

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

Credit **could** be given for:

- Arguments for and against the idea that there are less ethical issues than using humans.
- Cannot compare non-humans to human behaviour.
- 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.
- Any other relevant application.

<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]**

- 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 BPS ethical guidelines.
- Use of ethical committees.
- Replace with animals.
- Any other relevant disadvantages.

<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.

**TOTAL 45**

### GCE Psychology - PY4

**Q.1** (a) Describe what is meant by ‘a genetic influence on human behaviour’. **[3]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evolutionary factors in human behaviour.
- Conditions or tendencies established at conception (e.g. sex, aspects of mental disorder).
- Any other relevant description.

Marks	AO1
<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) Using psychological knowledge and research findings, discuss the balance of genetic and environmental influences on human behaviour. **[22]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Interaction between genetic and environmental influences (e.g. diathesis-stress theory, parenting and temperament, nutrition and behaviour).
- Critical analysis of research.
- 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:

- Discussion of principal genetic influences (e.g. evolutionary, proximal influences on disorder, intelligence).
- Discussion of principal environmental influences (e.g. culture, peers, parents).
- 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 term 'gender bias' in psychology. **[3]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- The practice of psychology is routinely and persistently operated to the benefit of one gender in relation to the other.
- Any other relevant description.

<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 gender bias in psychology.

[22]

Credit **could** be given for:

- Standard of evidence used in the argument presented.
- Evaluation of specific studies and theories.
- Ways of overcoming these types of gender bias (e.g. redefinition of psychological disorders, feminist perspectives in research).
- 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:

- Types of gender bias (e.g. alpha, beta, androcentrism).
- The historical invisibility of female psychologists (e.g. Loftus, Gibson).
- The assumption of gender differences in theory and research (e.g. biological determinism).
- Examples of appropriate psychological evidence (theories and/or studies) which display gender bias (e.g. psychoanalytic, aggression).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO3
12 - 15	Evidence is clearly interpreted and analysed. Conflicting arguments are presented in a structured manner that accurately address the question and reaches a reasoned conclusion. Depth and range of evidence are displayed, although not necessarily in equal measure. Appropriate terminology is used throughout.
8 - 11	Evidence is interpreted and analysed. Conflicting arguments are presented effectively and address the question. There are limitations in either the depth and range 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 used.
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 explanations for disorders of memory.

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Statistical abnormalities (e.g. tip-of-the-tongue, strong habit intrusion, onomastic aphasia, déjà vu).
- Psychological disorders (e.g. repression, PTSD flashbacks, fugue).
- Pathological states where memory disorder is a symptom (e.g. agnosias, Alzheimer's, Korsakoff's).
- 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. Language (grammar, punctuation and spelling) is relevant, well structured and accurate.
6 - 7	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) is accurate, structured and clear.
4 - 5	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is appropriate but basic in detail. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) shows some inaccuracies.
1 - 3	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) has errors.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Discuss what is meant by a disorder of memory and what are true disorders rather than normal processes or global organic illnesses.
- Evaluation of explanations for statistical abnormalities.
- Evaluate evidence for existence of and explanations of psychological disorders.
- Any other relevant material

Marks	AO2
12 - 15	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is 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** Using psychological knowledge and research findings, discuss explanations for 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.

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 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.

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.

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

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Piaget's theories and concepts.
- Vygotsky's theories and concepts.
- Theories of infant cognition (e.g. Kagan, Bruner).
- Development of social awareness (e.g. Dunn).
- 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. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) is relevant, well structured and accurate.
<b>6 - 7</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. 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. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) shows some inaccuracies.
<b>1 - 3</b>	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) has errors.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Methodological criticism of Piaget (e.g. Donaldson, McGarrigie).
- Importance of social context in cognitive development.
- Increased knowledge of neonatal abilities in infancy.
- Relevance of theories to real world, and their use (e.g. Piaget and primary education in UK).
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>12 - 15</b>	Evaluation is relevant, clearly structured and thorough. There is 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.6** Critically consider the effects of events during Late adulthood.

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Stage theories (e.g. Erikson, Levinson).
- Role changes in late adulthood (e.g. retirement, social disengagement).
- Psychophysical developments (e.g. reactions to hearing loss, decline of physical abilities, intellectual decline).
- Identity adjustment (e.g. re-engagement, loss of sexuality, spirituality).
- Bereavement and death (e.g. Murray-Parkes).
- 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. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) is relevant, well structured and accurate.
<b>6 - 7</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. 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. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) shows some inaccuracies.
<b>1 - 3</b>	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) has errors.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evaluation of stage theories (e.g. difficulty regarding falsification).
- Evaluation of research evidence relating to changes and developments.
- Ethnocentrism and large cultural differences (e.g. time, place, subculture).
- Persistence of stereotypes despite research evidence.
- 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** Using psychological knowledge and research findings, describe and evaluate 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 factors affecting health behaviours.

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Personality type, age, social class.
- Rationality in decision-making.
- Attribution style.
- Reference to real life studies of health behaviour.
- 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:

- Changes in the concept of health and health behaviour.
- Cultural and class differences (e.g. relative affluence, meaning of concept in non-Western societies).
- Critical research relating to major factors (e.g. rationality in decision-making).
- Inadequacy of model-based research in dealing with complex behaviour.
- 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 behaviourist learning theory applied to education including classical and operant conditioning. **[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Classroom management techniques (e.g. use of reinforcement generally, special cases).
- Token economies in schools (e.g. cumulative reward systems, 'gold stars').
- Competence-based education (e.g. NVQs, accreditation of actions rather than knowledge).
- Self-instruction programmes (e.g. computer-based learning).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
<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. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) is relevant, well structured and accurate.
<b>6 - 7</b>	Knowledge and understanding of evidence is reasonably accurate, and less detailed. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed. 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. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) shows some inaccuracies.
<b>1 - 3</b>	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) has errors.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evaluations (e.g. theory of motivation seriously inadequate, mechanistic views of humans, competence-based education has little reliable evidence).
- Critical examination of evidence.
- Use of evidence to support or contradict explanations.
- External influences (e.g. family, media, drugs).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO2
<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 present.
<b>0</b>	No relevant evaluation.

**Q.10** Describe and evaluate approaches to profiling.

**[25]**

Credit **could** be given for:

- Description of the main approaches in profiling (e.g. FBI, geographical).
- Description of relevant case material.
- Description of psychological assumptions underpinning approaches to profiling (e.g. offender consistency).
- 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. 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. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) shows some inaccuracies.
<b>1-3</b>	Knowledge and understanding is superficial and/or muddled. Language (including grammar, punctuation and spelling) has errors.
<b>0</b>	No relevant knowledge or understanding displayed.

Credit **could** be given for:

- Evaluation of relevant case material.
- Evaluation of the main approaches in profiling.
- Evaluation of psychological assumptions underpinning profiling.
- Evaluation of profiling as an activity in general (e.g. ethics, efficacy).
- 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 materials 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.