



# **GCE AS MARKING SCHEME**

**SUMMER 2022**

**AS  
PSYCHOLOGY – UNIT 1  
2290U10-1**

## INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2022 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

## GCE AS PSYCHOLOGY – UNIT 1

## SUMMER 2022 MARK SCHEME

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	TOTAL
1	14			14
2	6			6
3	8			8
4			10	10
5	4			4
6	8			8
7		10		10
8			4	4
9			6	6
10			10	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>80</b>

1. (a) Using examples from psychology, describe the 'localisation of brain function' assumption from the biological approach. [4]

Credit <b>will</b> be given for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lobes of the brain and specific functions e.g. frontal lobe linked to personality.</li> <li>• Examples such as Charles Whitman, Phineas Gage, Raine (1997) research.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate content.</li> </ul>	
Marks	AO1
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is thorough and clearly linked to psychology.</li> <li>• Effective use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable and linked to psychology.</li> <li>• Good use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is basic.</li> <li>• Link to psychology may not be clear.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description is superficial.</li> <li>• No link to psychology.</li> <li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

- (b) Describe the main components of the therapy you have studied from the biological approach (either drug therapy **OR** psychosurgery). [10]

<b>Drug Therapy</b>		<b>Psychosurgery</b>	
Credit <b>will</b> be given for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mode of action of specific drugs such as:</li><li>• Antidepressant drugs.</li><li>• Antipsychotic drugs.</li><li>• Antianxiety drugs.</li><li>• Any other appropriate content.</li></ul>		Credit <b>will</b> be given for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Examples of psychosurgery such as:</li><li>• Prefrontal lobotomy.</li><li>• Deep brain stimulation.</li><li>• Any other appropriate content.</li></ul>	
<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>		
<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description and level of accuracy is thorough.</li><li>• Depth and range are displayed.</li><li>• Effective use of appropriate terminology.</li><li>• Structure is logical.</li></ul>		
<b>6-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable.</li><li>• Depth or range is displayed, although not necessarily in equal measure.</li><li>• Good use of appropriate terminology.</li><li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li></ul>		
<b>3-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description and level of accuracy is basic.</li><li>• Depth or range.</li><li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li><li>• Structure is reasonable.</li></ul>		
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description and level of accuracy is superficial.</li><li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology.</li><li>• Answer lacks structure.</li></ul>		
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li><li>• No response attempted.</li></ul>		

2. Describe the findings from **both** the experiments in Loftus and Palmer's (1974) research '*Reconstruction of automobile destruction: an example of the interaction between language and memory*'. [6]

Credit **will** be given for:

*Experiment I*

- The table below illustrates the mean speed estimates for the various verbs:

Verb	Mean Estimate (mph)
Smashed	40.8
Collided	39.3
Bumped	38.1
Hit	34.0
Contacted	31.8

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

*Experiment II*

- The table below summarises the responses to the question, "Did you see any broken glass?" in each of the conditions:

Response	Smashed	Hit	Control
Yes	16	7	6
No	34	43	44

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

*Note:*

*Major inaccuracies – omissions, wrong integer number.*

*Minor inaccuracies – incorrect or missing fractional part.*

*If only one experiment is included, maximum of 3 marks awarded.*

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>
<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is thorough (no inaccuracies).</li> <li>• Depth and range are displayed.</li> </ul>
<b>4-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable (one major inaccuracy, up to two minor inaccuracies).</li> <li>• Depth or range is displayed, although not necessarily in equal measure.</li> </ul>
<b>2-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is basic (more than one major inaccuracy, more than two minor inaccuracies).</li> <li>• Depth or range is displayed.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is superficial (major inaccuracies throughout).</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

3. Using examples from psychology, describe **two** assumptions from the behaviourist approach. [4+4]

<p>Credit <b>will</b> be given for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blank slate; tabula rasa, role of conditioning behaviour, Little Albert Study.</li> <li>• Behaviour learnt through conditioning; classical conditioning, operant conditioning, Pavlov's Dogs, Skinner's Rats.</li> <li>• Humans and animals learn in similar ways; generalising animal research to humans, use of token economies based on animal research into conditioning.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate content.</li> </ul>	
Marks (per assumption)	AO1
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is thorough and clearly linked to psychology.</li> <li>• Effective use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable and linked to psychology.</li> <li>• Good use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is basic.</li> <li>• Link to psychology may not be clear.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description is superficial.</li> <li>• No link to psychology.</li> <li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>



4. Discuss the cognitive approach in terms of its strengths **and** weaknesses. [10]

Credit <b>will</b> be given for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deterministic nature of the approach.</li> <li>• Nomothetic nature of the approach.</li> <li>• Interactionist nature of the approach.</li> <li>• Comparison with other approaches.</li> <li>• Use of scientific method.</li> <li>• Application to therapeutic methods.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate content.</li> </ul>	
Marks	AO3
<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough discussion is made of both the strengths and weaknesses.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Depth and range are displayed.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
<b>6-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable discussion is made of both the strengths and weaknesses</li> <li>• Evaluative comments show some relevance to the context.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• Depth and range is displayed, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
<b>3-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic discussion is made of the strengths and weaknesses.</li> </ul> <b>OR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable discussion is made of the strengths or weaknesses.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are generic and not appropriately contextualised.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• A basic conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superficial discussion is made of the strengths and weaknesses.</li> </ul> <b>OR</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic discussion is made of strengths or weaknesses.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are superficial.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• No conclusion.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

5. Using **one** assumption from the positive approach, explain the formation of a relationship.

[4]

Credit **will** be given for:

- Acknowledgment of free will is demonstrated when individuals use dating sites and select the characteristics of their future partner.
- Authenticity of goodness and excellence, relationships allow the promotion of these qualities.
- Focus on the good life, connection to other, Basic Needs Theory, role of friendships and other relationships in promoting happiness and wellbeing (5 Ways to Wellbeing).
- Any other appropriate content.

Marks	AO1
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is thorough.</li> <li>• Description is clearly linked to formation of relationships.</li> <li>• Effective use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable.</li> <li>• Description is linked to formation of relationships.</li> <li>• Good use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is basic.</li> <li>• Link to formation of relationships may not be clear.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is superficial.</li> <li>• Muddled link to formation of relationships.</li> <li>• Little use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

6. Describe the procedures of Watson and Rayner's (1920) research '*Conditioned emotional reactions*'. [8]

Credit **will** be given for:

- At eight months, 26 days, they struck a hammer upon a suspended steel bar behind Albert to determine whether a fear reaction could be created by a loud sound.
- At approximately nine months Albert was introduced to tests to determine whether fear reactions can be created by stimuli other than 'sharp noises' and the 'sudden removal of support'.
- These tests involved suddenly confronting Albert with a white rat, a rabbit, a dog, a monkey, with masks with and without hair, cotton wool, burning papers etc.
- Albert's reactions were recorded with a motion picture camera.
- Testing to establish a conditioned emotional response started when Albert was 11 months old.
- 11 months 3 days: A white rat is presented to Albert who then reaches for it. As he touches the rat a loud noise is made behind him by hitting a steel bar with a hammer.
- 11 months 10 days: Joint stimulation: Rat is presented with no sound. Then joint stimulation begins with presenting the rat and sound three times, followed by rat alone, joint stimulation twice more, then rat alone. This stage demonstrates that a fear response can be conditioned to a neutral stimulus.
- 11 months 15 days: Generalisation: Albert was presented with the rat, wooden blocks, rabbit, dog, fur coat, cotton wool, John Watson's hair, the hair of two other observers, and a Santa Claus mask.
- 11 months 20 days: Change of environment. After more joint stimulation with the rat Albert was taken to a large well-lit lecture hall. The rat was presented alone. The rabbit is presented alone. The dog is presented alone. The rat is presented alone. Joint stimulation with rat and sound. Rat is presented alone. The rabbit is presented alone. The dog was presented alone. The dog barked. This experiment demonstrates that emotional transfers can occur.
- 1 year 21 days. Presented with the Santa Claus mask, fur coat, blocks, the rat, the rabbit and the dog.
- Planned 'detachment' was not undertaken as Albert was taken away from the hospital.
- Any other appropriate content.

Marks	AO1
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is thorough.</li> <li>• Depth and range are displayed.</li> <li>• Effective use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> </ul>
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is reasonable.</li> <li>• Depth and range are displayed, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> </ul>
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is basic.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description and level of accuracy is superficial.</li> <li>• Very little use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

7. Dan is studying AS Psychology and has been learning about the research carried out by Bowlby (1944). His teacher has suggested that Bowlby's research had many methodological and ethical problems. However, Dan disagrees.

With reference to the scenario, critically evaluate Bowlby's (1944) research '*Forty-four juvenile thieves: Their characters and home-life*'. [10]

Credit <b>will</b> be given for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methodological Issues e.g. cause and effect not established, use of qualitative data.</li> <li>• Validity Issues e.g. researcher bias, issues in self-report.</li> <li>• Ethical Issues e.g. confidentiality, valid consent in children.</li> <li>• Sampling Issues e.g. children in sample were all emotionally disturbed.</li> <li>• Alternative Evidence e.g. Romanian orphan studies.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate content.</li> </ul>	
Marks	AO2
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough discussion.</li> <li>• Depth and range are displayed.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Clear references are made to the scenario.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable discussion.</li> <li>• Depth and range are displayed, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• Reasonable references are made to the scenario.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic discussion.</li> <li>• Depth or range.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• Basic reference is made to the scenario.</li> <li>• A basic conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superficial discussion.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• Superficial or no reference is made to the scenario.</li> <li>• No conclusion.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

8. Discuss **one** difference between the psychodynamic and positive approaches. [4]

Credit <b>will</b> be given for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determinism e.g. 'free will' taken into account by positive approach, rejected by psychodynamic.</li> <li>• Disease model of psychodynamic approach compared to focus on promoting character strengths in positive.</li> <li>• Scientific Status e.g. positive approach uses scientific methods compared to unfalsifiable nature of psychodynamic approach.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate content.</li> </ul>	
Marks	AO3
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough discussion is made of the difference.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable discussion is made of the difference.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments show some relevance to the context.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic discussion is made of the difference.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are generic and not appropriately contextualised.</li> </ul>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superficial discussion is made of the difference.</li> <li>• Evaluative comments are superficial.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>• No response attempted.</li> </ul>

9. Evaluate aversion therapy **OR** systematic desensitisation in terms of ethical considerations. [6]

<b>Aversion Therapy</b>  Credit <b>will</b> be given for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physical and psychological harm caused compared to potential benefits.</li> <li>Issues of behavioural control.</li> <li>Historical uses of the therapy.</li> <li>Any other appropriate content.</li> </ul>		<b>Systematic Desensitisation</b>  Credit <b>will</b> be given for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considered more ethical than other behaviourist therapies.</li> <li>Issues of behavioural control.</li> <li>Issues of valid consent.</li> <li>Any other appropriate content.</li> </ul>
Marks	AO3	
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of ethical considerations is thorough and there is evidence of coherent elaboration.</li> <li>Depth and range are displayed.</li> <li>Evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context.</li> <li>Structure is logical throughout.</li> </ul>	
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of ethical considerations is reasonable and shows some coherence.</li> <li>Depth and range is displayed, although not necessarily in equal measure.</li> <li>Evaluative comments show some relevance to the context.</li> <li>Structure is mostly logical.</li> </ul>	
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation of ethical considerations is superficial.</li> <li>Material is muddled.</li> <li>Answer lacks structure.</li> </ul>	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>No response attempted.</li> </ul>	

10. Critically evaluate mindfulness **OR** quality of life therapy.

[10]

<b>Mindfulness</b>  Credit <b>will</b> be given for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectiveness: findings from research studies e.g. Kuyken et al (2013), Williams et al (2014), individual differences in effectiveness.</li> <li>Comparability to other therapies.</li> <li>Ethics of the process, a more positive approach, potential negative effects.</li> <li>Any other appropriate content.</li> </ul>		<b>Quality of Life Therapy</b>  Credit <b>will</b> be given for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectiveness: findings from research studies e.g. Abedi and Vostanis (2010), Toghyani et al (2011), individual differences in effectiveness.</li> <li>Comparability to other therapies.</li> <li>Ethics of the process, a more positive approach, potential negative effects.</li> <li>Any other appropriate content.</li> </ul>
<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO3</b>	
<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thorough discussion.</li> <li>Evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context.</li> <li>Structure is logical.</li> <li>Depth and range are displayed.</li> <li>An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>	
<b>6-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable discussion.</li> <li>Evaluative comments show some relevance to the context.</li> <li>Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>Depth and range is displayed, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>A reasonable conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>	
<b>3-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic discussion.</li> <li>Evaluative comments are generic and not appropriately contextualised.</li> <li>Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>Depth or range.</li> <li>A basic conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>	
<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Superficial discussion.</li> <li>Evaluative comments are superficial.</li> <li>Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>No conclusion.</li> </ul>	
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inappropriate answer given.</li> <li>No response attempted.</li> </ul>	