Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students’ responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students’ scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students’ reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year’s document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk
Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into two, three or four levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are two or four marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student’s answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student’s answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student’s answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner’s mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which does not contain anything of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Examiners are required to assign each of the students’ responses to the most appropriate level according to its overall quality, then allocate a single mark within the level. When deciding upon a mark in a level examiners should bear in mind the relative weightings of the assessment objectives (included for each question and summarised on pages 40-42) and be careful not to over/under credit a particular skill. For example, in questions 11, 16, 21, 24, 28, 32, 35, 39 and 42 more weight should be given to AO3 than to AO1. This will be exemplified and reinforced as part of examiner training and standardisation.
Section A

Issues and Debates in Psychology

01.1 Which **two** of the following statements describe a strongly deterministic view? Write the letters of your chosen answers in your answer booklet. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

C and E

01.2 Name **two** types of determinism. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

Hard determinism
Soft determinism
Biological determinism
Environmental determinism
Psychic determinism

Accept any other valid answer.

02 Briefly outline **one** problem associated with alpha bias in psychological research, and **one** problem associated with beta bias in psychological research. [4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 4

In each case:

**2 marks** for a brief, clear and coherent outline of the problem.

- In the case of alpha bias there is a misrepresentation of behaviour researchers/theorists overestimate/exaggerate gender differences.
- In the case of beta bias there is a misrepresentation of behaviour because researchers/theorists underestimate/minimise gender differences.

**1 mark** for a problem partially outlined or merely stated.

Credit other other valid problems.
03 Briefly outline what psychologists mean by ‘levels of explanation’. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

2 marks for clear and coherent outline which explains how explanations vary from those at a lower or fundamental level focusing on basic components or units to those at a higher more holistic multivariable level.

1 mark for vague or incomplete outline which refers to explanations at fundamental/basic and more holistic levels.

0 marks for mere reference to there being different levels of explanation.

Credit answers where knowledge of term is embedded in an example.

04 Explain how the researcher might develop the above investigation through taking a nomothetic approach. [6 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>Proposals for developing the research by taking a nomothetic approach are clear and appropriate. Explanation is mostly effective. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. There is clear focus on the question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Proposals for developing the research by taking a nomothetic approach are apparent and mostly appropriate. Explanation is partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>There is some useful proposal of how the researcher could develop the research by taking a nomothetic approach. Explanation is limited and/or poorly focused. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is often used inappropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation possible points:
- Taking a nomothetic approach would involve the researcher testing a larger sample of offenders.
- Sampling should involve a method of sample selection to give representativeness of a larger population, eg random sampling of the prison population.
- The researcher would probably use a testable hypothesis, eg violent offenders have more negative thoughts about childhood than non-violent offenders.
- Taking a nomothetic approach would involve collection of a large amount of data.
- Analysis would probably involve quantitative methods, eg statistical testing and the drawing of conclusions in relation to a wider population.
• Credit also comparison of the worth of idiographic and nomothetic approaches, eg how idiographic investigations yield information that is rich, in-depth (journals inform about the precise nature of the negative thoughts enabling greater insight) whereas nomothetic investigations enable the formulation of general laws, eg offenders have a more negative view of their childhood.

Credit other relevant explanatory points.
What is meant by the ‘nature-nurture debate’ in psychology? [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

2 marks for the possibility that behaviour is governed by nature (genes etc) and by nurture (eg environment, experiences etc) and reference to the debate being about the relative contribution of each of these influences.

1 mark for reference to the possibility that behaviour is governed by nature (genes etc) and (or) by nurture (eg environment, experiences).

0 marks for focus solely on one possible explanation (nature or nurture) or no relevant content.

Briefly explain the outcome of the study in relation to the nature-nurture debate. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 2

1 mark appears to support the nature side of the debate.

Plus

1 mark because the concordance rate is stronger in the identical twins where there is greater genetic relatedness (or nurture must also play a role – not 100% concordance).

Full credit can be awarded to answers which argue for mathematical ability being partly due to nurture as both percentage concordance rates are less than degree of genetic relatedness.
06.2 Some ways of establishing validity involve the use of a statistical test.

Outline how these researchers could have used a statistical test to establish **concurrent** validity of the mathematical reasoning ability test.

**[4 marks]**

Marks for this question: **AO2 = 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Answer focuses clearly on concurrent validity. How a correlational test would be used to determine the relationship between the two sets of scores is clearly described with reference to calculation of a correlation coefficient and need for a significant positive correlation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Answer focuses on validity. How a correlational test would be used to determine the relationship between the two sets of scores is partly described. The answer lacks accuracy and detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Content:**
- Concurrent validity would involve correlating the results on the maths test with results for the same group of people on an established maths reasoning test
- A Spearman’s rho or Pearson’s r test should be used for the two sets of test results
- If the mathematical ability test is valid then there should be a significant positive correlation between the two sets of test scores at the 0.05 level.
Section B

Relationships

07 Investment is one feature of the investment model of relationships. Identify one other feature of the investment model of relationships. [1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

1 mark for any of the following: satisfaction, commitment, comparison with alternatives.

08.1 Sketch a graph to show the most likely distribution curve for the investment scores in this study. Label the axes of your graph and mark on it the positions of the mean, median and mode. [3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 3

Credit a rough sketch of a negatively skewed distribution as follows:

1 mark for shape of curve with tail to the left.

1 mark for axis labels – ‘(Investment) Score’ on horizontal axis, ‘Number (of Participants)’/‘Frequency’ on vertical axis.

1 mark for positioning the mean, median and mode appropriately in relation to one another.
08.2 What sort of distribution does your graph show? [1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 1

1 mark for stating negative skew.

If graph sketched in 08.1 does not show a negative skew, credit answers that match the sketch given.

09 Explain one limitation of a self-report technique. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 2

1 mark for a brief explanation (must be explained rather than stated).

Plus

1 mark for elaboration in relation to consequences for the research/implications.

Possible limitations: questionable validity; lack objectivity (questions about self).

Credit any other relevant limitation.

10 Which one of the following sequences shows the correct order of Duck’s phases of relationship breakdown? Write the letter of your chosen answer in your answer booklet. [1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

B
Discuss evolutionary explanations for partner preferences.

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6 and AO3 = 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13–16</td>
<td>Knowledge of evolutionary explanations for partner preferences is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of evolutionary explanations for partner preferences is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Some knowledge of evolutionary explanation(s) for partner preferences is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of evolutionary explanation(s) for partner preferences is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- Natural selection theory: genes that confer reproductive advantage will increase in the gene pool
- Intra-sexual selection – members of one sex (usually male) compete for access to the other sex (usually female) leading to male-female dimorphism – accentuation of secondary sexual characteristics in those with greater reproductive fitness
- Inter-sexual selection – one sex (usually females) chooses from available prospective mates (usually males) according to attractiveness; biological marketplace explanation (Noe and Hammerstein 1995), genes that confer attractive qualities are more ‘saleable’.

Possible evaluation points:
- Apparent conflict between natural selection and sexual selection
- Use of evidence to support or contradict theory, eg in favour of natural selection, eg studies of feature preferences in males and females, eg waist-hip ratio, facial symmetry
- Animal evidence, eg mating strategies/parental investment and extrapolation to humans.
- Sexual strategies theory – partner selection strategies differ according to what each partner wants from different type of relationship (long-term or short-term).

Credit other relevant evaluation points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanations.
Section B

Gender

12 Explain what is meant by ‘androgyny’.

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

1 mark for a correct definition: possessing a balanced combination/mixture of masculine and feminine traits.

Or possessing high levels of both masculine and feminine traits.

13.1 Sketch a graph to show the most likely distribution curve for the masculinity scores in this study. Label the axes of your graph and mark on it the positions of the mean, median and mode.

[3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 3

Credit a rough sketch of a positively skewed distribution as follows:

1 mark for shape of curve with tail to the right.

1 mark for axis labels – ‘(Masculinity) Score’ on horizontal axis, ‘Number (of Students)’/‘Frequency’ on vertical axis.

1 mark for positioning the mean, median and mode appropriately in relation to one another.
13.2 What sort of distribution does your graph show? [1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 1

1 mark for stating a positive skew.

If the graph sketched in 13.1 does not show a positive skew, credit answers that match the sketch given.

14 Explain one limitation of a self-report technique. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 2

1 mark for a brief explanation (must be explained rather than stated).

Plus

1 mark for elaboration in relation to consequences for the research/implications.

Possible limitations: questionable validity; lack objectivity (questions about self).

Credit any relevant limitation.

15 Which one of the following statements about Freud’s psychoanalytic theory of gender development is false? Write the letter of your chosen answer in your answer booklet. [1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

C
16 Describe and evaluate Kohlberg’s explanation of gender development. [16 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6 and AO3 = 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13–16</td>
<td>Knowledge of Kohlberg’s explanation of gender development is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of Kohlberg’s explanation of gender development is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Evaluation is apparent and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Some knowledge of Kohlberg’s explanation of gender development is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of Kohlberg’s explanation of gender development is limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- Cognitive theory – relates to child’s understanding of gender.
- Stages of gender development: identity (awareness of own gender), stability (understanding of own gender as fixed over time), constancy (consistency understanding that gender is unchanged despite changes in outward appearance (clothing, hair etc) or context.
- Approximate ages: identity (2–3 yrs), stability (4–6 yrs) constancy (7+ yrs).
- Processes involved in transition through stages: maturation, socialisation, lessening egocentrism.

Possible evaluation points:
- Sensible focus on cognition (thinking governs behaviour) compared to, eg behavioural explanations.
- Use of evidence to support stages (eg Slaby and Frey 1975; Damon 1977).
- Cross-cultural findings confirm the three stages (eg Munro et al 1984).
- Kohlberg’s underestimation of age at which gender identity occurs, eg children seek same-sex playmates earlier than the proposed gender identity stage.
- Focus on description rather than explanation.
- Inability to explain why boys show stronger sex-typing than girls.
- Comparison with other explanations, eg gender schema theory.

Credit other relevant evaluation points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to evaluation of the explanation.
Section B
Cognition and development

17 Which one of the following statements describes one feature of what Piaget meant by ‘egocentrism’? Write the letter of your chosen answer in your answer booklet.

[1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

D

18.1 Sketch a graph to show the most likely distribution curve for the egocentrism scores in this study. Label the axes of your graph and mark on it the positions of the mean, median and mode.

[3 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 3

Credit a rough sketch of a negatively skewed distribution as follows:

1 mark for shape of curve with tail to the left.

1 mark for axis labels – ‘(Egocentrism) Score’ on horizontal axis, ‘Number (Children or Parents)/Frequency’ on vertical axis.

1 mark for positioning the mean, median and mode appropriately in relation to one another.
18.2  What sort of distribution does your graph show?  [1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 1

1 mark for stating a negative skew.

If the graph sketched in 18.1 does not show a negative skew, credit answers that match the sketch given.

19  Explain one limitation of asking parents to rate their own children.  [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 2

1 mark for a brief explanation (must be explained rather than stated).

Plus

1 mark for elaboration in relation to consequences for the research/implications.

Possible limitations: questionable validity; lack objectivity (questions about own child).

Credit other relevant limitations.

20  Baillargeon studied early infant abilities by conducting violation of expectation studies. What is meant by ‘violation of expectation’?  [1 mark]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 1

1 mark for ‘what is expected is not what happens’.

Answer can be general as above or set in the context of a specific study, eg tall carrot/short carrot study or truck/flap study.
### Marks for this question: AO1 = 6 and AO3 = 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13–16</td>
<td>Knowledge of Vygotsky’s theory of cognitive development is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of Vygotsky’s explanation of cognitive development is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Evaluation is apparent and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Some knowledge of Vygotsky’s explanation of cognitive development is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of Vygotsky’s explanation of cognitive development is limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Possible content:
- Social interactionist theory – focus on role of social interaction and culture in development of cognition – how child internalises the understanding of others.
- Through social interaction child develops tools of culture, eg language.
- Importance of language – enables shift from elementary mental functions to higher mental functions; external monologue > inner speech > internalised thought.
- Scaffolding – more knowledgeable others (parents, older peers, teachers, siblings) provide a supportive framework which is gradually withdrawn.
- Zone of proximal development – gap between what child can do unaided and what child can do with help – difference between current ability and potential ability – where scaffolding operates to extend child’s abilities.

Credit other relevant Vygotskian concepts.
Possible evaluation points:
- Evidence in favour of Vygotsky, eg Wood and Middleton (1975).
- Evidence against Vygotsky, eg tutoring does not accelerate learning Gelman (1969).
- Cross-cultural findings to support role of social factors.
- Implications for education – peer tutoring, classroom organisation, role of the teacher.
- Comparisons with Piaget – social interactionism vs constructivism; different views on the role of language (key to thought vs by-product of thought); child as apprentice vs child as scientist.

Credit other relevant evaluation points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to evaluation of the explanation.
Section C

Schizophrenia

22 Using your knowledge of schizophrenia, explain why Louise is now showing symptoms of schizophrenia. [4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of both components of the diathesis-stress model is clear and mostly accurate. The material is used appropriately to explain Louise’s schizophrenia. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Some knowledge of the diathesis-stress model is evident. Links to Louise’s schizophrenia are not always effective. The answer lacks accuracy and detail. Use of terminology is either absent or inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content:
Application of the diathesis-stress model as follows:
- genetic vulnerability interacts with stressful life events which trigger schizophrenia
- family background = genetic vulnerability
- losing parent/go to university = stressful events.
**23** Briefly outline how cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) is used to treat schizophrenia and explain one limitation of using CBT to treat schizophrenia. 

**[4 marks]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Outline of the use of CBT for schizophrenia is clear and has some detail. A limitation relevant to schizophrenia is clearly explained. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Outline of the use of CBT lacks clarity, detail and link to schizophrenia. The limitation is generic/stated rather than explained. The answer as a whole is not clearly expressed. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. Either outline or limitation done well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outline**

**Possible content:**
- Challenging beliefs (including origin of ‘voices’) and reality testing to reduce distress.
- Use of positive self-talk.
- Coping strategy enhancement through education and symptom targeting.
- Cognitive restructuring via ABCDE framework. Identifying activating event (A), exploring beliefs (B), recognising consequences (C), disputing irrational beliefs (D), restructured belief (E).

Credit other relevant aspects of cognitive behaviour therapy.

**Possible limitations:**
- CBT requires self-awareness and willingness to engage with process (positive symptoms lead to lack of awareness; negative symptoms lead to reluctance/inability to engage).
- Practical issues, eg length of therapy (leading to drop out at times of severe episodes).
- Not all clients are suited to vigorous confrontation.

Credit other relevant limitations.
Discuss biological explanations for schizophrenia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13–16</td>
<td>Knowledge of biological explanations for schizophrenia is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of biological explanations for schizophrenia is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Some knowledge of biological explanation(s) for schizophrenia is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of biological explanation(s) for schizophrenia is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- Genetic explanation – potential genetic mechanisms.
- Dopamine hypothesis – increased DA levels linked to symptoms of schizophrenia.
- Other neurotransmitters implicated, eg serotonin, acetylcholine and glutamate.
- Neural correlates – decreased ventricle size; reduction in temporal and frontal lobe volume
- Evolutionary explanations, eg ‘shaman’ view.

Possible discussion points:
- Use of evidence to support/refute, eg MZ/DZ twin studies; other concordance research, pharmacological action of effective antipsychotic drugs; MRI and fMRI scanning studies.
- Comparison with psychological explanations, eg family-based explanations (EE)
- Value of the diathesis-stress approach.
- Implications, eg determinism, early identification, consequences for treatment.
- Reductionism – explanation at a basic cellular and chemical level and consequences of this
- Issues related to diagnosis and classification as related to biological explanations.

Credit other relevant discussion points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanations.
Section C
Eating behaviour

25 Briefly outline the role of ghrelin in the control of eating behaviour. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

1 mark – ghrelin is a hormone/chemical released from stomach and small intestine into the bloodstream in relation to food intake.

Plus

1 mark – levels are lowest after a meal and then rise gradually, increasing feelings of hunger and stimulating eating behaviour.

26 Using your knowledge of the role of learning in food preference, outline how parents might encourage their children to eat a healthy diet. [4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of the role of learning in food preference is clear and mostly accurate. The material is used appropriately to explain how parents might encourage a healthy diet. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of psychological terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Some knowledge the role of learning in food preference is evident. Explanation of how parents might encourage a healthy diet is not always effective or not presented in psychological terms. The answer lacks accuracy and detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- Social learning/culture, eg role of others (parents and peers) as models.
- Concepts of observation, imitation, identification, vicarious reinforcement.
- Although less likely also credit answers based on associative learning, eg operant conditioning and direct reinforcement; classical conditioning and pleasurable association between UCS and CS.
- Research evidence is creditworthy where it exemplifies a particular method.

Credit other relevant suggestions based on learning theory.
27 Explain one limitation of using non-human animals to research the brain mechanisms of eating behaviour. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO3 = 2

1 mark for a brief explanation of a limitation (must be explained rather than stated).

Plus

1 mark for elaboration focused on the issue of brain mechanisms of feeding.

Possible limitations:
- Problem of extrapolating from non-human animals to humans.
- Limited behavioural range of non-human animals.

Credit other relevant limitations.
28 Discuss psychological explanations for anorexia nervosa. [16 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6 and AO3 = 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13–16</td>
<td>Knowledge of psychological explanations for anorexia nervosa is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of psychological explanations for anorexia nervosa is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Some knowledge of psychological explanation(s) for anorexia nervosa is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of psychological explanation(s) for anorexia nervosa is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:

- Family systems theory – concepts of autonomy vs enmeshment, over-protection, rigidity, conflict avoidance and control.
- Social learning theory – observation, imitation, identification, modeling, vicarious reinforcement, media influences, characteristics of preferred role models, cultural influences and norms.
- Cognitive theory – role of weight-based schema, perceptual distortions, cognitive biases, irrational beliefs.
- Personality correlates, eg low self-esteem.

Possible discussion points:

- Use of research evidence to support/refute, eg evidence that families of sufferers are over controlling/over involved; evidence that sufferers are perfectionist, compliant and seek to exert control; evidence of irrational beliefs re body perception; biological evidence.
- Comparison with other explanations.
- Problem of demonstrating cause and effect.
- Multifactorial nature of anorexia nervosa.

Credit other relevant discussion points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanations.

Only credit reference to treatments where used to discuss explanations, eg if studies show family therapy is effective this supports the family systems explanation.
Section C

Stress

29 With reference to hardiness, outline what is meant by ‘challenge’. [2 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2

2 marks – accurate outline with elaboration: an aspect of hardiness that sees change positively as an opportunity for personal growth and achievement, rather than negatively as a source of stress.

1 mark – brief or muddled outline.

30 Using your knowledge of workplace stress, explain why Mike may be experiencing these stress-related symptoms. [4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of the effects of workload and control is clear and mostly accurate. The material is used appropriately to explain Mike’s symptoms. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Some knowledge of the effects of workload and control is evident. Links to Mike’s symptoms are not always effective. The answer lacks accuracy and detail. Use of terminology is either absent or inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content:
- Combination of high workload and low levels of control is highly stressful.
- MIKE has a high workload (long hours, new tasks) therefore no control.
- Mike has low control because his workload is directed by his manager.
- Overload leading to lack of predictability in his job.
The Social Readjustment Rating Scale is widely used to measure stress.

Explain one limitation of the Social Readjustment Rating Scale.

Marks for this question: AO3 = 2

1 mark for a brief explanation of a limitation (must be explained rather than stated).

Plus

1 mark for elaboration

Possible limitations:

- Does not consider individual differences in response, e.g., divorce or children leaving home.
- Illness outcomes are not clearly specified.
- Correlations between the SRRS scores and illness outcomes are small/non-existent.
- Use of retrospective questionnaire has problems of self-presentation, demand characteristics, accuracy of recall.

Credit other relevant limitations.
Drug therapy, stress inoculation therapy and biofeedback are methods used to cope with stress. Discuss **two** of these methods of coping with stress.

**[16 marks]**

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 6 and AO3 = 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13–16</td>
<td>Knowledge of two methods is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of two methods is evident. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. There are occasional inaccuracies. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Knowledge of two methods is present but is vague/inaccurate or one method is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of method(s) is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible content:**
- Drug therapy – biological intervention using benzodiazepines and beta-blockers; modes of action of these drugs on the brain and/or peripheral nervous system.
- Stress inoculation therapy – cognitive intervention in stages: conceptualisation; skills acquisition/rehearsal, eg self-instruction; application practice.
- Biofeedback – behavioural operant conditioning of involuntary responses through the interplay of physiology (feedback from bodily arousal) and psychology (relaxation techniques).

**Possible discussion points:**
- Use of evidence to support effectiveness/suitability.
- Drugs work quickly/effectively on physiological, eg heart rate and blood pressure, but problems of side effects and dependency.
- SIT addresses the perception and causes of stress and so may lead to long lasting coping but requires commitment, perseverance and insight.
- Biofeedback requires sophisticated technology but can lead to positive behavioural change and long lasting techniques for coping with stress.
- Comparison of different methods.

Credit other relevant discussion points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the methods.
Section D
Aggression

33 Using your knowledge of evolutionary explanations for aggression, account for these high levels of aggression in young males.

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of evolutionary explanations of aggression is clear and mostly accurate. The material is used appropriately to explain levels of aggression amongst young males in inner cities. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Some knowledge of evolutionary explanations of aggression is evident. Links to high levels of aggression amongst young males in inner cities are not always effective. The answer lacks accuracy and detail. Use of terminology is either absent or inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- Male aggression derives from need to acquire/defend resources such as mates or territory (in the city) and/or to establish status (in groups of peers or between gangs).
- Male aggression derives from sexual jealousy of other males who may have sex with or steal their mates.
**34** Briefly outline and evaluate the findings of one research study into genetic factors in aggression.

[4 marks]

**Marks for this question: AO1 = 2 and AO3 = 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Findings are clear and accurate. Evaluation is clear and coherent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Findings are clear but there is no evaluation, or, findings and evaluation are both incomplete/partly accurate. For 1 mark there is some detail of findings but no evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Possible findings:**
- Outline of findings of any study of genetic factors and aggression, eg family studies on the MAOA gene.
- Non-human animal studies, eg breeding aggressive dogs; gene knock-out studies in mice.

Any genetic study of aggression is acceptable but do not credit studies of the role of hormones.

**Possible evaluation points:**
- Evaluation of findings, eg analysis of implication of findings; contradictory evidence.
- Alternative explanations; problem of demonstrating cause and effect.
- Methodological issues such as the validity of extrapolating from animals to humans.

Credit other relevant evaluation points.
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35 Describe and evaluate the social learning theory of human aggression. [16 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6 and AO3 = 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13–16</td>
<td>Knowledge of the social learning theory of aggression is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of the social learning theory of aggression is evident. Evaluation is apparent and mostly effective. There are occasional inaccuracies. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology mostly used effectively. Lacks focus on aggression in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Knowledge of the social learning theory of aggression is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of the social learning theory of aggression is limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- Emphasis on learning aggression through observation and imitation of role model.
- Concept of identification and influences on identification – status, attractiveness, similarity etc.
- Internalisation of aggressive model.
- Modelling of aggression is influenced by observation of consequences – vicarious reinforcement.
- Learning of aggression can be internal, taking place without immediate outward demonstration.
- Concept of self-efficacy – mediational processes, eg attention, retention, motivation, and motor reproduction affect learning, coming between observation of aggressive behaviour and demonstration of that behavior.
- Credit detail of Bandura’s research on learnt aggression where they contribute to description of theory.
Possible evaluation points:

- Use of evidence to support/refute the theory of aggression.
- Difficulty demonstrating cause and effect – although the Bandura research was able to control variables and did demonstrate that aggression was affected by modelling it is difficult to show cause and effect in real life aggression.
- Explains some forms of aggression better than others, e.g. cannot easily explain impulsive aggressive behaviours.
- Sees behaviour as environmentally determined whereas some behaviours may be innate.
- Mediating cognitive factors have to be inferred so cannot measure extent of their influence.
- Comparison with alternative explanations, e.g. deindividuation or biological approaches.

Credit other relevant evaluation points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the theory of aggression.
Section D
Forensic Psychology

Oli is in prison for violent and aggressive behaviour. He becomes angry very quickly and gets frustrated easily. He often feels threatened when he is near other people.

Explain how an anger management therapist might help Oli using anger management. [4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Explanation of how anger management might be used with Oli is clear and detailed. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>There is some explanation of how anger management might be used with Oli. The explanation lacks detail. Use of terminology is either absent or inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content/application

- Cognitive appraisal - the therapist would help Oli to explore what it is that triggers his anger, why other people make him feel threatened, why he feels frustrated.

- Skills acquisition- the therapist would teach Oli calming strategies that he can use when he feels angry, frustrated or when he feels threatened by other people.

- Examples of suitable calming strategies Oli could use would be: mantra when he feels threatened; breathing exercises when he is near other people; positive self-talk eg 'people are not going to harm me', 'people are usually kind' etc.

- Application practice - the therapist would act out role-play situations with Oli so he can practise his calming exercises in a situation that would normally make him frustrated and angry eg therapist might act out the role of a person pushing against Oli in a queue.
Outline one cognitive distortion shown by offenders who attempt to justify their crime. [2 marks]

Possible cognitive distortions:
- Minimisation explaining the consequences as less significant/damaging than they really are
- Hostile attribution bias blaming other factors for behaviour, eg blaming the victim.

Credit other relevant cognitive distortions.

One method of offender profiling involves categorising offenders as either organised or disorganised offenders. Briefly explain one limitation of this method of offender profiling. [2 marks]

1 mark for a brief explanation of a limitation (must be explained rather than stated).

Plus

1 mark for elaboration.

Possible limitations:
- Based on a restricted sample of 36 serial sex offenders (therefore cannot be generalised to a wide population).
- Based on the self-reports from this sample (which cannot therefore be relied on for validity).
- Distinction is an oversimplification (difficult to categorise some offenders as one type or another so is of questionable validity/usefulness).
- Research (Canter 2004) shows evidence for the organised type only (suggesting that organisation is a characteristic typical of most serial killers).

Credit other valid limitations.
39 Discuss the psychological effects of custodial sentencing. [16 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6 and AO3 = 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13–16</td>
<td>Knowledge of the psychological effects of custodial sentencing is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of the psychological effects of custodial sentencing is evident. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. There are occasional inaccuracies. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Knowledge of the psychological effect(s) of custodial sentencing is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of the psychological effect(s) of custodial sentencing is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- Institutionalisation – leads to lack of autonomy, conformity to roles and a dependency culture.
- Brutalisation – prison acts as school for crime, reinforces a criminal lifestyle and criminal norms, leads to high recidivism rates, approx 70% of young offenders re-offend within 2 years.
- Prevalence of psychological problems and psychiatric disorders in prison populations, eg higher incidence of mental illnesses such as depression, anxiety, self-harm, suicide, low self-esteem, eg Zimbardo’s study demonstrating psychological effects of imprisonment.
- Labelling leads to loss of social contacts, reduced employability, all affecting recidivism rates.
- Answer could offer positive psychological effects resulting from opportunities, treatment, rehabilitation, remorse etc.

Credit other relevant psychological effects.
Possible discussion points:

- Problem of cause and effect – difficult to show that problems are due to imprisonment, eg prisoners with psychiatric conditions may have problems before they are institutionalized.
- Prevention is better (Harrower 2001) avoids labelling and negative consequences of prison.
- Need for selectivity – only 8–10% of criminals commit 50% of crimes (Peterson 1981).
- Alternatives, eg community sentence better for low-risk offenders (keep job and social contacts).
- Counter-arguments re usefulness of custodial sentencing, eg justice is seen to be done, limits danger to public, possible reform, opportunity for new skills/training.
- General arguments against custodial sentences, eg do not deter, given to appease public, simply acts as retribution.

Credit other relevant discussion points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the psychological effects.
Section D

Addiction

40 Briefly outline one method for reducing addiction and explain one limitation of this method.  

[4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 2 and AO3 = 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Outline of one method for reducing addiction is clear and has some detail. A limitation is clearly explained. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | 1–2   | Outline of one method for reducing addiction lacks clarity. The limitation is generic/stated rather than explained. The answer as a whole is not clearly expressed. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.  
Either outline or limitation is done well. |
| 0     |       | No relevant content. |

Possible methods:
- Drug therapy, eg outline of named drug and mode of action.
- Behavioural interventions, eg outline of specific procedures and related mechanisms involved in aversion therapy or covert sensitization.
- Cognitive behaviour therapy, eg outline of stage by stage process.
- Theory of planned behaviour and/or Prochaska’s model as used to illustrate a method.

Credit other relevant methods.

Possible limitations:
will depend on the method outlined but likely responses include:
- Drug therapy – side effects and dependency issues with drugs such as methadone
- Aversion therapy – ethical issues.
- Cbt – issues of commitment and motivation.
- Theory of planned behaviour and Prochaska’s model are more descriptive and lack empirical support for effectiveness.

Credit other relevant limitations.
41 Briefly explain risk factors relevant to Dave’s addiction to smoking. [4 marks]

Marks for this question: AO2 = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of risk factors in addiction is clear and mostly accurate. The material is used appropriately to explain Dave’s behaviour. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>Some knowledge of risk factor(s) in addiction is evident. Links to Dave’s behaviour are not always effective. The answer lacks accuracy and detail. Use of terminology is either absent or inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- Genetic vulnerability (Dave’s family smoke).
- Stress (more responsibility at work – smoking may act to reduce stress).
- Family and peers (Dave may have observed and imitated the behaviour – SLT).
- Awareness of the interaction of different factors, eg genetic vulnerability and stress.
- Personality as a risk factor, eg may lack self-efficacy as demonstrated in his failure to quit smoking.
Discuss explanations for gambling addiction.

[16 marks]

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6 and AO3 = 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13–16</td>
<td>Knowledge of explanations for gambling addiction is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9–12</td>
<td>Knowledge of explanations for gambling addiction is evident. Discussion is apparent and mostly effective. There are occasional inaccuracies. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5–8</td>
<td>Knowledge of explanation(s) is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Knowledge of explanation(s) is limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No relevant content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible content:
- Learning theory – operant conditioning, reward and to partial reinforcement schedules.
- Cognitive theory – cognitive biases, irrational thinking, overestimates of the chances of winning and underestimates of the odds against, and hindsight bias (post hoc rationalisations), cognitions and behaviour of gamblers while actually gambling, eg irrational verbalisations (‘the machine hates me’).
- Classical conditioning, eg association and environmental cues.
- Genetic factors.
- Role for modelling and SLT.

Credit other relevant psychological explanations.
Possible discussion points:

- Use of evidence to support/refute explanations (including Skinner’s original work with rats and pigeons).
- Issues of extrapolating Skinner’s findings from animals to humans.
- Difficulty demonstrating cause and effect in real-life gambling contexts.
- Some explanations apply better to some forms of gambling than others, e.g., conditioning can be more easily applied to gambling where reinforcement is immediate, e.g., scratch-cards, than where it is delayed, e.g., weekly lottery ticket.
- Learning-based explanations are environmentally determinist whereas gambling may be an innate predisposition.
- Comparison with alternative explanations, e.g., genetics or reward pathways in the brain.

Credit other relevant discussion points.

Only credit evaluation of the methodology used in studies when made relevant to discussion of the explanations.
### Assessment Objective Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and debates in Psychology</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 RM</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 RM/Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 RM/Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 RM/Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 RM</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 RM/Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 RM/Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 RM</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognition and development</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 RM/Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 RM/Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 RM</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schizophrenia</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eating behaviour</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggression</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forensic Psychology</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addiction</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Paper Total | 32 | 18 | 46 | 96 |

Research Methods = 16 marks
Maths = 8 marks