



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2019

**A LEVEL
PSYCHOLOGY - UNIT 3
1290U30-1**

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 GCE A LEVEL PSYCHOLOGY**UNIT 3****SUMMER 2019 MARK SCHEME****1. Addictive behaviours**

(a) Describe **two** individual differences explanations for addictive behaviours.

[10]

Credit could be given for:

- Lang's addictive personality traits. Lang identified several personality factors that can contribute to the emergence of an addiction, including behaving impulsively and seeking instant gratification, valuing non-conformity over the accepted values of society, experiencing heightened stress and lacking coping skills, and tolerating deviance and feeling socially isolated. He argued that there was not what he called a "necessary and sufficient" trait for addiction but that the factors he identified would be useful in the treatment of addiction.
- Cognitive biases. This is a cognitive explanation which starts with the assumption that addiction is an irrational act and therefore must be underpinned by irrational thinking or 'cognitive biases'. These include mental shortcuts (heuristics) including the representativeness bias (that random events have a pattern and that it is possible to generalise from a very small sample of events to 'what should always happen') and the availability bias (that events are more likely because we hear about them, or can recall them easily, so new reports of lottery winners may make us more likely to believe that we can win).
- Eysenck's theory of personality. Eysenck suggested that addictions develop because they serve a need relating to the individual's personality profile. Addicts tend to have high Psychoticism and Neuroticism scores which are likely to be linked to impulsivity and self-medication.
- Field dependence. This is the tendency to rely on either internal or external referents in making perceptual judgements. Field-dependents show less differentiation in social perceptions and interactions compared to field-independents. There appears to be a high correlation between field-dependence and addiction, especially to alcohol although the explanation for this relationship is not completely understood.
- Any other appropriate individual differences explanation.

Marks	AO1
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two individual differences explanations of addictive behaviour is thorough and accurate. • There is depth and range to material included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical Structure.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two individual differences explanations of addictive behaviour is reasonably detailed and accurate. • There is depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two individual differences explanations of addictive behaviour is basic in detail and accuracy. • There is depth or range only in material used. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Reasonable structure. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one individual differences explanation of addictive behaviour is thorough and accurate.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two individual differences explanations of addictive behaviour is superficial in detail and accuracy. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one individual differences explanation of addictive behaviour is reasonably detailed and accurate.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

- (b) Some psychologists would suggest that individual differences explanations do not explain addictive behaviours compared to other explanations.

With reference to this statement, evaluate individual differences explanations of addictive behaviours. [15]

Individual differences explanations include Lang's personality traits, cognitive biases and field-dependence. Evaluation issues related to these include:

- The validity of the explanation/ evidence for and against the explanation. For example, research relating personality to addiction is usually correlational and does not show that personality is the cause of the addiction (it may be the effect). However recent research by Dong *et al.* (2013) was prospective rather than retrospective and supported the link between addiction and high P and N scores. Biological factors may be stronger predictors of addiction, but it is also possible that biological and personality factors interact. Evidence for cognitive biases comes from Griffiths (1994) who found that regular gamblers made significantly more irrational verbalisations than non-regular gamblers. Joukhador (2003) found that problem gamblers scored much higher on the Gambling Belief Questionnaire which measures cognitive biases. However, this evidence may simply be describing the thoughts of gamblers rather than explaining the behaviours. Attentional bias is also supported by Johnson *et al.* (1997).
- The usefulness of the explanation. How useful is it to identify a personality type that is correlated with addiction? If a risk for addiction could be predicted from personality type would this be ethical? What would be the social and political implications be? As we all display cognitive biases, it would be difficult to use cognitive biases as a predictor of addictive behaviours, but it would be useful to a cognitive therapist, who could identify and address the cognitive biases held by the individual.
- The relevance of the explanation to different types of addictive behaviour. McNamara *et al.* found that impulsivity increased the likelihood of some addictions but not others, perhaps lessening its usefulness. The cognitive biases of representativeness and availability may be useful in explain gambling behaviour, but they may not be useful in explaining other addictive behaviours.
- The application of the explanation to the method of modification. Understanding cognitive biases may be applied to Cognitive Restructuring. However, this may not apply to other types of addictive behaviours.
- Methodological issues such as the use of different methods, problems of control and sample sizes.
- Ethical issues such as the use of vulnerable individuals.
- Any other appropriate evaluation.

Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence used is well-chosen and applied effectively. • The evaluation of individual differences explanations of addictive behaviours has been effectively applied to the statement. • The details are accurate.
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate evidence used and applied. • The evaluation of individual differences explanations of addictive behaviours has been applied to the statement. • The details are mostly accurate.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence used is applied only superficially. • The evaluation of individual differences explanations of addictive behaviours has been applied in superficial ways to the statement. • There may be inaccuracies throughout.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence included. • No attempt at application.

Marks	AO3
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thorough evaluation made of individual differences explanations of addictive behaviours. • Structure is logical throughout. • Depth and range included. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable evaluation is made of individual differences explanations of addictive behaviours. • Structure is mostly logical. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic evaluation is made of individual differences explanations of addictive behaviours. • Structure is reasonable. • Depth or range. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superficial evaluation is made of individual differences explanations of addictive behaviours. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

2. Autistic spectrum behaviours

- (a) Describe **two** individual differences explanations of autistic spectrum behaviours.

[10]

The individual differences explanations named on the specification are:

- Gender differences- When it comes to developmental disorders of the brain, there are significant gender differences. Males are at far greater risk for neurodevelopmental disorders such as autism spectrum disorder (ASD) than females.
- Theory of mind -This explanation focuses on one of the key cognitive deficits observed in people who display autistic spectrum behaviours, an inability to understand that others have thoughts and feelings that are different from their own and an inability to take the perspective of another individual.
- Weak central coherence – this explanation also focusses in cognitive deficits, but this explanation looks at our ability to integrate fine detail into an overall coherent pattern. Those individuals who display autistic spectrum behaviours often struggle to identify the ‘bigger picture’ and may become overly focussed on detail.
- Any other appropriate individual differences explanation.

Marks	AO1
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two individual differences explanations of autistic spectrum behaviours is thorough and accurate. • There is depth and range to material included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical Structure.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two individual differences explanations of autistic spectrum behaviours is reasonably detailed and accurate. • There is depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two individual differences explanations of autistic spectrum behaviours is basic in detail and accuracy. • There is depth or range only in material used. • Some use of appropriate terminology • Reasonable structure <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one individual differences explanation of addictive behaviour is thorough and accurate.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two individual differences explanations of autistic spectrum behaviours is superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology • Answer lacks structure. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one individual differences explanation of addictive behaviour is reasonably detailed and accurate.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

- (b) (i) Briefly explain how social psychological explanations could be applied to modifying autistic spectrum behaviours. [5]

Credit can be given for:

- A demonstration of the understanding of the way that the general social psychological approach could be applied to modifying autistic spectrum behaviours.
- Linking the social psychological approach to a broad (or specific named) method of modifying autistic spectrum behaviours (most likely the Relationship Development Intervention or the Picture Exchange Communication System).
- Social psychological explanations focus on relationships, thinking styles and communication. Relationship Development Intervention aims to develop what Gutstein (2009) called dynamic intelligence, the ability to think flexibly and to consider alternative views. This intervention works with the whole family, rather than just the individual and focusses on interactions and activities for the whole family (the social environment so social-psychological), designed to help the individual form relationships and emotional bonds within this social environment.
- Picture Exchange Communication System may be mentioned here with a focus on relationships (the learner, the teacher, the facilitator) and the use of modelling and reinforcement.
- Modifications based on empathising -systemising theory using toys such as Lego or building blocks (which appeal to the systemising brain) can be used to develop social skills by asking children to work in small groups where each has a different role. One may be the supplier of the bricks, one the designer and the other the builder. Baron-Cohen has also developed two DVD resources based on E-S theories which are called Mindreading and Transporters. Both of these develop the ability to recognise and understand emotion in facial expressions. It is also possible to propose therapeutic intervention based on the refrigerator parenting explanation although from the original work of Bettelheim the suggestion would have been to simply remove the child from the family home and bring them up in a warm, nurturing environment.
- Any other appropriate content.

N.B. Candidates are not required to demonstrate detailed knowledge of specific methods of modifying behaviours other than the named methods from the specification.

Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The way in which social psychological explanations could be applied to modifying autistic spectrum behaviours has been clearly explained. • The details are accurate.
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The way in which social psychological explanations could be applied to modifying autistic spectrum behaviours has been explained. • The details are mostly accurate.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social psychological explanations have only been superficially applied to one method of modifying autistic spectrum behaviours. • There may be inaccuracies throughout.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence included. • No attempt at application.

(ii) Evaluate the methods of modifying autistic spectrum behaviours. [10]

There are two methods of modifying autistic spectrum disorders named on the specification.

Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS) – a technique using picture cards designed to improve functional communication. Evaluation points might include:

- Evidence for the effectiveness of PECS. Charlop-Christy *et al.* (2002) found evidence to support the three central claims of PECS: helping children with ASD acquire spontaneous speech, that it is easy to learn, and that it generalises well to non-training situations.
- However, a meta-analysis conducted by Flippin concluded that PECS was only 'fairly effective' and there was little evidence for long term improvements. Very little evidence for spontaneous speech and some evidence that PECS actually delayed speech development.
- Strengths and weakness of the research evidence (such as sample size). For example, the study described above by Charlop-Christy was conducted with only three participants.
- Ease of use. Flippin *et al.* argue that the reason PECS is so popular is that it is so easy to use. The materials are simple to use and crucially, the child does not have to be able to maintain eye contact before the training can begin. The pictures can be easily modified to suit the individual child.
- Validity. PECS appears to have good face validity for teachers and for parents (however the lack of evidence for its effectiveness needs to be considered here).
- Ethical implications. If there is evidence that PECS can have negative effects, should it be in use? Should we be withholding items from children until they can exchange a picture? Baron-Cohen argues that this is unethical and that it would be better to use something that the child is already interested in (such as his interactive DVDs). However, the child is rewarded for using pictures and this could be seen in a positive light. The child may also increase their motivation and self-esteem as the programme progresses.
- Social and financial implications. PECS is a commercial venture and the organisation (Pyramid Educational Consultants) producing the materials insist that users are trained, which is expensive and only available through them. More information about the products and the courses can be found here <https://pecs-unitedkingdom.com/>.
- Any other appropriate evaluation.

Relationship Development Intervention – a technique to modify the way the individual perceives others and to develop their theory of mind. Evaluation points might include:

- Evidence for the effectiveness of RDI. Evidence suggests that RDI is highly effective. In one study, Gutstein (2007) found that the majority of children who had undergone RDI showed 'remarkable' improvements in both social and educational skills. However, this was not an independent study conducted by objective and impartial researchers. This was a study conducted by the commercial organisation providing RDI. This can be seen as a source of bias.
- Lack of research / limitations of research. There are no objective, peer reviewed studies of RDI. There are no studies which compared children undergoing with RDI with a control group of children who were not undergoing RDI. An organisation called Research Autism UK states that they are unable to recommend its use due to the lack of good quality research.

- Ethical implications. Even though there is no good quality research supporting the use of RDI, many parents report success, particularly in terms of reducing pressure within family life and increasing the self-esteem of the individual with ASD. However, this should be balanced against what Flanagan describes as ‘offering false hope’.
- Financial and social implications. RDI is a commercial organisation (<http://www.rdiconnect.com/about-rdi/>) whose primary aim is to make money. It is important to ensure that treatments are not invested in without the appropriate research evidence to back this up. This needs to be understood within the context of ever increasing diagnoses of ASD and the danger of unscrupulous organisations seeing this as a financial opportunity.
- Any other appropriate evaluation point.
- Any other appropriate method of modifying autistic spectrum behaviours.

Marks	AO3
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thorough evaluation made of methods of modifying autistic spectrum behaviours. • Structure is logical throughout. • Depth and range included. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable evaluation is made of methods of modifying autistic spectrum behaviours. • Structure is mostly logical. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic evaluation is made of methods of modifying autistic spectrum behaviours. • Structure is reasonable. • Depth or range. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superficial evaluation is made of methods of modifying autistic spectrum behaviours. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

3. Bullying behaviours

David has been in trouble in school for acts of both physical and verbal aggression and is at risk of being excluded. Both his father and his older brother also show high levels of aggression. David's teacher describes him as struggling to understand how other children are feeling and often reacts badly when criticised.

- (a) Describe how **two** explanations of bullying behaviours can be applied to the above scenario. [15]

Any explanation of bullying can be used to answer this question. These include:

Biological explanations.

- **Bullying genes.** This explanation is based on the assumption that there may be genes underpinning bullying behaviours and has a particular focus on studies that show a genetic component to aggression.
- **Evolved gender differences.** This is an evolutionary theory which suggests that some adaptive advantage may result from bullying such as status and dominance and therefore a greater chance of survival / reproduction.
- **Hormones.** Both testosterone and cortisol have been shown to be implicated in bullying behaviours.
- Any other appropriate biological explanation can be credited.

Individual differences explanations.

- **Cognitive biases.** Cognitive biases associated with bullying include the tendency to interpret others' behaviour as hostile and provocative and underestimate their own responsibilities in experiencing problems relating to others.
- **Narcissistic personality.** The narcissistic personality is one that gains pleasure from admiring themselves. The three key features of this personality type are grandiosity, arrogance and lack of empathy. This can lead to bullying due to the negative relationships that this personality type tends to cultivate; relationships with people who give them attention and make them feel superior. Narcissists are over sensitive to criticism and this can also lead to them bullying others.
- **Theory of mind.** Theory of Mind is key in understanding that other people have thoughts and feelings that are different from our own. This explanation of bullying suggests that bullies are not simply lacking in social skills but are particularly skilled at selecting and manipulating victims.

Social psychological explanations

- **Cultural differences.** Bullying is more common in some cultures than in others. There are also important differences in the way that bullying is perceived and responded to in different cultures. For example, bullying is more acceptable in Asian countries, especially when workplace bullying is considered. These differences are thought to reflect cultural norms relating to aggression and anti-social behaviour more generally.
- **In-group/out-group.** This explains bullying as a consequence of our need to feel part of groups and therefore not part of other groups. In order to feel positive about ourselves, we need to identify our in group and our out group – putting the out group down, discriminating against them etc. is a way of making our in group more positive.
- **Moral disengagement.** This explanation was proposed by Bandura and comes from social cognitive theory. We generally hold standards for appropriate behaviour that we judge ourselves by – we behave morally because otherwise we would judge ourselves negatively. However, we are able to disengage from these standards gradually and 'allow' ourselves to behave in more negative ways. This involves cognitive restructuring, minimising one's role and ignoring or distorting consequences.
- Any other appropriate explanation.

Credit application to the scenario as AO2.

Marks	AO1
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two explanations of bullying is thorough and accurate. • There is depth and range to material included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical Structure.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two explanations of bullying is reasonably detailed and accurate. • There is depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two explanations of bullying is basic in detail and accuracy. • There is depth or range only in material used. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Reasonable structure. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one explanation of bullying is thorough and accurate
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two explanations of bullying is superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology • Answer lacks structure. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one explanation of bullying is reasonably detailed and accurate.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanations are thoroughly applied to the scenario throughout. • The evidence used is well-chosen and applied effectively to the example of bullying. • The details are accurate.
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanations are reasonably applied to the scenario, although there may be some aspects which are not applied. • Appropriate evidence used and applied to the example of bullying. • The details are mostly accurate.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanations have only been superficially applied to the scenario. • There may be inaccuracies throughout.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence included. • No attempt at application.

(b) Evaluate biological explanations of bullying behaviours.

[10]

The three biological explanations named on the specification are bullying genes, evolved gender differences, hormones.

The focus of the answer should be on the evaluation of the explanations rather than simple description of the methods (which would be A01). Points may include:

- Support for / against the explanation. Evidence for the bullying gene comes from a huge number of studies that support the argument that there are genes for aggression. For example, Rhee and Waldman (2002) conducted a meta-analysis of studies looking at aggression and anti-social behaviours and found that genetic influences explained 41% of the variation. This is good evidence for the role of genetic factors but also suggests that other factors are also important. Ball *et al.* (2008) explored bullying, rather than simply aggression, through a longitudinal twin study and found 63% concordance for MZ twins and 33% for DZ twins. Again, this confirms the importance of genetic factors but also that other factors are also important. This is the diathesis-stress explanation; that genes and the environment interact. It is likely that an early trauma is the precipitating factor.
There is support for the evolved gender differences explanation of bullying, for example that the verbal bullying of girls by girls seems to be directed at reducing the appeal of the victim to members of the opposite sex (Owens *et al.*, 2000). There is also evidence that bullying by boys is more physical than bullying by girls and that boys are more likely to be both the bully and the victim of bullying in almost every culture. This provides support for the evolutionary argument / that this is innate.
- The usefulness of the explanation/ The application of the explanation to the method of modification. Genetic explanations of bullying are likely to overlap significantly with genetic explanations of aggression and other forms of anti-social behaviour. It is difficult to imagine that bullying could be separated from these other forms of behaviour and explained in genetic terms, especially when we consider the range of behaviours that bullying can take.
Understanding the evolutionary nature of bullying can be useful although this does suggest that such behaviours are difficult to eradicate. Bullying has benefits for the bully and therefore the only way to reduce this behaviour is to increase the costs of bullying (and increase the benefits of not bullying).
- Methodological issues. Strengths and weaknesses of twin / adoption studies. Problems in defining / measuring bullying. Social desirability bias in self-reports.
- Any other appropriate evaluation.

Marks	AO3
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thorough evaluation made of biological explanations of bullying. • Structure is logical throughout. • Depth and range included. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable evaluation is made of biological explanations of bullying. • Structure is mostly logical. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic evaluation is made of biological explanations of bullying. • Structure is reasonable. • Depth or range. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superficial evaluation is made of biological explanations of bullying. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

4. Criminal behaviours

- (a) (i) Briefly describe the characteristics of criminal behaviours. [5]

The characteristics of criminal behaviour could be addressed in different ways:

- Characteristics of the behaviour that need to be present to be considered a crime: The behaviour causes harm to a victim (physical, psychological, financial). Criminal intent must be present. The harm must be legally forbidden.
- Risk factors for criminal behaviours (genetic factors, prenatal factors, upbringing, exposure to violent models, birth trauma combined with early rejection, poverty, peer groups, use of drugs and alcohol, mental illness.).
- Types of individuals committing different types (white collar, violent etc.) of crime (age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status).
- Farr and Gibbons suggested 7 different categories of criminal behaviour: Property/predatory crime, Property/fraudulent crime, Interpersonal violence general, Interpersonal violence sexual, Transactional vice, Order disruption, Folk/mundane crime.
- Any other appropriate characteristic.

Marks	AO1
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the characteristics of criminal behaviours is thorough and accurate. • There is depth and range to the material included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical structure.
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the characteristics of criminal behaviours is reasonably detailed and accurate. • There is depth and range to the material used but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Structure is mostly logical.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the characteristics of criminal behaviours is basic in detail and accuracy. • There is depth or range only in material used. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

(ii) Describe **one** social psychological explanation of criminal behaviours.

[5]

Social psychological explanations named on the specification include:

- Differential association theory (Sutherland): attitudes to criminal behaviour are important, someone who learns pro-crime attitudes through association with criminals will be more likely to commit a crime, criminal behaviour is also learnt through association with criminals (and via conditioning/reward) and becomes internalised.
- Gender socialisation. This is broadly a social learning explanation which applies knowledge about gender roles in general to criminal behaviour. For example, boys are encouraged to take risks more than girls are, boys are encouraged to demonstrate physical strength more than girls. Conversely girls are more controlled / monitored than boys. This gives more both more motivation and more opportunity.
- Normalisation theory. This is also a social learning approach and considers the key role of the media in the normalisation of crime and our desensitisation to it.
- Any other appropriate social psychological explanation.

Marks	AO1
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one social psychological explanation of criminal behaviours is thorough and accurate. • There is depth and range to the material included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical structure.
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one social psychological explanation of criminal behaviours is reasonably detailed and accurate. • There is depth and range to the material used but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Structure is mostly logical.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one social psychological explanation of criminal behaviours is basic in detail and accuracy. • There is depth or range only in material used. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

- (b) Some psychologists would suggest that criminal behaviours can only be understood through a combination of different explanations.

With reference to this statement, evaluate explanations of criminal behaviours.

[15]

Explanations of criminal behaviours could include:

- Biological explanations -disinhibition hypothesis, inherited criminality, role of the amygdala.
- Individual differences explanations – Eysenck’s criminal personality, intelligence factors, psychopathic personality.
- Social psychological explanations – differential association theory, gender socialisation, normalisation theory.

The focus of the answer should be on the evaluation of the explanations rather than simple description of the explanations (which would be A01). Points may include:

- Evidence for / against the explanation. Biological explanations: support for inherited criminality from adoption studies (e.g. Mednick *et al.* 1987). Research can often be correlational rather than experimental (difficult to conduct experiments in this area). Gospic *et al.* offer support for the role of the amygdala in aggression (but not necessarily all crime) in their Ultimate Game study. Longitudinal studies by Raine *et al.* support the role of biological factors in predicting later aggressive behaviours (especially when combined with birth trauma or early maternal rejection). Individual differences explanations: evidence supports the link between extraversion and psychoticism and criminal / anti-social behaviour (e.g. Dunlop). Evidence that personality has a biological component / is innate (Zuckerman). Recent evidence however suggests that personality is not consistent (Graham *et al.* 2017) and this would reduce the strength of this evidence. There are weaknesses of all psychometric tests such as social desirability bias. Evidence that offenders tend to make hostile attributions (Schoneberg) and misinterpret nonverbal cues. Levels of moral reasoning may differ between different types of offenders (although Kohlberg is a theory of moral reasoning and not moral behaviour). Social psychological explanations: differential association theory was an important development in the understanding of social / environmental factors in crime (Osborn & West, Farrington). Some longitudinal research supports the role of social factors (Farrington) although this is correlational and not experimental.
- The usefulness of the explanation. Biological explanations tend to focus on aggressive crimes and offer little support for other crimes. Issues for criminal justice system if can argue that the behaviour was innate and therefore not within the individuals’ control. Personality factors may be useful in predicting likely offenders (but not if personality is not consistent over time) but knowledge of personality may be useful in determining treatment (psychopathic individuals are not helped by treatments such as anger management and social skills training). Cognitive distortions and biases can be useful in understanding the offender. Differential association theory expanded the definitions of crime to include white collar crime, but still is unlikely to be able to account for all crime.
The application of the explanation to the method of modification. Biological explanations may lead to the possibility of biological treatments (drugs, surgery) although this raises significant ethical concerns. Some more ethical suggestions include diet (Gesch) and ear acupuncture. Cognitive distortions and biases important in developing treatment programmes such as anger management.

- Position on debates such as nature – nurture, free will – determinism. Biological explanations tend to be on the nature side of the debate although increasingly the focus on the interaction between genetic predisposition and environmental triggers. Biological explanations tend to be deterministic and this raises interesting issues for the criminal justice system relating to responsibility.
- Any other appropriate evaluation.

Credit explicit reference to the statement as AO2.

Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence used is well-chosen and applied effectively to the statement. • The details are accurate.
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate evidence used and applied to the statement. • The details are mostly accurate.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence used is applied only superficially to the statement. • There may be inaccuracies throughout.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence included. • No attempt at application.

Marks	AO3
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thorough evaluation made of explanations of criminal behaviours. • Structure is logical throughout. • Depth and range included. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable evaluation is made of explanations of criminal behaviours. • Structure is mostly logical. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic evaluation is made of explanations of criminal behaviours. • Structure is reasonable. • Depth or range. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superficial evaluation is made of explanations of criminal behaviours. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

5. Schizophrenia

Rhian has been experiencing some distressing symptoms and has been referred to a psychiatrist. She reports hearing voices and is worried that people are watching her. Her father reports that Rhian often does not go to work, has a lack of interest in what is going on around her and shows very little emotion. He worries that recent family problems may have affected his daughter.

- (a) Describe how **two** explanations of schizophrenia could be applied to the above scenario.

[15]

Explanations of schizophrenia named on the specification include:

Biological explanations

- Cannabis influence on brain chemistry. This biological explanation considers the role of early cannabis use in the development of schizophrenia, particularly where there is also a genetic predisposition to the disorder.
- Dopamine hypothesis. This explanation focusses on the role of the neurotransmitter, dopamine. Too much or too little of a neurotransmitter can affect the messages that are sent across synapses and may account for the symptoms of schizophrenia such as delusions and hallucinations.
- Enlarged ventricles. This explanation focusses on abnormalities of brain structure. There is evidence to suggest that the four ventricles in the brain are enlarged in those with schizophrenia.

Individual differences explanations

- Thought disorder. This is a cognitive explanation suggesting that schizophrenia can be explained in terms of dysfunctions in the perceptual and attentional processing. This has been used to explain hallucinations and other negative symptoms.
- Schizophrenogenic mother. This explanation comes from the psychodynamic approach and argues that the mother-child relationship is crucial in understanding normal and abnormal development. Schizophrenogenic mothers are both overprotective and controlling and at the same time, rejecting and distant, producing an extremely vulnerable child.
- Sex differences. Schizophrenia is more common in males than females and this is likely to be due to specific behaviours that are also more commonly found in males, such as substance abuse or different life events.

Social psychological explanations

- Cultural norms (Different cultural norms for behaviour, particularly in young males can influence the likelihood of being diagnosed as suffering from schizophrenia particularly where the patient is from a different culture to the psychiatrist. There is also evidence of cultural differences in the progression of the disorder; Schizophrenic patients in Western developed countries showed a higher frequency of depressive symptoms, primary delusions, thought insertion and thought broadcasting, while in non-Western developing countries visual and directed auditory hallucinations were more frequent.
- Dysfunctional families (failure to provide for physical or emotional needs of children, coupled with rigid expectations, authoritarianism, exploitation and other forms of abuse produce a variety of effects in children including 'reality shifting' and inappropriate communication patterns and emotional responses).
- Expressed emotion (or EE is a measure of how the relatives of someone suffering from schizophrenia talk about this person. Family members with high expressed emotion are hostile, very critical and not tolerant of the patient. They feel like they are helping by having this attitude. They not only criticise behaviours relating to the disorder but also other behaviours that are unique to the personality of the patient. High levels of EE can act as potential triggers for the development of schizophrenia and can worsen the

prognosis of someone with the disorder. Low expressed emotion is when the family members are more reserved with their criticism. The family members feel that the patient doesn't have control over the disorder. Low expressed emotion causes a different kind of stress and it is less directly aimed at the patient. High or low expressed emotion makes the patient feel trapped, out of control and dependent upon others. The patient may feel like an outsider because of the excessive attention received).

- Any other explanation.
- Credit application to the scenario as AO2.

Marks	AO1
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two explanations of schizophrenia is thorough and accurate. • There is depth and range to material included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical Structure.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two explanations of schizophrenia is reasonably detailed and accurate. • There is depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two explanations of schizophrenia is basic in detail and accuracy. • There is depth or range only in material used. • Some use of appropriate terminology. • Reasonable structure. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one explanation of schizophrenia is thorough and accurate.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two explanations of schizophrenia is superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology. • Answer lacks structure. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one explanation of schizophrenia is reasonably detailed and accurate.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted

Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanations are thoroughly applied to the scenario throughout. • The details are accurate.
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanations are reasonably applied to the scenario. • The details are mostly accurate.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanations are applied only superficially to the scenario. • There may be inaccuracies throughout.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence included. • No attempt at application.

(b) Evaluate social psychological explanations of schizophrenia.

[10]

Social psychological explanations of schizophrenia named on the specification are:

Cultural norms
Dysfunctional families
Expressed emotion

The focus of the answer should be on the evaluation of the explanations rather than simple description of the explanations (which would be A01). Points may include:

- Evidence for / against the explanation. Dysfunctional families: There is little evidence to support the double bind hypothesis and it is possible that parents of those with schizophrenia may adopt unusual styles of communication in order to deal with a child with schizophrenia. There is evidence for expressed emotion (e.g. Vaughn & Leff) which shows that relapse rates are significantly higher in those with high EE. Methodological problems here include shared environment: not possible to determine whether schizophrenia is the result of shared genes or family environment if sufferers are brought up within their genetic family. Likely that a diathesis-stress explanation is more appropriate: that certain types of family environments act as a trigger for genetically predisposed individuals. Urban environments produce higher rates of schizophrenia than rural ones although the evidence here is mixed, and this may be a result of social drift rather than any causal factors.
- The usefulness of the explanation/ The application of the explanation to the method of modification. Understanding family dynamics is crucial for therapists working in family intervention.
- Any other appropriate evaluation.

Marks	A03
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thorough evaluation made of social psychological explanations of schizophrenia. • Structure is logical throughout. • Depth and range included. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable evaluation is made of social psychological explanations of schizophrenia. • Structure is mostly logical. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic evaluation is made of social psychological explanations of schizophrenia. • Structure is reasonable. • Depth or range. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superficial evaluation is made of social psychological explanations of schizophrenia. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

6. Stress

- (a) (i) Describe **two** social psychological explanations of stress. [10]

Social psychological explanations of stress named on the specification include:

- Daily Hassles. It is thought that daily hassles are a significant source of stress. These are daily stressors such as arguing with family or lack of car park spaces which, little and often, will infuriate an individual and fuel their reaction to stress.
- Life events. It is thought that important life events (e.g. divorce, health issues) fuel our stress levels and that we adapt our way of living to cope with them. Researchers have developed scales to measure the impact of the life events and noted a relationship between the individual suffering with stress related illnesses and life events.
- Locus of control. People who have internal locus of control are in control of the things happening to them; whereas external locus of control displays the opposite.
- Any other appropriate social psychological explanation to be credited.

Marks	AO1
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two social psychological explanations for stress is thorough and accurate. • There is depth and range to material included. • Effective use of terminology throughout. • Logical Structure.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two social psychological explanations of stress is reasonably detailed and accurate. • There is depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure • Good use of terminology. • Mostly logical structure.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two social psychological explanations of stress is basic in detail and accuracy. • There is depth or range only in material used • Some use of appropriate terminology • Reasonable structure <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one social psychological explanation of stress is thorough and accurate
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of two social psychological explanations of stress is superficial. • Very little use of appropriate terminology • Answer lacks structure. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of one social psychological explanation of stress is reasonably detailed and accurate
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given • No response attempted

- (ii) Briefly explain how social psychological explanations can be applied to modifying stress. [5]

Credit can be given for:

- Linking the social psychological explanations to a broad (or specific named) method of modifying stress (most likely the use of stress inoculation training).
- For example, stress inoculation training (SIT) works through giving individuals experiences of small stressors so that they can prepare themselves for future stressors and increase their hardiness. The use of SIT could aid in dealing with daily hassles such as car problems by being familiar with the experience of small stressors and having the belief and coping mechanisms to deal appropriately with those stressors.
- Any other appropriate content.

N.B. Candidates are not required to demonstrate detailed knowledge of specific methods of modifying behaviours other than the named methods from the specification.

Marks	AO2
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The way in which social psychological explanations could be applied to modifying stress has been clearly explained. • The details are accurate.
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The way in which social psychological explanations could be applied to modifying stress has been explained. • The details are mostly accurate.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social psychological explanations have only been superficially applied to one method of modifying stress. • There may be inaccuracies throughout.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence included. • No attempt at application.

(b) Evaluate **one** method of modifying stress.

[10]

The methods of modifying stress identified on the specification are Beta-blockers and Stress Inoculation Training.

The focus of the answer should be on the evaluation of the methods rather than simple description of the methods (which would be A01).

Beta-blockers

- Evidence for their effectiveness. There is evidence that betablockers reduce performance anxiety (e.g. Neftel *et al.*) although there are individual differences in the effectiveness (Schweizer *et al.*). Other evidence suggests beta blockers can help people reduce anxiety driven habits and focus on their main goal (Schwabe *et al.*).
- Strengths and limitations of beta blockers: betablockers are effective in reducing physiological effects of stress but do not deal with the psychological / emotional effects, although the use of drugs may make it easier for someone to access other types of therapies.
- Ethical implications (side effects). Beta blockers do have side effects which include dizziness, blurred vision and sleep problem. There are also problems associated with stopping the drug and it is generally advised that the individual reduces their dose slowly rather than stopping suddenly. Their use in sports competitions is banned even though they do not directly affect performance (only the anxiety associated with the performance).
- Social and financial implications. Stress is a huge problem in the developed world and the use of drugs over psychological therapies may be simply responding to psychological, social and emotional problems with a biological treatment, masking the real problems.
- Any other appropriate evaluation.

Stress Inoculation Training

- The effectiveness of SIT: There is plenty of evidence for the effectiveness of SIT (Saunders *et al.*, Sheery & Horan) in a range of different situations. It is more difficult to identify the effective component of SIT and it is likely that is the combination of components with the application phase that is significant. Prolonged exposure is thought to be more effective for PTSD. The combination of SIT with other methods (such as beta-blockers) is commonly used, as the biological effects of the beta blockers allow the individual to engage in the therapy more effectively.
- Compared to drug therapies, SIT deals with the stress directly, teaching people how to identify stress and develop effective techniques for dealing with it. Cognitive methods such as SIT also provide the patient with a 'tool' that can be used in future cases of stress. However, some situations will never be within the individual's control. SIT is time consuming and expensive. It has also been suggested that it requires a certain level of intelligence or education to communicate with the analyst. This may make it unsuitable for certain members of the population.
Ethical implications. Possibility of psychological harm / distress through being asked to relive stressful situations. Cost – benefit analysis here would suggest that short term distress worth it for the longer term gains.
- Social and financial implications. As noted above, stress is a major concern in society and has a huge financial impact in terms of days' work lost and long-term health implications. Any treatment that reduces stress will have positive outcomes for society as a whole. However, companies could be criticised for setting up general stress management courses as an easy option rather than trying to tackle causes of workplace stress. This removes the blame from the organisation and places it with the individual.
- Any other appropriate evaluation.

Marks	AO3
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thorough evaluation made of one method of modifying stress. • Structure is logical throughout. • Depth and range included. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable evaluation is made of one method of modifying stress. • Structure is mostly logical. • Depth and range but not in equal measure. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic evaluation is made of one method of modifying stress. • Structure is reasonable. • Depth or range. • A basic conclusion is reached.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superficial evaluation is made of one method of modifying stress. • Answer lacks structure. • There is no conclusion.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

SECTION B: CONTROVERSIES

Answer **one** of the questions.

7. Scientific Status

Using examples from psychology, discuss the costs and benefits of psychology being a science.

[25]

This question explicitly addresses two of the four bullet points given under the heading of Scientific Status in the specification and these are

- Benefits of being a science to society and the economy
- Costs of being a science

However, material covered under the other two bullet points (changing nature of science and methodologies used by different approaches) is likely to also be relevant.

Benefits of being a science include:

- Provide objective evidence to support / refute claims.
- Use of rigorous scientific method means that research is objective, controlled, replicable.
- Use of peer review
- Is taken more seriously.
- Is distinguishable from 'common-sense' / 'armchair' psychology.
- This leads to benefits for society and the economy.
- Use of scientific methodologies / triangulation.

Costs of being a science include:

- Determinist.
- Reductionist.
- Can only study overt behaviour.
- Overly general / less focus on the individual. Treats individuals as research subjects (contrast with positive approach).
- Some subjects cannot be tested scientifically.
- Ignores the importance of social / cultural / time changes. Scientific factors may be reliable only in the short term.
- May be unethical to use scientific methods of investigation.
- Operationalizing variables/ focus on cause and effect may reduce the 'human experience' / may ignore the complexity of variables that influence any behaviour.
- Objectivity is difficult if not impossible (humans studying humans).
- Theoretical viewpoints can be a source of bias.
- Falsification means that we can never prove anything (just support hypotheses).

Examples of studies, theories and approaches can be drawn from any part of the specification.

Marks	AO2
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence used is well-chosen and effective in support and developing comments made. • Details are accurate throughout. • There is depth and range to material included. • Effective use of terminology.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence used is appropriate to support the comments made. • Details may have some minor inaccuracies. • There is depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure. • Good use of terminology.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence not always made relevant to comment. • There may be significant inaccuracies. • There is depth or range only in material used. • There is some use of appropriate terminology.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little credit-worthy evidence given. • Application of the evidence to the comment is inappropriate. • There is very little use of appropriate terminology.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

Marks	AO3
13-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sophisticated and articulate interpretation of the issue. • Thoroughly well-developed and balanced arguments. • Evaluative comments are evidently relevant to the context. • Structure is logical throughout. • An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.
10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good interpretation of the key issue. • Arguments made are thorough and balanced. • The evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context. • Structure is mostly logical. • A reasonable conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.
7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable interpretation of the key issue. • Arguments are reasonable but may be one-sided. • The evaluative comments made tend to be generic and not contextualised. • The structure is reasonable. • A basic conclusion is reached.
4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be some misinterpretation regarding the key issues. • Arguments made are basic but creditworthy. • Answer does not move beyond assertions. • Basic structure. • Any conclusion may be contradictory with flow of the answer.
1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no engagement with the issue beyond simple rewording. • Answer does not move beyond assertions. • Answer lacks clarity. • There is no conclusion.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate answer given. • No response attempted.

8. Cultural Bias

Discuss the controversy of cultural bias including reference to historical and social context. Use examples from psychology in your answer. [25]

The controversy of cultural bias on the specification includes the following bullet:

- Cross cultural studies
- Difference or bias
- Ethnocentrism
- Historical and Social context

Candidates must make reference to historical and social context as this is identified in the question but may also make reference to any other relevant material. The controversy might include:

- The extent to which psychology / psychological research is culturally biased.
- Emics, etics and imposed etics
- Natural tendency towards ethnocentrism
- Alpha and beta bias.
- Western bias in textbooks.
- Little awareness of psychology in non-western countries.
- The use of cross cultural studies.
- Funding and review mechanisms make widening participation unlikely
- Ways of attempting to make psychology free from cultural bias (use of different sample, use of local researchers etc.)
- Greater understanding of different cultures through cross cultural research
- Greater recognition of our own ethnocentrism through conducting research.
- Understanding that sub-cultures and time periods can also be understood as cultures and the importance of understanding the historical and social context in which the study was performed.

Examples of studies, theories and approaches can be drawn from any part of the specification.

Marks	AO2
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence used is well-chosen and effective in support and developing comments made. Details are accurate throughout. There is depth and range to material included. Effective use of terminology.
6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence used is appropriate to support the comments made. Details may have some minor inaccuracies. There is depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure. Good use of terminology.
3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence not always made relevant to comment. There may be significant inaccuracies. There is depth or range only in material used. There is some use of appropriate terminology.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little credit-worthy evidence given. Application of the evidence to the comment is inappropriate. There is very little use of appropriate terminology.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriate answer given. No response attempted.

Marks	AO3
13-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A sophisticated and articulate interpretation of the issue. Thoroughly well-developed and balanced arguments. Evaluative comments are evidently relevant to the context. Structure is logical throughout. An appropriate conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.
10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A good interpretation of the key issue. Arguments made are thorough and balanced. The evaluative comments are clearly relevant to the context. Structure is mostly logical. A reasonable conclusion is reached based on the evidence presented.
7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reasonable interpretation of the key issue. Arguments are reasonable but may be one-sided. The evaluative comments made tend to be generic and not contextualised. The structure is reasonable. A basic conclusion is reached.
4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May be some misinterpretation regarding the key issues. Arguments made are basic but creditworthy. Answer does not move beyond assertions. Basic structure. Any conclusion may be contradictory with flow of the answer.
1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no engagement with the issue beyond simple rewording. Answer does not move beyond assertions. Answer lacks clarity. There is no conclusion.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriate answer given. No response attempted.