

- Q.4** Comment on ethical issues in the use of non-human animals in research in psychology. **[15]**

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- Arguments for and against less ethical issues than using humans.
- Ethical issues relevant to specific research e.g. Brady (1958) - pain, suffering and eventual death of monkeys.
- Non human animals regarded as having less inherent value e.g. Singer's proposition of the principle of quality and speciesism.
- Relevant legislation and guidelines e.g. Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act (1986), BPS Guidelines, Bateson's cube.
- Discussion of decreasing number of non-human animals being used in psychological research e.g. Thomas & Blackman (1991) research.
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>12-15</b>	Discussion is appropriate and well detailed. Material is used in an effective manner (evidence of coherent elaboration) and is thorough. Depth and range of knowledge is displayed, though not necessarily in equal measure. Specialist terms are used throughout.
<b>8-11</b>	Discussion is reasonably appropriate but less detailed. Material is used in an effective manner. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. Some specialist terms.
<b>4-7</b>	Discussion is basic; material is used in a relevant manner but is limited. Few specialist terms.
<b>1-3</b>	Discussion is superficial; material is muddled and/or incoherent. Specialist terms are either absent or are incorrect.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding of relevant material is demonstrated.

- Q.5** Discuss ways of dealing with ethical issues in the use of human participants in research in psychology. **[15]**

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- Use of presumptive consent and prior general consent as a means of dealing with lack of informed consent.
- Use of role play as a means of dealing with deception.
- Use of ethical guidelines.
- Use of ethical committees.
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>12-15</b>	Discussion is appropriate and well detailed. Material is used in an effective manner (evidence of coherent elaboration) and is thorough. Depth and range of knowledge is displayed, though not necessarily in equal measure. Specialist terms are used throughout.
<b>8-11</b>	Discussion is reasonably appropriate but less detailed. Material is used in an effective manner. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. Some specialist terms.
<b>4-7</b>	Discussion is basic; material is used in a relevant manner but is limited. Few specialist terms.
<b>1-3</b>	Discussion is superficial; material is muddled and/or incoherent. Specialist terms are either absent or are incorrect.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding of relevant material is demonstrated.

## GCE Psychology - PY4

**Q.1** (a) Describe what is meant by the term 'cultural bias' in psychology. **[3]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- The researcher distorts hypotheses, research instruments, data or conclusions in ways consistent with their own cultural attitudes and practices.
- Any other appropriate definition.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>
<b>3</b>	A full and accurate description is given with clear reference to psychology.
<b>2</b>	A full and accurate description is given but no clear reference to psychology <b>OR</b> Basic description with some reference to psychology.
<b>1</b>	A basic and limited description is given.
<b>0</b>	No relevant description.

(b) Discuss issues of cultural bias in psychology.

[22]

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evaluation of specific studies and theories.
- Identification of biases (e.g. historical, imposed etc, ethnocentric, implicit).
- Overall evaluation of strength of argument and conclusions.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO2
6 - 7	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented.
4 - 5	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in the material presented. Depth or range of evaluation is displayed.
2 - 3	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
1	Some very limited, relevant evaluation is present.
0	No relevant evaluation.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Bias towards Western cultures (e.g. exclusion of non-Western psychology in academic work, US publication domination, implicit Western norms).
- Assumptions of Western psychology (e.g. universality of concepts, behaviour and social relationships).
- Ethnocentrism in action (e.g. in diagnosis of mental disorder, theories of moral behaviour).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO3
12 - 15	Evidence is clearly interpreted and analysed. Conflicting arguments are presented in a structured manner that accurately addresses the question and reaches a reasoned conclusion. Range and depth of evidence are displayed though not in equal measure.
8 - 11	Evidence is interpreted and analysed. Conflicting arguments are presented effectively and address the question. There are limitations in either the range or depth of evidence presented or in the structure of the argument or in the overall conclusion. Some appropriate terms are used.
4 - 7	Evidence is basic. The material is used in a relevant manner to address the question but the structure of the answer and the conclusion are limited. Few appropriate terms are identifiable.
1 - 3	There is little evidence relating to the question. The answer is confused and/or severely limited in scope. Appropriate terms are either not used or are used incorrectly.
0	No material relevant to the question.

**Q.2** (a) Describe what is meant by the concept 'ethical cost' in psychology. **[3]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Some outcome of the process, conclusions or application of research has caused detriment to the participants or the population at large.
- A moral threshold has been breached in some way by this research or its application.
- Any other relevant definition.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>
<b>3</b>	A full and accurate description is given with clear reference to psychology.
<b>2</b>	A full and accurate description is given but no clear reference to psychology <b>OR</b> basic description with some reference to psychology.
<b>1</b>	A basic and limited description is given.
<b>0</b>	No relevant description.

- (b) Discuss the balance of scientific benefits against ethical costs in psychology. [22]

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evaluation of items of research used in the argument.
- Evaluation of the quality of the argument used in the answer.
- Evaluation of the importance of the issues raised in the question and the answer.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO2
6 - 7	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.
4 - 5	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in the material presented. Depth or range of evaluation is displayed.
2 - 3	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
1	Some very limited, relevant evaluation is present.
0	No relevant evaluation.

Credit **could** be given for:

- What constitutes a scientific benefit/ethical cost?
- Descriptions of scientific benefits (e.g. understanding and predicting behaviour, therapies) and types of ethical cost (e.g. discrimination, psychological harm).
- Balances between scientific advances, social advancement, social morality (e.g. can science be value-free, use of knowledge to oppress).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO3
12 - 15	Evidence is clearly interpreted and analysed. Arguments are presented in a structured manner that accurately addresses the question and reaches a reasoned conclusion. Depth and range of evidence are displayed
8 - 11	Evidence is interpreted and analysed. Conflicting arguments are presented effectively and address the question. There are limitations in either the range or depth of evidence presented or in the structure of the argument or in the overall conclusion. Some appropriate terms are used.
4 - 7	Evidence is basic. The material is used in a relevant manner to address the question but the structure of the answer and the conclusion are limited. Few appropriate terms are identifiable.
1 - 3	There is little evidence relating to the question. The answer is confused and/or severely limited in scope. Appropriate terms are either not used or are used incorrectly.
0	No material relevant to the question.

**Q.3** Describe and evaluate alternatives to the multi-store model of memory.

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Levels of processing approach.
- Working memory hypothesis (initial idea and elaborations).
- Multiple forms of LTM (e.g. semantic/episodic/autobiographical/procedural).
- Reconstructive memory (e.g. existence of 'top-down' filters).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
8 - 10	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is accurate and well detailed. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure. The use of language including grammar punctuation and spelling is relevant, well structured, coherent and accurate.
6 - 7	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. The use of language including grammar, punctuation and spelling is accurate, structured and clear.
4 - 5	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is appropriate, but basic in detail. The use of language may show some inaccuracies in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
1 - 3	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Written expression has errors in the use of language, including grammar, punctuation and spelling.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evaluation of the levels of processing approach (e.g. Morris 1977, Eysenck & Keane 1995).
- Evaluation of working memory hypothesis (e.g. Baddeley 1997, Hampson & Morris 1996).
- Research relating to multiple forms of LTM (e.g. Baddeley 1995, Cohen & Squire 1980).
- Discussion of the shortcomings of all models.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO2
12 -15	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.
8 - 11	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in the material presented. Depth or range of evaluation is displayed.
4 - 7	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
1 - 3	Some very limited, relevant evaluation is present.
0	No relevant evaluation.

**Q.4** Discuss explanations relating to the dissolution of relationships.

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Official vs real reasons for break-up (e.g. Duck 2011).
- Other factors in dissolution (e.g. gender differences, duration of relationships).
- Models of dissolution (e.g. Rollie & Duck 2006, Lee 1984).
- Other types of dissolution (e.g. bereavement).
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>
<b>8 - 10</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is accurate and well detailed. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure. The use of language including grammar punctuation and spelling is relevant, well structured, coherent and accurate.
<b>6 - 7</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. The use of language including grammar, punctuation and spelling is accurate, structured and clear.
<b>4 - 5</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is appropriate, but basic in detail. The use of language may show some inaccuracies in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>1 - 3</b>	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Written expression has errors in the use of language, including grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evaluation of Duck's precipitating factors (e.g. supporting evidence, over-generalisation)
- Evidence relating to other factors in dissolution (e.g. Akert 1998 on post-break up behaviours, Fincham 2004 on attributional styles).
- Evaluation of models of dissolution (e.g. sample bias in most research, over-generalisation).
- General evaluation (e.g. ethnocentrism, comparison of models) applied to dissolution of relationships).
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>12 - 15</b>	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.
<b>8 - 11</b>	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in the material presented. Depth or range of evaluation is displayed.
<b>4 - 7</b>	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
<b>1 - 3</b>	Some very limited, relevant evaluation is present.
<b>0</b>	No relevant evaluation.

**Q.5** Describe and evaluate theories of cognitive development.

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Piagetian theory.
- Other theories (e.g. Vygotsky, Bruner).
- Information processing approach (e.g. metacognition).
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>
<b>8 - 10</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is accurate and well detailed. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure. The use of language including grammar punctuation and spelling is relevant, well structured, coherent and accurate.
<b>6 - 7</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. The use of language including grammar, punctuation and spelling is accurate, structured and clear.
<b>4 - 5</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is appropriate, but basic in detail. The use of language may show some inaccuracies in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>1 - 3</b>	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Written expression has errors in the use of language, including grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Criticism and modification of Piagetian framework.
- Evidence relating to other theories (e.g. evaluation and application of Vygotskian ideas in education).
- Evaluation of information processing approach (e.g. Case 1985, Bee 2000)
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>12 - 15</b>	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.
<b>8 - 11</b>	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in material presented. Depth or range of evaluation is displayed.
<b>4 - 7</b>	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
<b>1 - 3</b>	Some very limited, relevant evaluation is present.
<b>0</b>	No relevant evaluation

**Q.6** Describe and evaluate explanations of adolescent identity.

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Blos's psychoanalytic theory.
- Erikson's stage theory of identity.
- Marcia's identity status theory.
- Negotiating relationship change, roles and identities (e.g. Coleman 1995)
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>
<b>8 - 10</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is accurate and well detailed. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure. The use of language including grammar punctuation and spelling is relevant, well structured, coherent and accurate.
<b>6 - 7</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. The use of language including grammar, punctuation and spelling is accurate, structured and clear.
<b>4 - 5</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is appropriate, but basic in detail. The use of language may show inaccuracies in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>1-3</b>	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Written expression has errors in the use of language, including grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Adolescence as a social construct.
- Evaluative material (e.g. support for major theories, weaknesses in concept and method).
- Biases in research (e.g. ethnocentrism, differences within cultures, gender bias, historical changes).
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>12 -15</b>	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.
<b>8 - 11</b>	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed.
<b>4 - 7</b>	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
<b>1 - 3</b>	Some very limited, relevant evaluation is present.
<b>0</b>	No relevant evaluation.

**Q.7** Discuss theories of hypnosis.

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- State theories (e.g. Hilgard, Oakley).
- Non-state theories (e.g. Wagstaff, Spanos).
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>
<b>8 - 10</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is accurate and well detailed. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure. The use of language including grammar punctuation and spelling is relevant, well structured, coherent and accurate.
<b>6 - 7</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. The use of language including grammar, punctuation and spelling is accurate, structured and clear.
<b>4 - 5</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is appropriate, but basic in detail. The use of language may show some inaccuracies in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>1-3</b>	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Written expression has errors in the use of language, including grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evaluation of state theories.
- Evaluation of non-state theories.
- Discussion of current scientific position (i.e. balance of evidence).
- Relevance of theory in relation to actual usage of hypnosis (e.g. clinical use, entertainment).
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>12 -15</b>	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.
<b>8 - 11</b>	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in the material presented. Depth or range of evaluation displayed.
<b>4 - 7</b>	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
<b>1 - 3</b>	Some very limited, relevant evaluation is present.
<b>0</b>	No relevant evaluation

**Q.8** Discuss issues in health promotion.

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Nature of health promotion (e.g. public sector belief and/or behaviour modification).
- Behaviour change models (e.g. Health Belief Model, Theory of Reasoned Action).
- Self-empowerment approaches (e.g. participatory learning, increasing self-efficacy).
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>
<b>8 - 10</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is accurate and well detailed. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure. The use of language including grammar punctuation and spelling is relevant, well structured, coherent and accurate.
<b>6 - 7</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. The use of language including grammar, punctuation and spelling is accurate, structured and clear.
<b>4 - 5</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is appropriate, but basic in detail. The use of language may show some inaccuracies in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>1-3</b>	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Written expression has errors in the use of language, including grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evaluation of specific issues (e.g. support for HBM, TRA).
- Psychological issues (e.g. rationality in decision-making, heuristics).
- Effectiveness of health promotion campaigns (e.g. anti-obesity).
- Ideological and ethical issues (e.g. freedom of individual, mandate for change efforts by government).
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>12 -15</b>	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.
<b>8 - 11</b>	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed.
<b>4 - 7</b>	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
<b>1 - 3</b>	Some very limited, relevant evaluation is present.
<b>0</b>	No relevant evaluation.

**Q.9** Describe and evaluate motivating factors in the classroom.

[25]

Credit **could** be given for:

- Attribution theory as applied to education (e.g. self-attributions).
- Behavioural concepts as applied to education (e.g. learned helplessness).
- Teaching/learning styles and their effect on motivation (e.g. mismatch of preferred style and teaching mode).
- The effects of labelling and stereo-typing on motivation (e.g. self-fulfilling prophecy).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
8 - 10	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is accurate and well detailed. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure. The use of language including grammar punctuation and spelling is relevant, well structured, coherent and accurate.
6 - 7	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. The use of language including grammar, punctuation and spelling is accurate, structured and clear.
4 - 5	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is appropriate, but basic in detail. The use of language may show some inaccuracies in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Written expression has errors in the use of language, including grammar, punctuation and spelling.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evidence relating to specific explanations.
- Classroom management and use of motivating factors.
- Individual differences and demotivating factors (e.g. psychological disturbances, gender and cultural differences).
- External influences (e.g. family, media, drugs).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO2
12 -15	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.
8 - 11	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed.
4 - 7	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
1 - 3	Some very limited, relevant evaluation present.
0	No relevant evaluation.

**Q.10** Describe and evaluate theories of crime.

[25]

Credit **could** be given for:

- Biological explanations of crime (e.g. genetic, physiological).
- Psychological explanations of crime (e.g. psychoanalytic theory, SLT, cognitive).
- Social theories (e.g. familial influences, peer group subculture, differential association, gender).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
8 - 10	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is accurate and well detailed. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure. The use of language including grammar punctuation and spelling is relevant, well structured, coherent and accurate.
6 - 7	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. The use of language including grammar, punctuation and spelling is accurate, structured and clear.
4 - 5	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is appropriate, but basic in detail. The use of language may show some inaccuracies in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Written expression has errors in the use of language, including grammar, punctuation and spelling.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evidence relating to specific theories.
- Methodological issues relating to specific theories.
- Historical, cultural and political evaluative issues.
- Crime and the notion of criminality as a social construct.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO2
12 -15	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure
8 - 11	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in the materials presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed.
4 - 7	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
1 - 3	Some very limited, relevant evaluation is present.
0	No relevant evaluation.

**Q.11** Discuss external factors affecting sporting performance.

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Social facilitation (e.g. Zajonc).
- Interactive audiences and home court/away court effects (e.g. Varca 1980)
- Audience characteristics (e.g. size, density, hostility).
- Team cohesion (e.g. group effects, self-efficacy)
- Coaching factors (e.g. compatibility, stereotypes in selection).
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>
<b>8 - 10</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is accurate and well detailed. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed through not necessarily in equal measure. The use of language including grammar punctuation and spelling is relevant, well structured, coherent and accurate.
<b>6 - 7</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. The use of language including grammar, punctuation and spelling is accurate, structured and clear.
<b>4 - 5</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is appropriate, but basic in detail. The use of language may show some inaccuracies, including grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>1-3</b>	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Written expression has errors in the use of language, including grammar, punctuation and spelling.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evaluation of audience and crowd effects.
- Evaluation of team and coaching factors.
- Problems for scientific research (e.g. subjectivity, difficulty of operationalising and measuring variables).
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>12 -15</b>	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.
<b>8 - 11</b>	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in the material presented. Depth or range of evaluation is displayed.
<b>4 - 7</b>	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
<b>1 - 3</b>	Some very limited, relevant evaluation is present.
<b>0</b>	No relevant evaluation.

**Q.12** Describe and evaluate aetiologies of unipolar depression including psychological and physiological explanations. **[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Genetic factors (e.g. evidence from twin, family and adoption studies).
- Biochemical factors (e.g. hormones).
- Psychological explanations (e.g. learned helplessness, cognitive factors, negative cognitive triad).
- Social and developmental explanations (e.g. unresolved childhood conflicts).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
8 - 10	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is accurate and well detailed. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure. The use of language including grammar punctuation and spelling is relevant, well structured, coherent and accurate.
6 - 7	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. The use of language including grammar, punctuation and spelling is accurate, structured and clear.
4 - 5	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is appropriate, but basic in detail. The use of language may show some inaccuracies in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Written expression has errors in the use of language, including grammar, punctuation and spelling.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Issues with the definition of depression.
- Critical examination of empirical evidence (e.g. problems with serotonin theories).
- Problems with generalisation (e.g. individual differences, cross-cultural differences).
- Socio-cultural context and depression (e.g. lack of threats to existence).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO2
12 -15	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is evidence of coherent elaboration in the material presented. Depth and range of evaluation is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.
8 - 11	Evaluation is relevant, structured and shows some coherence in the material presented. Depth or range of evaluation is displayed.
4 - 7	Evaluation shows some relevance but is basic and limited in detail.
1 - 3	Some very limited, relevant evaluation is present.
0	No relevant evaluation.



WJEC  
245 Western Avenue  
Cardiff CF5 2YX  
Tel No 029 2026 5000  
Fax 029 2057 5994  
E-mail: [exams@wjec.co.uk](mailto:exams@wjec.co.uk)  
website: [www.wjec.co.uk](http://www.wjec.co.uk)