

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
1	a	<p>Explain why Freud's (1909) study of Little Hans can be viewed from the psychodynamic perspective.</p> <p>Understanding of a principle of the psychodynamic perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unconscious mind</li> <li>• Influence of (traumatic) early childhood experiences</li> </ul> <p>How Freud's study can be seen as psychodynamic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oedipus complex</li> <li>• Phallic stage of development</li> </ul> <p>Appropriate supporting evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence from Hans' phobia of horses</li> <li>• Fantasies - giraffe, plumber, children</li> </ul> <p><u>Example of a 3-mark answer:</u></p> <p>The psychodynamic perspective holds that many important influences on behaviour come from a part of the mind about which an individual has no direct awareness (1). Freud considered Little Hans' fear of horses to be an unconscious fear of his father because he thought the dark around the mouth of a horse plus the blinkers resembled the moustache and glasses worn by his father (1). This subconscious fear of his father was because Little Hans was experiencing the Oedipus complex (a part of the phallic stage of psychosexual development) (1).</p>	3	<p><b>3 marks</b> - The response demonstrates a clear and accurate explanation of why Freud's study can be viewed from the psychodynamic perspective, supported by appropriate evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principle of the psychodynamic perspective.</li> <li>• How Freud's study can be seen as psychodynamic (e.g. link to Oedipus complex/phallic stage of development)</li> <li>• Evidence from Freud's study.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> - An answer which address at least two of the above points.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> - A partial or vague answer which addresses at least one of the above points or is an uncontextualised answer.</p> <p><b>0 mark</b> - No or incorrect answer.</p> <p><b>Examiner's Comments</b></p> <p>Many candidates were able to show an understanding of a principle of the psychodynamic perspective. However, the question required candidates to go on to explain how Freud's study can be seen as psychodynamic and provide appropriate supporting evidence from Freud's study. Candidates often referred to the study (e.g. phobias) but did not provide details to show understanding.</p>

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b	<p>Outline <u>one</u> strength of the psychodynamic perspective.</p> <p><u>Most likely answers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The psychodynamic perspective can be used to explain a <u>wide variety of behaviours</u> (1). It is therefore a very useful perspective (1).</li> <li>• A strength of the psychodynamic perspective is that it favours the <u>case study method</u> (1) which allows for an in-depth study of an individual or small group (1).</li> <li>• A strength of the psychodynamic perspective is it can be <u>used to treat</u> mental disorders through psychoanalysis (by name or description) (1) it can be used to bring unconscious conflicts to the conscious mind to be resolved (1).</li> <li>• The psychodynamic perspective is a <u>holistic</u> approach because it takes account of both innate instincts (nature) and the effects of the environment (nurture) (1). It therefore allows for a variety of explanations of behaviours and does not reduce behaviour down to one factor (1).</li> <li>• The psychodynamic perspective is <u>deterministic</u> as it suggests that behaviour is initially strongly influenced by unconscious factors/early childhood experiences (1) which means it is useful for predicting behaviour (1).</li> <li>• The psychodynamic perspective suggests that once individuals become aware of unconscious factors, they can exert <u>freewill</u> and manage their behaviour (1). This means individuals can change negative behaviours into positive ones (1).</li> <li>• Other appropriate strength.</li> </ul>	2	<p>2 marks - A clear outline of an appropriate strength which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies an appropriate strength.</li> <li>• Justifies the strength.</li> </ul> <p>1 mark - The mere identification of an appropriate strength, i.e. the mere identification of a strength with no justification.</p> <p>0 mark - No creditworthy information.</p> <p>N.B. This answer does not need to be supported by any evidence.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Most candidates could identify one appropriate strength of the psychodynamic perspective, although this was not always justified. Candidates should refine how they use 'usefulness' as a strength as they needed to refer to the psychodynamic therapy 'psychoanalysis' and then explain how it works.</p>

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	c	<p>Outline <u>one</u> weakness of the psychodynamic perspective.</p> <p><u>Most likely answers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research conducted taking the psychodynamic perspective is often <b>unscientific</b> (1). The unconscious mind is extremely difficult to test and measure making findings questionable (1).</li> <li>• Ideas/theories suggested by the psychodynamic perspective are <b>unfalsifiable</b> (1). The existence of the unconscious mind cannot be proven/disproven (1).</li> <li>• Studies that take this perspective are frequently case studies involving a single participant (1) which means any findings <b>cannot be generalised</b> to the wider population (1).</li> <li>• Samples used in psychodynamic perspective research are <b>unrepresentative</b> because they involve participants with unique problems (1), limiting the usefulness of any findings (1).</li> <li>• Because the psychodynamic perspective frequently uses the case study method, evidence is often <b>highly subjective</b> and can be affected by researcher bias (1), making the validity of findings questionable (1).</li> <li>• Other appropriate weakness.</li> </ul>	2	<p>2 marks - A clear description of an appropriate weakness which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies an appropriate weakness.</li> <li>• Justifies the weakness.</li> </ul> <p>1 mark - The mere identification of an appropriate weakness, i.e. the mere identification of a weakness with no justification.</p> <p>0 mark - No creditworthy information.</p> <p>N.B. This answer does not need to be supported by any evidence.</p> <p><u>Examiner's Comments</u></p> <p>Most candidates could identify one appropriate weakness of the psychodynamic perspective, although this was not always justified. A popular weakness to use was that the psychodynamic perspective is 'unscientific' and this was then justified further (i.e. researcher bias, subjective methodology etc).</p>
		Total	7	

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
2	a	<p><b>Explain how Freud's study of Little Hans relates to the psychodynamic perspective.</b></p> <p>The psychodynamic approach includes all the theories in psychology that see human functioning based upon the interaction of drives and forces within the person, particularly unconscious, and between the different structures of the personality.</p> <p>Possible content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• role of unconscious – unconscious desire of mother and fear of castration from father</li> <li>• role of dreams in revealing unconscious – the giraffe fantasy as desire to take mother away from father</li> <li>• psychosexual stages of development – Hans was in the phallic stage</li> <li>• resolution of conflict – family fantasy</li> <li>• focus on individual differences – use of case study method</li> </ul>	4	<p><b>4 marks</b> for an accurate outline of at least one feature of the psychodynamic perspective and effectively applying it to Freud's study.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> for an accurate outline the concept of at least one feature of the psychodynamic perspective and an attempt to apply it to Freud's study, or for a partial outline of at least one feature of the psychodynamic perspective and for effectively applying it to the study.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> for an outline of at least one feature of the psychodynamic perspective, or for a partial outline of at least one feature and an attempt to apply it to Freud's study, or for effective application of the perspective to the study even though concept(s) are not explicitly defined.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for a partial outline of at least one feature of the psychodynamic perspective or an attempt to apply the perspective to Freud's study, or for a simple list of terms related to the psychodynamic perspective with no expansion <b>0 marks</b> – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>Candidates can still gain the marks without any explicit information on the psychodynamic perspective but the study must be related to the features of the psychodynamic perspective.</p>

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b	<p>Describe one application of the psychodynamic perspective.</p> <p>Possible applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Therapy for disorders – psychoanalysis including dream analysis, free association, hypnosis</li> <li>• Recovering repressed memories e.g. eye witnesses</li> <li>• Dealing with attachment disorders</li> <li>• Promoting attachment between infant and carers</li> <li>• Rehabilitation of criminals – theories of morality</li> <li>• Displacement strategies for aggression</li> </ul> <p><u>Example of 4 mark answer</u></p> <p>Eye witnesses to crimes are sometimes unable to recall details because they have repressed them (1). Psychodynamic strategies can be used to access the unconscious where they are being held (1). One way of doing this is through the process of hypnosis which alters a person's state of consciousness (1). This can be done in a therapeutic context so that the witness feels safe and able to retrieve and reveal an event that is potentially traumatic for them (1).</p> <p>NB Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	4	<p><b>4 marks</b> for a detailed and accurate description of a relevant application which is clearly related to the principles or concepts of the psychodynamic perspective.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> for a detailed and accurate description of a relevant application, or for an accurate description which is clearly related to the principles of the psychodynamic perspective.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> for an accurate description of a relevant application, or for identifying an application which is related to the principles and concepts of the psychodynamic perspective.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for identifying an application.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>* Credit first answer only but therapy can be generic term elaborated by identification of different therapies.</p>

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	c	<p>Outline the defining principles and concepts of the behaviourist perspective and briefly discuss its usefulness as a perspective.</p> <p>Possible content for principles and content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• role of learning, experience and environment</li> <li>• classical and operant conditioning</li> <li>• social learning</li> <li>• born a blank slate</li> <li>• importance of studying observable behaviour</li> <li>• stimulus-response psychology</li> <li>• scientific approach</li> </ul> <p>Possible points for discussing usefulness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• well established and reliable applications such as therapies (aversion therapy, systematic desensitisation) and other system for behaviour change (social skills training, token economies)</li> <li>• impact of role models can be used positively (in education) or restricted (certification for films and games)</li> <li>• is key in emphasising the role of nurture over nature, and potential for change</li> <li>• cognitive-behavioural techniques had developed from behaviourism although traditionally the mind was viewed as a 'black box'</li> <li>• over-reliance on lab experiments may mean findings are not that useful in real-life</li> <li>• some research conducted on animals which may limit its usefulness when applying to human beings</li> <li>• applications rely on reductionist ideas</li> </ul> <p>NB Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>	4+4	<p><b>3-4 marks</b> for a clear, accurate and detailed outline of the behaviourist perspective which includes at least two defining principles or concepts.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> for a brief or vague outline of the behaviourist perspective which includes at least two defining principles or concepts, or for a clear and accurate outline of one defining principle or concept. There may be some muddling or inaccuracy. Plus</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> for a clear, detailed and well informed discussion of the extent of the perspective's usefulness</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> for a brief or vague discussion of the extent of the perspective's usefulness. There may be some muddling of ideas or applications as part of the discussion.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – no creditworthy response.</p> <p>Practical applications need to be discussed in the context of usefulness, not simply listed, to gain credit.</p>

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	d	<p>Discuss the similarities and differences between the psychodynamic perspective and the behaviourist perspective.</p> <p>Possible points of comparison:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumptions relating to nature/nurture. Both recognise the role of experience on subsequent behaviour. More focus on childhood with psychodynamic perspective whereas behaviourism looks at experience more broadly. Psychodynamic perspective also emphasises the role of nature e.g. unconscious forces, stages of development.</li> <li>Assumptions relating to freewill/determinism. Both deterministic but different types – environmental determinism vs psychic determinism.</li> <li>Assumptions relating to reductionism/holism. Behaviourism very reductionist in terms of focus on stimulus response. Psychodynamic perspective reduces explanations down to unconscious but this does interact with childhood experiences – more holistic than behaviourism</li> <li>Assumptions relating to individual/situational explanations – psychodynamic perspective focuses more on internal mechanisms (id, ego, superego) whereas behaviourists look at environment (situation) and not the individual.</li> <li>Applications relating to usefulness – behaviourist techniques focus more on here and now, whereas psychodynamic techniques focus on past. Both optimistic in terms of potential for change although psychodynamic perspective tends to view human experience more negatively.</li> <li>Processes relating to ethical considerations – more manipulation of behaviour by behaviourists but psychodynamic perspective criticised for revisiting traumatic experiences from the past</li> <li>Assumptions relating to social sensitivity – issues around behaviourists manipulating behaviour to make people more normal whereas</li> </ul>	15	<p><b>12-15 marks</b> for a thorough and balanced comparison of both perspectives. At least three points of comparison are made, are relevant and accurate and should cover both similarities and differences. Arguments are coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised. A range of points are considered and are well developed as part of the analysis. There is evidence of valid conclusions that summarise issues very well. There is consistent use of psychological terminology, and well-developed line of reasoning which is logically structured. Information presented is appropriate and substantiated.</p> <p><b>8-11 marks</b> for a good and reasonably balanced comparison of both perspectives. The points of comparison are mainly relevant and accurate and should cover at least one similarity and one difference. Arguments are presented with reasonably clear understanding of the points raised. A range of points are considered and some are developed as part of the analysis. There is evidence of valid conclusions that summarise issues well. There is good use of psychological terminology in a response with reasonable structure. Information presented is largely appropriate.</p> <p><b>4-7 marks</b> for a limited comparison of both perspectives. Points of comparison are weak but have some relevancy. Arguments are presented but with limited understanding of the points raised. At least one relevant point is considered and may be developed as part of the analysis. There is evidence of attempts to draw conclusions. Relevant evidence is used as part of the discussion. There is some use of psychological terminology in a response with limited structure. Information presented is sometimes appropriate.</p> <p><b>1-3 marks</b> for a basic coverage of both perspectives where any comparison may be implied rather than explicit. If arguments are presented it is with weak understanding. One or a limited range of points may be considered but with no real development. There is limited or no use of psychological terminology and structure is</p>

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
		<p>with psychodynamic there are issues around 'sexualisation' of children. Both can be accused to stigmatising certain types of families/family dynamics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Psychology as a science – behaviourism more objective than psychodynamic perspective. Use of experimentation vs use of case studies.</li> <li>• Ethnocentrism – more value judgements involved in psychodynamic perspective whereas behaviourist processes are not culture bound.</li> <li>• Validity – use of animals by behaviourists raises issues of generalisability. Behaviourist experiments may also lack ecological and construct validity. Qualitative data arising from psychodynamic research has more validity.</li> <li>• Reliability - easier to replicate behaviourist research. Applications of behaviourism (e.g. therapy) produces more consistent outcomes than psychodynamic techniques.</li> </ul> <p>NB Other appropriate responses should be credited.</p>		<p>poor. Information presented is rarely appropriate.</p> <p><b>0 marks – no creditworthy response.</b></p> <p>* Do not credit comparison of principles/concepts or comparison of studies.</p>
		Total	31	

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
3	a	<p>Using your knowledge of psychology, suggest ways in which the lives of individuals with autism could be improved.</p> <p>Possible suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of operant conditioning to develop more sociable behaviours</li> <li>• Use of modelling to develop more sociable behaviours</li> <li>• Special schooling to support individual needs</li> <li>• Social support groups for parents/carers</li> <li>• Campaigns to raise awareness of autism and reduce stigma/discrimination</li> <li>• Therapeutic play</li> <li>• Use of medication for certain symptoms</li> </ul>	8	<p><b>7-8 marks</b> for a high standard of knowledge and understanding of how the suggested ways could be used to improve the lives of people with autism. There is very effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions are largely accurate and several details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. At least two suggestions are covered.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> for a good standard of knowledge and understanding of how the suggested ways could be used to improve the lives of people with autism. There is effective application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions are mostly accurate and some details have been included about how they could be implemented and developed. At least two suggestions are covered.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> for reasonable knowledge and understanding of how the suggested ways could be used to improve the lives of people with autism. There is some application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions are partially accurate.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> for basic knowledge and understanding of how the suggested ways could be used to improve the lives of people with autism. There is weak application of psychological knowledge within these suggestions. The suggestions may have limited accuracy.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B. If only one suggestion is made then a maximum of 4 marks to be awarded. Award marks in line with the descriptors above.</p> <p><b>Examiner's Comments</b></p> <p>This question elicited a variety of responses. Most candidates focused on two suggestions which was enough if done well. The best responses had a clear psychological basis to their ideas which included reference to key terminology and</p>

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
				<p>concepts. There was also an obvious focus on how these ideas would improve the lives of individuals with autism whereas in other responses this was only implied.</p>
	b	<p>Evaluate the suggestions you have made in part (d) with reference to issues and debates you have studied in psychology.</p> <p>Potential issues for evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions relating to nature/nurture</li> <li>• Assumptions relating to freewill/determinism</li> <li>• Assumptions relating to reductionism/holism</li> <li>• Assumptions relating individual/situational explanations</li> <li>• Usefulness</li> <li>• Ethical considerations</li> <li>• Social sensitivity</li> <li>• Psychology as a science</li> <li>• Ethnocentrism</li> <li>• Validity</li> <li>• Reliability</li> </ul>	10	<p><b>9-10 marks</b> for demonstrating good evaluation that is relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments are coherently presented with clear understanding of the points raised. A range of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 9d. More than one suggestion is evaluated.</p> <p><b>6-8 marks</b> for demonstrating reasonable evaluation that is mainly relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments coherently presented in the main with reasonable understanding of the points raised. A range of appropriate evaluation points are considered. The evaluation points are mainly in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 9d.</p> <p><b>3-5 marks</b> for demonstrating limited evaluation that is sometimes relevant to the demand of the question. The arguments may lack clear structure/organisation and show limited understanding of the points raised. The evaluation points are occasionally in context and supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 9d.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> for demonstrating basic evaluation that is rarely relevant to the demand of the question. Any arguments lacks clear structure/organisation and show a very basic understanding of the points raised. The evaluation points are not necessarily in context and are not supported by relevant evidence of the description given in 9d.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy response.</p> <p>N.B. If only one suggestion is evaluated then a maximum of 6 marks to be awarded. Award marks in line with the descriptors above.</p> <p><b>Examiner's Comments</b></p>

## Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
			<p>As with Question 9(d), there was real variability in the quality of response. In general, those candidates who scored well in the previous question also tended to do well on this one. Strong evaluation was characterised by a balanced approach which considered all suggestions in some depth and where the discussion was around key themes and debates in psychology rather than just looking at the pragmatics of implementing a particular idea.</p> <p> AfL</p> <p>Candidates are still tending to evaluate any suggestions they make for an idea or initiative based on issues such as time and cost. To score well, candidates need to learn to go beyond this and consider bigger issues centred around the debates and other themes. Candidates should not worry about the validity of the suggestions that they make in Question 9 (d) as a weak or limited idea is easier to evaluate.</p> <p>Exemplar 3</p>

## Mark Scheme

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
			<p>This could be done using social learning theory. For example, parents of children with autism are a role model, so they should allow their child to observe them socialising with other people. This observation of a role model makes the autistic child likely to imitate the behaviour, meaning that they will learn how to act in social situations. Therefore, behaviourism will be useful in improving the lives of individuals with autism.</p> <p>In addition, operant reinforcement could be used to improve lives of autistic people. For example, when an individual with autism interacts with someone in a socially correct way, they could be rewarded with a small gift, like chocolate. This will encourage this social interaction to continue because the individual will keep wanting to receive the reward. Therefore, operant conditioning will work in the form of a reward, probably to improve the lives of individuals with autism.</p> <p>This response shows good psychological knowledge as well as outlining feasible strategies.</p> <p><b>Exemplar 4</b></p> <p>Using social learning theory to improve lives in very deterministic SCT assumes that all behaviour is influenced by learning, thus removing the element of choice for the individuals. This means that the person's ability to make their own choice (free-will) is ignored when seeing how people with ASD socialise. However, SCT is sceptic as Bandura studied the impacts of TV in a controlled observation of the aggression of 72 children with a bobo doll. This meant that SCT is a reliable or belief for the cause of behaviour, so is very easy to be effective in improving the lives of people with autism.</p> <p>Operant conditioning ignores the individual differences of each person's life with autism. For example, one person may be able to resist the temptation of a reward more than another person. Therefore, using operant conditioning may not be effective in improving the lives of every person with autism.</p> <p>Alternatively, operant conditioning supports the nature side of the nature-nurture debate. This means that behaviour is due to a person's environmental influences, so because most people with autism are able to change, therefore, lives of people with autism are a result of environmental factors, which can be successfully altered using operant conditioning.</p> <p>The evaluation in this response goes beyond the basics and begins to explore psychological themes and concepts.</p> <p><b>Misconception</b></p>

**Mark Scheme**

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer/Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
				Some candidates believe that writing about the rationale behind an initiative or idea or explaining its potential impact counts as evaluation. If anything, this type of content is better included in Question 9 (d) as it really counts as further description.
Total			18	

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
4		<p>Compare the biological area to the behaviourist perspective. Use examples from appropriate <u>core studies</u> to support your answer.</p> <p>Candidates may make comparisons between the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected</li> <li>• Ethical considerations</li> <li>• Reductionism</li> <li>• Determinism</li> <li>• Ethnocentrism</li> <li>• Scientific procedures</li> <li>• Methodology / Designs</li> <li>• Reliability</li> <li>• Validity</li> <li>• Individual / situational explanations</li> <li>• Nature / nurture</li> <li>• Usefulness of research</li> </ul> <p>A comparison point based on the assumption of the areas cannot be credited with elaboration marks unless linked to a debate (maximum 3 marks)</p> <p>Example comparison point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One way the biological area and behaviourist perspective are similar is through the use of controlled methodology such as laboratory experiments (1). For example in Bandura's study from the behaviourist perspective an IV was manipulated – whether or not the children observed an aggressive, non-aggressive or no role model, and the environment was high controlled – all toys in each room were the same for all children (1). Similarly in Blakemore and Coopers study from the biological area, an IV was manipulated - whether the kittens were reared in a horizontal or a vertical environment (1). This means both approaches carry out research which can establish cause and effect because the influence of extraneous variables is minimised (1)</li> <li>• Other appropriate response</li> </ul>	12	<p>Per point of comparison: Best two should be credited</p> <p>4 marks – Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified (1); discussed / elaborated (1); And supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate supporting core studies (1+1)</p> <p>3 marks – Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified (1); not discussed / elaborated; But supported by relevant evidence from two appropriate supporting core studies – one from each perspective (1+1)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified (1)</p> <p>Discussed / elaborated (1); And supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate core study (1)</p> <p>2 marks – Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified (1); not discussed / elaborated; But supported by relevant evidence from one appropriate core study (1)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Similarity / difference between perspectives is identified (1); discussed / elaborated (1); But not supported by any relevant evidence from appropriate core studies</p> <p>1 mark – Similarity / difference is identified (1)</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy response</p> <p><i>As the question asks students to use evidence from appropriate core studies, only those addressed on the specification should be credited</i></p> <p><i>Responses that identify AND / OR discuss comparison points between research rather than the areas should not be credited</i></p> <p><i>As the question says compare, candidates can give 2 similarities, 2 differences or a similarity and a difference</i></p> <p><i>The evidence given to support must clearly support the point being made to be</i></p>

**Mark Scheme**

<b>Question</b>		<b>Answer/Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
				<p><i>credited</i></p> <p><b>Examiner's Comments</b></p> <p>For an 8 mark comparison question, candidates should identify two clear points of comparison – similarity / difference which they elaborate and then support with relevant evidence from two appropriate core studies. Many candidates only made one comparison point or failed to make any comparison points and simply described evidence from two core studies. Some candidates used inappropriate studies to support their points or used inappropriate detail from the study which did not match their point. A well-structured answer differentiated the better candidates from weaker ones.</p>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
5	a	<p>Outline <u>one</u> principle or concept of the behaviourist perspective.</p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of behaviour is <u>learned</u> from the environment / the people around us (after birth).</li> <li>• If behaviour is learned, undesirable and anti-social behaviours can be 'unlearned'.</li> <li>• That psychology should be seen as a science and behaviour should be studied in a scientific manner using observation and measurements.</li> <li>• The only subject matter for psychology should be behaviours which can be observed and measured.</li> <li>• The major influence on human behaviour is <u>learning</u> from the environment.</li> <li>• Modelling by significant others can greatly influence the <u>learning</u> of behaviour.</li> <li>• Behaviour can be understood by thinking of a person as a machine and looking at what goes into the machine (stimulus or input) and measuring what comes out (responses or outputs).</li> <li>• Everyone is born a blank slate and external influences from the environment and others around us shape our behaviours.</li> <li>• Behaviour is <u>learned</u> by observing others and imitating them.</li> <li>• Other appropriate principle or concept should be credited.</li> </ul>	[2]	<p><b>2 marks</b> – An appropriate principle / concept is accurately outlined and clearly linked to the behavioural perspective.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – An appropriate principle / concept is briefly or partially described. Understanding is not fully clear e.g. behaviour is learned.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information e.g. everything is learned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>If there is no reference to 'behaviour' no marks can be awarded.</i></li> <li>• <i>Outlines of classical conditioning / operant conditioning / Social Learning Theory can gain credit here as they are concepts of the behaviourist perspective.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Examiner's Comments</b> There were some good answers here though some candidates provided answers that were principles / concepts of the social area rather than the behaviourist perspective.</p>

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
	b	<p>Briefly outline why Bandura et al.'s study into the transmission of aggression can be viewed from the behaviourist perspective.</p> <p>Possible 3-mark answer - GOOD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The behaviourist perspective holds that the majority of behaviour is <u>learned</u> from the environment after birth. Bandura et al.'s study shows how young children can <u>learn</u> aggressive behaviour through the observation of significant others in their immediate social environment. Children in this study, regardless of their innate levels of aggression, who observed an aggressive model subsequently showed more physical and verbal aggression than children who either saw a non-aggressive model or no model at all, suggesting that behaviour can be <u>learned</u> by observing others.</li> </ul> <p>Possible 2-mark answer REASONABLE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The behaviourist perspective holds that the majority of behaviour is <u>learned</u> from the environment after birth. Bandura et al.'s study shows how young children can learn aggressive behaviour through the observation of significant others in their immediate social environment.</li> </ul> <p>Possible 1-mark answer LIMITED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bandura et al.'s study shows how young children can learn behaviour through the observation of significant others in their immediate social environment.</li> </ul>	[3]	<p><b>3 marks – GOOD</b> - The response demonstrates good understanding of how Bandura et al.'s study links to the behaviourist perspective with an explicit link being made between the study and the perspective. The response is <u>clearly</u> supported by evidence from the study as illustrated in the Answer Guidance.</p> <p><b>2 marks – REASONABLE</b> – The response demonstrates reasonable understanding of how Bandura et al.'s study links to the behaviourist perspective with a clear link being made between the study and the perspective. The response is not <u>clearly</u> supported by evidence from the study.</p> <p><b>1 mark – LIMITED</b> - The response shows limited understanding of how Bandura et al.'s study links to the behaviourist perspective. There is no actual evidence from the study i.e. <u>no contextualisation</u> but some understanding is evident.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – No creditworthy information, e.g. mere findings from the study with no link to learning.</p> <p><i>N.B. If the answer merely refers to behaviour being influenced by other people / the environment / external influences, <u>no marks</u> can be awarded as this is to be considered a social explanation.</i></p> <p><i>If the candidate refers to the Social Learning Theory, the response must make it clear that <u>learning</u> is involved to gain more than 1 mark.</i></p> <p><b>Examiner's Comments</b> Again, there were some good answers to this question. However, weaker candidates provided answers that merely referred to behaviour being influenced by other people / the environment / external influences, which were actually social explanations rather than behaviourist explanations. Supporting evidence from Bandura et al.'s study was generally very weak / vague/inaccurate.</p>
		Total	5	

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
6		<p><i>Compare the individual differences area with the behaviourist perspective. Support your answer with examples from relevant core studies.</i></p> <p>Candidates may make comparisons between the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected</li> <li>• Ethical considerations</li> <li>• Reductionism / holism</li> <li>• Determinism / freewill</li> <li>• Scientific procedures</li> <li>• Methodology / designs</li> <li>• Reliability</li> <li>• Validity</li> <li>• Ability to generalise</li> <li>• Individual / situational explanations</li> <li>• Nature / nurture</li> </ul> <p><b>Example answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The individual differences area differs from the behaviourist perspective because it focuses on the differences between individuals or groups rather than the similarities as looked for in the behaviourist perspective (1) which sees behaviour as being learned from the environment, suggesting that individuals exposed to the same stimuli will respond in similar ways, especially if the response leads to pleasant consequences (1). For example, Hancock et al.'s study focused on language differences between psychopathic and non-psychopathic murderers when describing their offences whereas Chaney et al. looked to see whether the overall administration of medication could be improved similarly in both asthmatic boys and asthmatic girls when asked to use a Funhaler compared to a conventional inhaler (1). Because the individual differences area often involves studying atypical individuals, sample sizes are often too small. For example, Freud only studied one individual, Little Hans when he was trying to find evidence to link the development of a phobia to his theory of psychosexual development (1). On the other hand, the behaviourist perspective tries to make general assumptions about how behaviour can</li> </ul>	[6]	<p><b>GOOD</b> 5–6 marks for one similarity or difference is explored in depth with a detailed consideration of relevant core studies which support both areas.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Two comparison points are identified and clearly linked to a relevant core studies from each area for each point.</p> <p><b>REASONABLE</b> 3–4 marks for one similarity or difference that is brief and supported by evidence or is detailed but only partially supported by evidence.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Two comparison points are identified with limited use of evidence.</p> <p><b>LIMITED</b> 1–2 marks for one similarity or difference which may be supported by evidence.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>For outlining two studies where there is an indication of what the difference or similarity might be.</p> <p><i>Responses that discuss comparison points between research rather than the areas should not be credited as these will not answer the question and so will be awarded NAQ.</i></p> <p><i>As the question says compare, candidates can give one or two similarities, one or two differences or a similarity and a difference.</i></p> <p><i>The evidence given to support must clearly support the point being made to be credited.</i></p> <p><b>Examiner's Comments</b></p> <p>This was the most poorly answered question on the paper with many candidates unable to meet the demands of the question. Although most attempted it and knew they had to find either differences or similarities between the two approaches, the similarities or differences were frequently not creditworthy. A very common error was to contrast the aims of the two approaches but this rarely gave a genuine point of comparison. Other common errors included suggesting that</p>

## Mark Scheme

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Marks	Guidance
		<p>be learned from the surrounding environment so, sample sizes can be large (1). For example, Bandura et al.'s sample consisted of 72 children drawn from the Stanford University Nursery School when they showed how children can learn aggressive behaviour from adult models in their immediate environment (1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both the individual differences area and the behaviourist perspective recognise the role of environmental experiences in shaping behaviours (1). For behaviourists this is reliably explained in terms of conditioning and learning when individuals experience their environment and for the area of individual differences adopts a more holistic approach recognising the interaction of many external factors and how they impact on an individual (1). The role of experience is demonstrated in Bandura et al.s study where they showed that children exposed to role models in their environment are likely to pay attention to behaviour and imitate it (1). For example, children imitated an adult they had seen on a film by being aggressive to an inflatable doll – something they were unlikely to have done without this external influence (1). Meanwhile, in Freud's case study of Little Hans there is a suggestion that the boy's experiences through his relationships with his parents had led to him developing a phobia (1). The phobia was not seen as natural phenomenon but as something that was a response to the way Hans's parents had dealt with his Oedipus complex (1).</li> <li>Other appropriate answers should be credited.</li> </ul>		<p>they represented completely different sides of the nature / nurture approach, that they were both reductionist (again linked to a misunderstanding of reductionism), and that they were both deterministic. Similarities were often not specific enough to these two approaches and could apply to any pairing of approaches eg both being unethical, both being useful. Of course, if the differences / similarities were not valid then the use of evidence could not get credit either which meant a number of candidates scored zero. Answers that earned marks tended to focus on differences rather than similarities, such as scientific versus unscientific, determinism versus freewill, holism versus reductionism, focusing on the individual versus making generalisations, interactionism versus nurture. A number of candidates completely misunderstood the question and identified differences or similarities which allowed them to compare studies from the different approaches eg suggesting both areas used experiments, or that one area used small samples while the other used large samples.</p>
		Total	6	