. • There is depth and range to material, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Reasonable reference to the statement.
3-5	• Evidence used is not always made relevant to comments made. • There may be significant inaccuracies. • There is depth or range only in material used. • There is some use of appropriate terminology. • References to the statement are basic and/or superficial.
1-2	• Evidence used is not appropriate to the comments made. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • No reference to the statement.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Indicative direction of argument **might** be:

Supporting Argument

- The social impact of research conducted by male researchers making such research findings and not generalisable.
- Varied research examples in psychology across many different topic areas that illustrate sexism. I.e. Male researchers analysing male only or male and female participants.
- The fact that early research with an androcentric focus represents historical or social contexts.
- Clear evidence of bias in theories / explanations in psychology.
- Any other appropriate evaluation points.

Against Argument

- Reference to and analysis of studies / research that have been conducted in ways that appreciate and accommodate the differing view of male and females.
- Is psychology biased – or does it simply show that differences exist between genders?
- Increasingly women, now contribute towards the academic discipline of psychology, gradually the subject is becoming less androcentric in its focus and knowledge generation.
- Researchers are aware more of biases in research and thus utilise procedures that reduce bias. Female researchers analyse female participants etc.
- 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	• A sophisticated and articulate interpretation of the key issue. • Thoroughly well developed and balanced discussion. • Evaluative comments are evidentially relevant to the context. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.
10-12	• A thorough interpretation of the key issue. • Discussion is well-developed and balanced. • The evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the analysis of evidence.
7-9	• A reasonable interpretation of the key issue. • Discussion is reasonable but may be one-sided. • The evaluative comments made tend to be generic (not in context). • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is made based on the analysis of the evidence.
4-6	• May be some misinterpretation regarding the key issue. • Discussion is basic but creditworthy. • Answer does not move beyond assertions. • Structure is basic. • Any conclusion may be contradictory with the flow of the answer.
1-3	• There is no engagement with the issue beyond simple rewording. • Limited discussion or no sense of argument. • Limited or no evaluation • Answer lacks structure. • No conclusion.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

8. ‘Psychology can never have scientific status because of the methodologies used by various approaches.’

Discuss to what extent you agree with this statement. [25]

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 appropriate and linked to the statement made.

Candidates will be expected to make reference to the quotation. In so doing they might:

- Assess if psychology is a science through examining the characteristics of science.
- Refer to the fact that psychology had theoretical origins and some early psychologists often illustrated scientific principles.
- Comment on the way in which some approaches in psychology embody scientific subject matter. (E.g. Biological Psychology, Behaviourism).
- Comment via comparison about those approaches in psychology that do not embody subject (e.g. psychodynamic approach).
- Other relevant examples that contribute to this debate from different areas of study.

Mark	AO2
9-10	• Evidence used is well-chosen. • Details are accurate throughout. • There is depth and range to material. • Effective use of terminology. • Clear reference to the statement.
6-8	• Evidence used is appropriate. • Details may have minor inaccuracies. • There is depth and range to material, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Reasonable reference to the statement.
3-5	• Evidence used is not always made relevant to comments made. • There may be significant inaccuracies. • There is depth or range only in material used. • There is some use of appropriate terminology. • References to the statement are basic and/or superficial.
1-2	• Evidence used is not appropriate to the comments made. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • No reference to the statement.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

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.

Indicative direction of argument **might** be:

Supporting Argument

- Areas of psychology illustrate resounding universal principles (e.g. Behaviourism and principles of learning)
- Some areas of psychology (e.g. Biological Psychology, Cognitive Psychology) make use of scientific methods of investigation emphasising objectivity and control (e.g. lab experiment, imaging techniques).
- Characteristics of science (FORCE) can be found in many (but not all) aspects of psychological research.
- Hypotheticodeductive methods employed in many (but not all) areas of psychological research.

Against Argument

- The theoretical underpinnings of psychological approaches often dictate an analysis of phenomena through methods that are not traditionally scientific.
- Psychology examines human individuals – to whom so many variables affect behaviour. Is it right to be scientific when the subject matter being examined might not be best analysed in such a way? Some behaviours just can't be studied that way.
- Psychology holds few (in comparison to natural science) universal principles / laws that govern behaviour and allow prediction of future behaviour.
- Some approaches in psychology do not advocate the importance of scientific processes and procedures. The focus on the individual is more important than a generalisable rule. Ideographic rather than nomothetic being a preferred focus.

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	• A sophisticated and articulate interpretation of the issue. • Thoroughly well developed and balanced discussion. • Evaluative comments are evidentially relevant to the context. • Structure is logical. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.
10-12	• A thorough interpretation of the key issue. • Discussion is well-developed and balanced. • The evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based upon the analysis of evidence.
7-9	• A reasonable interpretation of the key issue. • Discussion is reasonable but may be one-sided. • The evaluative comments made tend to be generic (not in context). • Structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is made based on the analysis of the evidence.
4-6	• May be some misinterpretation regarding the key issue. • Discussion is basic but creditworthy. • Answer does not move beyond assertions. • Structure is basic. • Any conclusion may be contradictory with the flow of the answer.
1-3	• There is no engagement with the issue beyond simple rewording. • Limited discussion or no sense of argument. • Limited or no evaluation • Answer lacks structure. • No conclusion.
0	• Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.