

## Mark schemes

## Q1.

[AO1 = 3 AO3 = 5]

Level	Mark	Description
4	7-8	Knowledge of how behaviourists explain learning through the process of operant conditioning is accurate with some detail. Comparison of operant conditioning with social learning is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	5-6	Knowledge of how behaviourists explain learning through the process of operant conditioning is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Comparison of operant conditioning with social learning is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3-4	Limited knowledge of how behaviourists explain learning through the process of operant conditioning is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any comparison of operant conditioning with social learning is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	Knowledge of how behaviourists explain learning through the process of operant conditioning is limited. Comparison of operant conditioning with social learning is very limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible content – outline:**

- learning is shaped (and maintained) by its consequences/determined by association between response and consequences
- types of reinforcement (positive/negative) and their role in increasing the likelihood of a behaviour being repeated
- role of punishment in extinguishing behaviour
- Skinner's research.

**Possible comparisons:**

- direct/indirect reinforcement – in operant conditioning these processes are direct but in social learning these are vicarious/indirect and can occur through observation and imitation

- both assume that human development is a consequence of nurture; babies are born as 'blank slates upon which experience writes'; both suggest that behaviour is a result of learned associations and reinforcement/punishment; social learning involves mediational processes (cognition) and operant conditioning does not
- operant conditioning assumes a hard determinism position, that all behaviour is environmentally determined by external influences that we are unable to control (environmental determinism); social learning assumes a soft determinism position, that as well as being influenced by our environment cognitive factors can mediate learning, we also exert some influence upon it through the behaviours we choose to perform (reciprocal determinism)
- operant conditioning takes a reductionist approach to the study of behaviour by breaking complex actions into the simplest observable actions of the stimulus and the response; social learning is less reductionist because it allows for cognitive factors to mediate this learning
- both are nomothetic, believing we have shared processes for learning behaviour and using generalisation to develop general principles or laws of human behaviour
- both assume that all aspects of behaviour can be investigated scientifically and use laboratory experiments.

Credit other relevant material.

**Q2.****[AO1 = 3 AO3 = 5]**

Level	Mark	Description
4	7-8	Comparison of the humanistic and psychodynamic approaches is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	5-6	Comparison of the humanistic and psychodynamic approaches is mostly effective but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3-4	Comparison of the humanistic and psychodynamic approaches is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	Comparison of the humanistic and psychodynamic approaches is very limited. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

**Possible comparisons:**

- determinism – the humanistic approach assumes people have free choice over their behaviour, whereas the psychodynamic approach assumes that behaviour is determined by unconscious factors (beyond conscious control)
- nature/nurture – the humanistic approach assumes behaviour is affected by desire to self-actualise (nature) and our experience can provide barriers to this through conditions of worth and varying experience of conditional positive regard (nurture). Likewise, the psychodynamic approach assumes behaviour is driven by unconscious forces, eg id/ego/superego dynamics (nature) but our coping mechanisms such as defence mechanisms arise from experience (nurture)
- methodology – both are much less scientific than other approaches (but the psychodynamic approach assumes that some aspects of behaviour can be investigated scientifically)
- therapy – Rogers believed that counselling (utilising unconditional positive regard) can be used to help clients solve their problems, overcome conditions of worth and enable their potential for self-actualisation, whereas Freud believed that psychoanalysis can lead to improvements in clients through psychotherapy.

Credit other relevant material.