



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2003

GCE

Psychology A

Unit PYA5

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334
Registered address: Addleshaw Booth & Co., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ
Kathleen Tattersall: *Director General*

Unit 5: Individual Differences and Perspectives

Mark Allocations for Assessment Objective 1

| Mark bands | Content | Detail & accuracy | Organisation & structure | Breadth/depth of content and synoptic possibilities |
|------------|------------------|--|--------------------------|---|
| 15-13 | Substantial | Accurate & well-detailed | Coherent | Substantial evidence of both |
| 12-10 | Slightly limited | Accurate & reasonably detailed | Coherent | Evidence of both |
| 9-7 | Limited | Generally accurate & reasonably detailed | Reasonably constructed | Some evidence of both |
| 6-4 | Basic | Lacking detail | Sometimes focused | Little evidence |
| 3-0 | Just discernible | Weak/muddled/inaccurate | Wholly/mainly irrelevant | Little or no evidence |

Mark Allocations for Assessment Objective 2

| Mark bands | Evaluation is... | Selection and elaboration | Use of material and synoptic possibilities |
|------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| 15-13 | Thorough | Appropriate selection and coherent | Highly effective |
| 12-10 | Slightly limited | Appropriate selection and elaboration | Effective |
| 9-7 | Limited | Reasonable elaboration | Reasonably effective |
| 6-4 | Basic | Some evidence of elaboration | Restricted |
| 3-0 | Weak, muddled and incomplete | Wholly/mainly irrelevant | Not effective |

Mark allocations for Approaches questions**Approaches part (a)**

| Mark bands | Content | Accuracy | Engagement |
|------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|
| 6-5 | Reasonably thorough | Accurate | Coherent |
| 4-3 | Limited | Generally accurate | Reasonable |
| 2-1 | Basic | Sometimes flawed or inaccurate | Muddled |
| 0 | | | No engagement |

Approaches part (b)

| Mark bands | Commentary | Use of material | Engagement |
|------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| 6-5 | Reasonably thorough | Effective | Coherent |
| 4-3 | Limited | Reasonably effective | Reasonable |
| 2-1 | Basic | Restricted | Muddled |
| 0 | | | No engagement |

Approaches part (c)

| Mark bands | Commentary | Plausibility | Engagement |
|------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| 6-5 | Reasonably thorough | Appropriate | Coherent |
| 4-3 | Limited | Reasonably appropriate | Reasonable |
| 2-1 | Basic | Largely inappropriate | Muddled |
| 0 | | | No engagement |

Approaches part (d)

Should engage with method in (c) **and** with the stimulus material.
Marking allocation as for part (b).

Importing/exporting possible between A & B, and C & D.

Quality of Written Communication (QoWC)

| | | |
|---------------|--|----------------|
| Band 5 | The work is characterised by the accurate and clear expression of ideas and the precise use of a broad range of specialist terms. only minor (if any) errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling. | 4 marks |
| Band 4 | The work is characterised by a reasonably accurate expression of ideas, the use of a good range of specialist terms and few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. | 3 marks |
| Band 3 | The work is characterised by a coherent expression of ideas, the use of some specialist terms and reasonable grammar, punctuation and spelling. | 2 marks |
| Band 2 | The work is characterised by an adequate expression of ideas, the use of a reasonable range of specialist terms and adequate grammar, punctuation and spelling. | 1 mark |
| Band 1 | The work is characterised by a poor expression of ideas, the use of a limited range of specialist terms and poor grammar, punctuation and spelling. | 0 marks |

Synoptic possibilities

Unit 5 rewards the demonstration of synopticity. Synopticity can be defined as ‘affording a general view of the whole’. It is the addressing of psychology-wide matters and concerns.

Possible routes identified in the specification are:

- Demonstrating different explanations or perspectives.
- Demonstrating different methods used.
- Relating overarching issues and debates.
- Links with other areas of the specification.
- Psychology-wide concerns and issues such as reliability and validity, cultural variation and demand characteristics/participant reactivity (e.g. iatrogenesis).

It is quite acceptable (i.e. will permit access to the full range of marks) for candidates to offer just one of these categories, or to offer several of them.

Furthermore, synopticity may be demonstrated either within a particular area (i.e. covering a large number of theoretical and methodological components, issues and debates and making links between these) or across a number of different areas (in terms of their theories, methodologies, issues and debates and making links between these). The former can be thought of as ‘vertical’ synopticity, the latter as ‘horizontal’ synopticity.

For the approaches questions (question 8 and 9) the possibilities for demonstration of synopticity given above are supplemented with the following:

- Biological/medical, behavioural, psychodynamic and cognitive approaches.
- Other psychological approaches, not named in the specification, such as social construction, humanistic psychology, evolutionary psychology.
- Those approaches deriving from other, related disciplines such as sociology, biology and philosophy.

Section A: Individual Differences

1

Total for this question: 30 marks**Discuss arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes.****(30 marks)**

Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes (CBSs).

AO1

One approach which candidates may legitimately take in answering this question is to refer to the DSM and/or the ICD. The ICD-10 states that CBSs are not easily accommodated by the categories in established and internationally used psychiatric classifications (such as the ICD itself). The DSM, however, defines them as “recurrent, locality-specific patterns of aberrant behaviour and troubling experience that may or may not be linked to a specific DSM-IV diagnostic category”. Thus both appear ambivalent about whether or not CBSs exist as entities in their own right although the ICD statement seems closer to supporting the ‘for’ argument.

Another approach is to examine the so-called universal or absolutist positions (supported by writers such as Yap) which contends that disorders are found in all cultures but can be influenced by cultural factors. This can then be juxtaposed with the culturally relative position (supported by writers such as Pfeiffer) which contends that some disorders are specific to particular cultures and can only be understood in terms of the values and beliefs of those particular cultures.

It is acceptable for candidates to focus upon cultural relativism through a consideration of specific areas (e.g. depression). Given the existence of eating disorders on the AS specification it is possible that candidates may use them here as a vehicle for their arguments. This is acceptable.

Note that there is a requirement for candidates to offer a plurality of arguments. If only one argument is given partial performance penalties apply (see Mark allocations). Examiners should be mindful of the breadth/depth trade-off here when some candidates consider two arguments whereas others may consider many more.

Candidates may write an answer ‘as the case for.....’ This is acceptable.

Synoptic possibilities

Individual Differences questions can have ‘foreground’ or ‘background’ synoptic requirements. This one is the former, therefore the concentration is highly likely to be upon a description of the influence of culture upon pathology and how pathology is recognised, classified and diagnosed. Candidates may, however, also make useful reference to factors such as different perspectives (e.g. psychiatry versus other models); may focus upon issues such as the scientific status of psychology, nature/nurture and reductionism; and make links to other areas of the specification (e.g. the nature of abnormality on AS).

AO2

Candidates may address evaluation through a consideration of how well specific CBSs fit ICD/DSM criteria (e.g. windigo as a possession state and amok as a rage reaction). It may also be more general, for example a consideration of cultural factors in psychopathology (and its classification and diagnosis) per se. The arguments that have been put forward by Fernando (1991) regarding ethnocentricity in clinical practice are relevant here.

Given the existence of eating disorders on the AS specification it is possible that candidates may use them here as a vehicle for their arguments. This is acceptable.

Synoptic possibilities

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** synopticity are also relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis.

Question 1 Assessment Objective 1

Description of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes (CBSs).

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|--------|---|-------|
| Band 5 | Description of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent. There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Description of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Description of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i> | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Description of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i> | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Description of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking detail with little focus on the question.</i> | 3-0 |

Question 1 Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes (CBSs).

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|--------|---|-------|
| Band 5 | Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is thorough and there is evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a highly effective manner. | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is slightly limited and there is evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in an effective manner. | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is limited and there is evidence of reasonable elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a reasonably effective manner. <i>Partial performance is thorough, coherent and highly effective (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i> | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is basic and there is some evidence of elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a restricted manner. <i>Partial performance is limited with reasonable elaboration; reasonably effective use of material.</i> | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant . <i>Partial performance is basic with some evidence of elaboration; restricted use of material.</i> | 3-0 |

- | | |
|--|------------|
| (a) Outline two clinical characteristics of schizophrenia. | (5 marks) |
| (b) Describe and evaluate two or more explanations of schizophrenia. | (25 marks) |

(a) Outline is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to offer a summary description of two clinical characteristics of schizophrenia.

(b) Describe is an **AO1 and AO2** term which requires candidates to both describe and evaluate two or more explanations of schizophrenia.

Part (a)

AO1

The characteristics most likely to be offered may include disturbances of thought processes; disturbances of emotion and behaviour; hallucinations; delusions; apathy and withdrawal.

Note that candidates are required to outline two characteristics. If only one is outlined partial performance penalties apply (see mark allocations). If more than two are outlined all should be marked and the best two credited.

Part (b)

AO1

Candidates must focus here upon explanations of schizophrenia, those who continue to focus upon characteristics of the disorder or stray into consideration of, for example, implications for treatment or nature of treatments should receive credit only insofar as the answers may be serendipitously relevant.

The organisation of material in the specification – biological (e.g. genetics; brain chemistry) and psychological (e.g. social and family relationships) – will guide a lot of candidates but any relevant explanations (e.g. behaviourist; psychoanalytic) are acceptable.

Answers must focus upon the explanations as they pertain to schizophrenia; general accounts (e.g. of behaviourism) may receive marks only insofar as they may contain some material of serendipital relevance, otherwise a mark of 0 should be given.

Candidates are required to describe a plurality of explanations. If only one is given partial performance penalties apply (see mark allocations).

Explanations may be ‘macro’ (e.g. biological) or ‘micro’ (e.g. specific theorists).

Synoptic possibilities

Individual Differences questions can have ‘foreground’ or ‘background’ synoptic requirements. This one is the former, therefore candidates may address different perspectives (e.g. bio-psychology; behaviourism) as a central part of their answers; description of the methodologies associated with these could also be relevant. Candidates may usefully consider issues such as gender/culture bias; debates such as nature/nurture and reductionism; and make links to other areas of the specification (e.g. the nature of abnormality on AS).

AO2

The most likely form of evaluation may be through reference to the evidence on which the explanations are based and the candidate's ability to give a thorough and empirically well supported account. Any relevant evaluation, however, is acceptable.

Candidates are required to evaluate a plurality of explanations. If only one is given partial performance penalties apply (see mark allocations).

Synoptic possibilities:

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** synopticity are also relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis.

Question 2 (a) Assessment Objective 1

Outline of two characteristics of schizophrenia.

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|---|------------|
| Band 3 | Explanation of two characteristics of schizophrenia is reasonably thorough . It is accurate and well-detailed . | 5-4 |
| Band 2 | Explanation of two characteristics of schizophrenia is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . <i>Partial performance is reasonably thorough, accurate and well-detailed.</i> | 3-2 |
| Band 1 | Explanation of two characteristics of schizophrenia is weak, muddled and/or inaccurate . <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i> | 1-0 |

Question 2 (b) Assessment Objective 1

Description of explanations of schizophrenia.

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| Band 5 | Description of explanation of schizophrenia is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR A 10 MARK ALLOCATION. | 10-9 |
| Band 4 | Description of explanations of schizophrenia is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR A 10 MARK ALLOCATION. | 8-7 |
| Band 3 | Description of explanations of schizophrenia is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR A 10 MARK ALLOCATION. <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i> | 6-5 |
| Band 2 | Description of explanations of schizophrenia is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR A 10 MARK ALLOCATION. <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i> | 4-3 |
| Band 1 | Description of explanations of schizophrenia is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR A 10 MARK ALLOCATION. <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking detail with little focus on the question.</i> | 2-0 |

Question 2 (b) Assessment Objective 2*Evaluation of explanations of schizophrenia.*

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|--|--------------|
| Band 5 | Evaluation of explanations of schizophrenia is thorough and there is evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a highly effective manner. | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Evaluation of explanations of schizophrenia is slightly limited and there is evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in an effective manner. | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Evaluation of explanations of schizophrenia is limited and there is evidence of reasonable elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a reasonably effective manner. <i>Partial performance is thorough, coherent and highly effective (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i> | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Evaluation of explanations of schizophrenia is basic and there is some evidence of elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a restricted manner. <i>Partial performance is limited with reasonable elaboration; reasonably effective use of material.</i> | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Evaluation of explanations of schizophrenics is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant . <i>Partial performance is basic with some evidence of elaboration; restricted use of material.</i> | 3-0 |

3 Total for this question: 30 marks

“Although biological therapies are often effective in the treatment of mental disorders they might be criticised as being ethically dubious and treating only the body rather than the person”.

**Discuss issues relating to the use of biological (somatic) therapies, such as those raised in the quotation.
(30 marks)**

Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate issues relating to the use of biological therapies (such as those raised in the quotation).

AO1

The two issues raised in the quotation are contentions that biological therapies are:

- ethically dubious;
- operate only at a physical level (as opposed to psychological or social/cultural levels).

The wording of the question however makes it quite legitimate for candidates to discuss any issues that they wish, relating to the use of biological therapies.

It is important to note that the focus of the question is on issues relating to the **use** of biological therapies.

If candidates address issues in a general fashion (e.g. discussing ethics), marks should only be awarded for material which is relevant to the use of biological therapies. Thus, for example, a ‘straight’ ethics answer with no reference to biological therapy would receive 0 marks.

The question requires the candidate to describe a plurality of issues. If only one is offered partial performance penalties will apply (see mark allocation).

There is no requirement for the candidate to make explicit reference to the quotation.

Synoptic possibilities

These include, methodologies, issues/debates such as ethical issues, free will and determinism and psychology as a science. Candidates may also make links to other parts of the specification, such as defining abnormality on the AS. Biological therapies may be contrasted with other therapies (e.g. psychological versus psychiatric therapies).

AO2

Here candidates are required to evaluate and analyse issues relating to the use of biological therapies.

The same rules as outlined for **AO1** regarding the selection of issues applies here.

Evaluation/analysis of the issues raised in the quotation are likely to focus on whether ethical issues, such as informed consent, are applicable for certain patients; and whether therapies which focus only on biological factors can be successful. Other relevant evaluation/analysis is, of course, acceptable.

The question requires the candidate to discuss a plurality of issues. If only one is offered partial performance penalties will apply (see mark allocation).

Synoptic possibilities

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** synopticity are also relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis.

Question 3 Assessment Objective 1

Description of issues relating to the use of biological therapies.

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| Band 5 | Description of issues relating to the use of biological therapies is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Description of issues relating to the use of biological therapies is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Description of issues relating to the use of biological therapies is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i> | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Description of issues relating to the use of biological therapies is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus of the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i> | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Description of issues relating to the use of biological therapies is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking detail with little focus on the question.</i> | 3-0 |

Question 3 Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of issues relating to the use of biological therapies.

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| Band 5 | Evaluation of issues relating to the use of biological therapies is thorough and there is evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a highly effective manner. | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Evaluation of issues relating to the use of biological therapies is slightly limited and there is evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in an effective manner. | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Evaluation of issues relating to the use of biological therapies is limited and there is evidence of reasonable elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a reasonably effective manner. <i>Partial performance is thorough, coherent and highly effective (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i> | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Evaluation of issues relating to the use of biological therapies is basic and there is some evidence of elaboration. The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a restricted manner. <i>Partial performance is limited with reasonable elaboration; reasonably effective use of material.</i> | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Evaluation of issues relating to the use of biological therapies is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant . <i>Partial performance is basic with some evidence of elaboration; restricted use of material.</i> | 3-0 |

Section B: Perspectives - Issues And Debates

4

Total for this question: 30 marks

“Psychologists have a real dilemma in carrying out work in socially sensitive areas. Such work raises difficult ethical issues and yet it may provide insights into some of society’s most pressing problems.”

**Discuss issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research, such as those raised in this quotation.
(30 marks)**

Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research (SSR), such as those raised in the quotation.

AO1

The issues explicitly raised in the quotation are:

- Difficult issues being involved in SSR.
- Providing insights into some of society’s most pressing problems.

However, candidates are free to address other issues relating to the *ethics* of SSR (e.g. the role of the psychologist in society). Answers must focus on the ethics of SSR; general answers (for example, on the nature of socially sensitive research with no reference to ethics) will receive credit only insofar as the material may be serendipitously relevant.

Sieber and Stanley (1988, see Cardwell, 1997) suggest that the following ethical issues relate to SSR: privacy; confidentiality; sound and valid methodology; deception; informed consent; just and equitable treatment; scientific freedom; ownership of data; values and epistemology of social scientists; and risk/benefit ratio. Given the wide coverage of Sieber and Stanley’s analysis in the mainstream textbooks it is likely that many candidates will base their answers on at least some of these points.

It is quite acceptable for candidates to discuss socially sensitive practice. Studies such as those carried out by Milgram may be made relevant but mere description of the studies (without relating them to SSR issues) should receive no credit.

The question requires the candidate to discuss a plurality of issues. If only one is offered partial performance penalties will apply (see mark allocation). There is no requirement for the candidate to make explicit reference to the quotation.

Synoptic possibilities

The focus of the question is itself synoptic but other synoptic possibilities may be relevantly raised. These include methodologies (how psychologists carry out their work); and other issues/debates such as gender and culture bias and nature/nurture. Links may also be made to other parts of the specification, e.g. individual differences.

AO2

This component of the answer is likely to focus on an analysis/evaluation of the specific issues raised in AO1. Examples include whether deception and lack of informed consent can be justified in SSR and the ‘publish or be damned’ argument (which contends that psychologists may have a moral obligation to publish findings even if they are ‘contentious’). Candidates may also consider whether the benefits which have arisen from SSR may be judged to be ethically acceptable.

The same rules relating to selection of issues and their relationship to SSR made in AO1 above apply equally here.

Synoptic possibilities

All of the points made above with reference to AO1 synopticity are also relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis.

Question 4 Assessment Objective 1

Description of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research (SSR).

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| Band 5 | Description of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Description of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Description of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i> | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Description of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i> | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Description of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question’s requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking detail with little focus on the question.</i> | 3-0 |

Question 4 Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research (SSR).

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| Band 5 | Evaluation of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research is thorough and there is evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a highly effective manner. | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Evaluation of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research is slightly limited and there is evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in an effective manner. | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Evaluation of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research is limited and there is evidence of reasonable elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a reasonably effective manner. <i>Partial performance is thorough, coherent and highly effective (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i> | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Evaluation of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research is basic and there is some evidence of elaboration. The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a restricted manner. <i>Partial performance is limited with reasonable elaboration; reasonably effective use of material.</i> | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Evaluation of issues relating to the ethics of socially sensitive research is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant . <i>Partial performance is basic with some evidence of elaboration; restricted use of material.</i> | 3-0 |

5

Total for this question: 30 marks

Describe and evaluate the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research.
(30 marks)

Describe is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to present evidence in relation to case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research (theories and/or studies).

Evaluate is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO2** with relation to case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research (theories and/or studies).

AO1

The requirement of this part of the question is to describe the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research. Examiners should remember that the term research includes both empirical investigation and the development of theory.

In making the case candidates may focus on a few arguments (even just one) or offer a broader range. The depth/breadth trade-off is important to take into account here when awarding marks.

Some of the arguments most likely to be given will include:

- That there are universals between all animals;
- That non-human animals are often easier to study than humans;
- That certain studies can be carried out on non-human animals which would not be permitted with humans;
- That animals are interesting to study in their own right;
- Bringing about break-throughs in our understanding of human problems and conditions.

Note that the emphasis is on psychological research. Answers focusing on, for example, medical research should receive credit only insofar as material may have relevance to psychological or psychiatric conditions.

Any arguments against the use of non-human animals should be credited as **AO2** only.

Synoptic possibilities

The focus of the question is itself synoptic because it is concerned with an issue in psychology but other synoptic possibilities may be relevantly raised. These include theoretical perspectives (e.g. behaviourism versus humanistic psychology), methodologies (e.g. emphasis on experimentation), other issues/debates such as ethical issues, reductionism and psychology as a science. Links may also be made to other parts of the specification, e.g. comparative psychology and AS studies on stress or attachment.

AO2

It is likely that candidates may adopt one of two approaches in this part of the answer, either directly evaluating/analysing the arguments described (for **AO1**) or offering arguments against the use of non-human animals in psychological research. Examples of the latter include:

- Animal suffering.
- Animals having rights by virtue of their inherent value and not being used as a renewable resource.
- Availability of less contentious alternatives (e.g. computer modelling).
- Practical limitations such as ratomorphism.

Again, material must be relevant to psychological research.

A study-by-study approach is acceptable and should, as usual, be judged by the criteria in the marking bands.

Synoptic possibilities

All of the points made above with reference to AO1 synopticity are also relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis.

Question 5 Assessment Objective 1

Description of the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research.

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| Band 5 | Description of the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Description of the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Description of the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Description of the case for the use on non-human animals in psychological research is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Description of the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 3-0 |

Question 5 Assessment Objective 2*Evaluation of the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research.*

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|--|--------------|
| Band 5 | Evaluation of the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research is thorough and there is evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a highly effective manner. | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Evaluation of the case for the use on non-human animals in psychological research is slightly limited and there is evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in an effective manner. | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Evaluation of the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research is limited and there is evidence of reasonable elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a reasonably effective manner. | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Evaluation of the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research is basic and there is some evidence of elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a restricted manner. | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Evaluation of the case for the use of non-human animals in psychological research is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant . | 3-0 |

6

Total for this question: 30 marks

Discuss the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies. (30 marks)

Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies.

AO1

Candidates are required here to give a descriptive account of the free will and determinism debate in specific cases of psychological research (theories and/or studies). Two possible pitfalls are that candidates may write generally about the free will and determinism debate without relating it to psychological examples or they may focus on the psychological examples but insufficiently relate them to the free will and determinism debate. In both instances material should clearly only receive credit to the extent that it fulfils the requirements of the question.

Likely favourites may include behaviourism, bio-determinism and psychoanalysis; candidates can legitimately focus upon specific studies should they so wish. Humanistic psychology may prove to be the favourite example of free will.

The question requires a plurality of examples. If only one is given partial performance penalties will apply (see mark allocation).

Synoptic possibilities

The focus of the question is itself synoptic but other synoptic possibilities may be relevantly raised. These include other issues/debates such as psychology as a science and nature-nurture. Links may also be made to other parts of the specification, e.g. topics within the field of developmental psychology.

AO2

This will be an analysis/evaluation of the **AO1** points made. Possibilities include the appropriateness or usefulness of a free will and determinism analysis and what it tells us about the human condition (perhaps in terms of determinants of our behaviour and experiences).

The point made in **AO1** above about the two possible pitfalls applies equally here.

The question requires a plurality of applications. If only one is offered partial performance penalties apply (see mark allocation).

Synoptic possibilities

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** synoptic are also relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis.

Question 6 Assessment Objective 1

Description of the free will and determinism debate as it relates to psychological theories and/or studies.

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| Band 5 | Description of the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Description of the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Description of the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i> | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Description of the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i> | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Description of the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking details with little focus on the question.</i> | 3-0 |

Question 6 Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of the free will and determinism debate as it applies to psychological theories and/or studies.

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| Band 5 | Evaluation of the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies is thorough and there is evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a highly effective manner. | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Evaluation of the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies is slightly limited and there is evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in an effective manner. | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Evaluation of the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies is limited and there is evidence of reasonable elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a reasonably effective manner. <i>Partial performance is thorough, coherent and highly effective (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i> | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Evaluation of the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies is basic and there is some evidence of elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a restricted manner. <i>Partial performance is limited with reasonable elaboration; reasonably effective use of material.</i> | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Evaluation of the free will and determinism debate with reference to two or more psychological theories and/or studies is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant . <i>Partial performance is basic with some evidence of elaboration; restricted use of material.</i> | 3-0 |

- | |
|---|
| (a) Explain what is meant by the nature-nurture debate. (5 marks) |
| (b) Discuss two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology. (25 marks) |

Explain is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to present his or her knowledge of the nature-nurture debate. Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology.

Part (a) AO1

Nature-nurture is concerned with the relative influence of inheritance/determined maturation and learning/adaptability. The debate concerns the argument or determination of the relative influence of each upon particular phenomena.

Candidates may choose to use examples rather than a conceptual definition. This is acceptable as long as it conveys accuracy and understanding.

Part (b) AO1

This part of the question requires the candidate to describe two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology. As with Q6 there are two potential pitfalls: firstly that the candidate writes generally about the nature-nurture debate and does not apply it appropriately to psychological examples or (perhaps less likely here) that the candidate writes about the psychological topics (e.g. IQ testing) without sufficiently relating it to the nature-nurture debate. In either instance material will only gain credit to the extent that it has serendipital relevance.

It is particularly difficult to anticipate the most popular examples which will be offered as these will be greatly influenced by the sections of the A2 specification candidates have studied.

The question requires the candidate to describe two or more examples. If only one is given partial performance penalties will apply (see mark allocation). Some candidates may offer two examples whilst others may offer (possibly, many) more. Examiners should be alert to the depth/breadth trade-off.

Synoptic possibilities

The focus of the question is itself synoptic but other synoptic possibilities may be relevantly raised. These include theoretical orientations such as behaviourism and bio-psychology; methodological concerns and other issues/debates such as gender and culture bias (e.g. in intelligence testing) and ethical issues. Links may also be made to other parts of the specification, e.g. biological and psychological explanations of abnormality in the AS specification.

AO2

This will be the analysis/evaluation of the examples given as **AO1**. It is likely to be achieved through, for example, the nature of the evidence, conflicting results from different studies, and problems with methodology and interpretation.

The same points made in **AO1** in relation to partial performance and the depth/breadth trade-off apply equally here.

Synoptic possibilities

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** synopticities are also relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis.

Question 7 (a) Assessment Objective 1

Explanation of what is meant by the nature-nurture debate.

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|---|------------|
| Band 3 | Explanation of what is meant by the nature-nurture debate is reasonably thorough . It is accurate and well-detailed . | 5-4 |
| Band 2 | Explanation of what is meant by the nature-nurture debate is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . | 3-2 |
| Band 1 | Explanation of what is meant by the nature-nurture debate is weak, muddled and/or incorrect . | 1-0 |

Question 7 (b) Assessment Objective 1

Description of examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology.

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| Band 5 | Description of two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR A 10 MARK ALLOCATION. | 10-9 |
| Band 4 | Description of two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR A 10 MARK ALLOCATION. | 8-7 |
| Band 3 | Description of two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR A 10 MARK ALLOCATION. <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i> | 6-5 |
| Band 2 | Description of two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR A 10 MARK ALLOCATION. <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i> | 4-3 |
| Band 1 | Description of two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR A 10 MARK ALLOCATION. <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking detail with little focus on the question.</i> | 2-0 |

Question 7 (b) Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology.

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|--|--------------|
| Band 5 | Evaluation of two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology is thorough and there is evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a highly effective manner. | 15-13 |
| Band 4 | Evaluation of two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology is slightly limited and there is evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in an effective manner. | 12-10 |
| Band 3 | Evaluation of two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology is limited and there is evidence of reasonable elaboration . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a reasonably effective manner. <i>Partial performance is thorough, coherent and highly effective (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i> | 9-7 |
| Band 2 | Evaluation of two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology is basic and there is some evidence of elaboration. The material (including synoptic possibilities) is used in a restricted manner. <i>Partial performance is limited with reasonable elaboration; reasonably effective use of material.</i> | 6-4 |
| Band 1 | Evaluation of two or more examples of the nature-nurture debate in psychology is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material (including synoptic possibilities) is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant . <i>Partial performance is basic with some evidence of elaboration; restricted use of material.</i> | 3-0 |

Section C: Approaches

8

Total for this question: 30 marks

Steve lives for football. He supports one of the big, top league teams and also his local team and feels excitement and pride when they win. He watches almost every match shown live on television, much to the annoyance of his girlfriend, who hates football. Steve collects all sorts of memorabilia connected with his two clubs and always wears one of the replica kits on Saturdays and Sundays. Steve says that he does love his girlfriend but has a different type of passion for football.

- (a) Describe how two approaches might try to explain Steve's passion for football. (6 marks + 6 marks)
AO1
- (b) Assess one of these explanations of Steve's passion for football in terms of its strengths and limitations. (6 marks)
AO2
- (c) How would one of these approaches investigate Steve's passion for football? (6 marks)
AO2
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating Steve's passion for football. (6 marks)
AO2

It must be clearly appreciated that the Approaches questions are concerned with epistemology rather than ontology, thus the candidate is rewarded for demonstrating knowledge of how a particular approach would endeavour to explore the topic area in questions. Answers which focus on particular studies or published accounts should receive credit only insofar as these illustrate an understanding and critical appreciation of the theoretical and methodological orientations of the general approach to the hypothetical example given in the question.

Here is an illustration of the approaches:

- *Behaviourism.* Many of the classic tenets of conditioning and observational learning could be used to explain Steve's passion for football. For example, deriving positive reinforcement from his team winning, and perhaps punishment at being part of the crowd supporting a team which loses and may be taunted by the opposing fans. He may also model his behaviour upon that he observes in peers around him.
- *Evolutionary psychology.* The competitive streak associated with 'survival of the fittest' may be used to explain Steve's behaviour. He may see success as a competition for scarce resources (success in terms of trophies) and the kudos associated with success and ownership.
- *Anthropology.* Anthropologists have often studied tribal and inter-tribal warfare in their work. The identification of people with club gangs who compete with each other may contain elements of this. This may well offer an interesting explanation of Steve's love for football and identification with his teams (for example, by wearing replica kits).

The method described should clearly be one associated with, or be appropriate to, the approach chosen.

Question 8 (a) Assessment Objective 1

For description of each approach

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|--------|--|-------|
| Band 3 | Psychological content is reasonably thorough and accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent . | 6-5 |
| Band 2 | Psychological content is limited and generally accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable . | 4-3 |
| Band 1 | Psychological content is basic, sometimes flawed and inaccurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled . | 2-1 |
| | There is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material. | 0 |

Question 8 (b) Assessment Objective 2

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|--------|---|-------|
| Band 3 | There is reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent . | 6-5 |
| Band 2 | There is limited commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable . | 4-3 |
| Band 1 | There is basic commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). The material has been used in a restricted manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled . | 2-1 |
| | There is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material. | 0 |

Question 8 (c) Assessment Objective 2

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|--------|--|-------|
| Band 3 | There is reasonably thorough commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent . | 6-5 |
| Band 2 | There is limited commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is reasonably appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable . | 4-3 |
| Band 1 | There is basic commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is largely inappropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled . | 2-1 |
| | There is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material. | 0 |

Question 8 (d) Assessment Objective 2Should engage with method in (c) **and** with the stimulus material

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|--------|---|-------|
| Band 3 | There is reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in an effective manner . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent . | 6-5 |
| Band 2 | There is limited commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable . | 4-3 |
| Band 1 | There is basic commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. The material in which material has been used is restricted . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled . | 2-1 |
| | There is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material. | 0 |

Tina is an extremely shy and nervous young woman. She hates the thought of meeting new people and the idea of having to speak to others in her meetings at work fills her with a sense of dread. Her shyness means that she tends to avoid going out to places where she is likely to meet lots of other people. As a result she stays in most of the time.

- (a) Describe how two approaches might try to explain Tina's shyness. (6 marks + 6 marks)
AO1
- (b) Assess one of these explanations of Tina's shyness in terms of its strengths and limitations. (6 marks)
AO2
- (c) How would one of these approaches investigate Tina's shyness? (6 marks)
AO2
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating Tina's shyness. (6 marks)
AO2

It must be clearly appreciated that the Approaches questions are concerned with epistemology rather than ontology, thus the candidate is rewarded for demonstrating knowledge of how a particular approach would endeavour to explore the topic area in questions. Answers which focus on particular studies or published accounts should receive credit only insofar as these illustrate an understanding and critical appreciation of the theoretical and methodological orientations of the general approach to the hypothetical example given in the question.

Here is an illustration of the approaches:

- *Cognitive psychology.* Just as people with eating disorders (AS specification) have been shown to have non-veridical cognitions and perceptions about their body shape, so Tina may have similar cognitions about herself. She may have low self-esteem which makes it difficult for her to engage in social intercourse and inaccurate about others' judgements about her which have the same result. Arguments focussing upon the ways in which individuals process information are also relevant here.
- *Psychoanalysis.* In Freudian theory, for example, an explanation for Tina's behaviour may be in terms of the balance, and conflict between the forces of the id and the superego, or in terms of 'inadequate' ego functioning. It could also possibly be a result of regression to an early, socially immature way of functioning.
- *Bio-psychology.* There are many examples of arguments that personality and temperament are determined by biological factors, such as those which contend that neurological or genetic factors may shape the people we are or our proclivities to develop certain personality types of behavioural dispositions.

The method described should clearly be one associated with or appropriate to the approach chosen.

Question 9 (a) Assessment Objective 1

For description of each approach

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|--|------------|
| Band 3 | Psychological content is reasonably thorough and accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent . | 6-5 |
| Band 2 | Psychological content is limited and generally accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable . | 4-3 |
| Band 1 | Psychological content is basic, sometimes flawed and inaccurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled . | 2-1 |
| | There is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material. | 0 |

Question 9 (b) Assessment Objective 2

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|---|------------|
| Band 3 | There is reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent . | 6-5 |
| Band 2 | There is limited commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with stimulus material is reasonable . | 4-3 |
| Band 1 | There is a basic commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). The material has been used in a restricted manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled . | 2-1 |
| | There is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material. | 0 |

Question 9 (c) Assessment Objective 2

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|--|------------|
| Band 3 | There is reasonably thorough commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent . | 6-5 |
| Band 2 | There is limited commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is reasonably appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable . | 4-3 |
| Band 1 | There is basic commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is largely inappropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled . | 2-1 |
| | There is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material. | 0 |

Question 9 (d) Assessment Objective 2Should engage with method in (c) **and** with the stimulus material

| Band | Mark allocation | Marks |
|---------------|---|------------|
| Band 3 | There is reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in an effective manner . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent . | 6-5 |
| Band 2 | There is limited commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable . | 4-3 |
| Band 1 | There is basic commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. The material in which material has been used is restricted . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled . | 2-1 |
| | There is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material. | 0 |

References

Cardwell, M.C. (1997): The ethics of socially sensitive research. *Psychology Review* 3.3 pp.17-20.

Fernando, S. (1991): *Mental Health: Race and culture*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Pfeffer, W.M. (1982): Culture bound syndromes. In I.AI-Issa (ed.) *Culture and psychopathology*. Baltimore, Maryland: University Park Press.

Sieber, J.E. & Stanley, B. (1988): Ethical and professional dimensions of socially sensitive research. *American Psychologist*. 43,1 pp.49-55.

Yapp, P.M. (1974): *Comparative Psychiatry: A theoretical framework*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.

Assessment grid

| Question | AO1 | AO2 | Totals |
|---|------------|------------|---------------|
| 1 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| 2(a) | 5 | | |
| (b) | 10 | 15 | 30 |
| 3 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| 4 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| 5 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| 6 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| 7(a) | 5 | 15 | |
| (b) | 10 | | 30 |
| 8(a) | 12 | | |
| (b) | | 6 | |
| (c) | | 6 | 30 |
| (d) | | 6 | |
| 9(a) | 12 | | |
| (b) | | 6 | |
| (c) | | 6 | 30 |
| (d) | | 6 | |
| QoWC | | | 4 |
| Total for unit (answering 3 questions) | | | 94 |