

GCE 2005
January Series



Mark Scheme

Psychology A Specification

PYA5 Individual Differences and Perspectives

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 the AQA website:
www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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 AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General

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
12-10	Slightly limited	Accurate & reasonably detailed	Coherent	Evidence
9-7	Limited	Generally accurate & reasonably detailed	Reasonably constructed	Some evidence
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	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
2-0	Basic	Sometimes flawed or inaccurate	Muddled or minimal or no engagement

Approaches part (b) & (d)

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

Approaches part (c)

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

Approaches part (d)

Should engage with method in (c) and with the stimulus material.

Marking allocation as for part (b).

**QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION
(QoWC)**

Band 3	The work is characterised by a CLEAR expression of ideas, the use of a GOOD range of specialist terms, and FEW errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.	4-3 marks
Band 2	The work is characterised by a REASONABLE expression of ideas, the use of SOME specialist terms, and REASONABLE grammar, punctuation and spelling.	2-1 marks
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).

Each question is synoptic. The above list identifies additional avenues for gaining credit of synopticity.

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.

Synopticity may be demonstrated either within a particular area or across a number of different areas. 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**

- (a) Describe **two or more** case studies of Multiple Personality Disorder (Dissociative Identity Disorder). (15 marks)
- (b) To what extent do case studies, such as those described in part (a), lead us to believe that Multiple Personality Disorder is iatrogenic (manufactured by the therapist)? (15 marks)

Describe is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to present **AO1** with relation to two or more case studies of Multiple Personality Disorder.

To what extent is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to consider the extent to which case studies lead us to believe that Multiple Personality Disorder is iatrogenic.

Part (a)**Indicative AO1:**

The most commonly used textbooks focus on three case studies of MPD – Eve White (Thigpen & Cleckley, 1954); Sybil (Schreiber, 1973) and Kenneth Bianchi. Other methodologies e.g. experiments and surveys are not creditworthy. The first two of these have been made famous by filmed accounts (e.g., *The Three Faces of Eve*). Accounts should focus upon the nature of the case studies, for example the characteristics of the disorder in each individual case or simply describing the nature of the case. According to the DSM-IV a person must have at least two separate but parallel identities which should be long-lasting and disruptive. Eve White had 22 identities which existed over a 20 year period before she achieved a single, stable identity. Sybil had 17 identities. Bianchi blamed the murder of ten women on two ‘other’ personalities, Steve and Billy.

The question requires the candidate to describe two or more case studies of MPD therefore those offering only one will be deemed to be partially performing (see mark allocation for **AO1**).

Examiners should be mindful of the breadth/depth trade off when marking the work of candidates who offer descriptions of two case studies and those offering more than this.

Descriptions of case studies often appear rather anecdotal but this is often the nature of the material one is working with here.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The following are some possibilities for additional synopticity:

- Theoretical interpretations (e.g., a psychoanalytic account of the case study of Sybil and her childhood maltreatment)
- Ethical considerations (e.g., the popular films of Eve and Sybil leading to what textbooks have called an epidemic of diagnosis of MPD)
- Links to the AS specification and defining psychological abnormality.

Part (b)**Indicative AO2:**

Kinderman (2002) discusses two main explanations for MPD: the posttraumatic model and the sociocognitive model. The former views MPD as spontaneous whereas the latter sees it as iatrogenic. Thigpen & Cleckley were of the opinion that it would have been impossible for Eve to produce her different personalities to please therapists and to maintain the consistency of performance. Sybil's original doctor believed that her MPD was spontaneous and a response to her childhood abuse by her mother. A locum doctor, however, who worked with Sybil in the absence of Dr. Ferber, believed her disorder to be iatrogenic. Bianchi was eventually diagnosed to be suffering from anti-social personality disorder rather than MPD and was found guilty of committing most of the murders with his cousin. Both were imprisoned.

Note that the wording of the question means that the candidate does not have to use the same case studies in parts a and b.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The following are some possibilities for additional synopticity:

- Difficulties surrounding the processes involved in diagnosis
- Culture bias (MPD is claimed to be a highly Westernised phenomenon)
- Issues relating to clinical practice such as False Memory Syndrome.

Note that the focus of both parts of the question is on case studies. General MPD answers should be limited to a maximum of Band 2 for both **AO1 and AO2**.

Note there is no partial performance in part b. Examiners should be particularly mindful of the need for candidates to provide sustained critical commentary. The focus of the question is on iatrogenesis of MPD and materials on alternatives (e.g. arguments for or against their existence, or the 'spontaneous argument') should only receive **AO2** credit in so far as it is explicitly used to evaluate iatrogenesis. The effectiveness of **AO2** material is related to the degree to which candidates address the 'to what extent' component of this question part.

Question 1 Assessment Objective 2

Description of two or more case studies of Multiple Personality Disorder

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of two or more case studies of Multiple Personality Disorder 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). ‘In-question’ synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Description of two or more case studies of Multiple Personality Disorder 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 two or more case studies of Multiple Personality Disorder 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 two or more case studies of Multiple Personality Disorder 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 two or more case studies of Multiple Personality Disorder 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 1

Evaluation of whether case studies lead us to believe that Multiple Personality Disorder is iatrogenic.

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of whether case studies lead us to believe that Multiple Personality Disorder is iatrogenic is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). ‘In-question’ synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of whether case studies lead us to believe that Multiple Personality Disorder is iatrogenic is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of whether case studies lead us to believe that Multiple Personality Disorder is iatrogenic is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of whether case studies lead us to believe that Multiple Personality Disorder is iatrogenic is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of whether case studies lead us to believe that Multiple Personality Disorder is iatrogenic is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

2

Total for this question: 30 marks

Compare and contrast biological and psychological explanations of depression.	<i>(30 marks)</i>
---	-------------------

Compare and contrast is an **AO1 and AO2** term which requires the demonstration of knowledge and understanding of a biological explanation of depression and a psychological explanation of depression and consideration of similarities and differences between the explanations.

There are **two strategies** which examiners may use to mark answers to compare and contrast questions. The **first strategy** is for ‘free-standing’ description of biological and psychological explanations of depression to be credited under the **AO1** allocation of marks. Such content should be descriptive but evaluative material may receive credit if it constitutes an elaboration of this description. The **AO2** allocation of marks is then awarded for explicit comparing and contrasting of the explanations and may be descriptive and/or evaluative.

The **second strategy** is to credit *description* of similarities and differences as **AO1** and *evaluation* of similarities and differences as **AO2**.

These strategies are reflected in the marking allocations which follow.

Examiners should award marks according to whichever of the two strategies will earn more credit for the candidate. In almost all instances this will be determined by whether the answer comprises predominantly free-standing accounts of the explanations or whether it is predominantly comparing and contrasting.

Comparing and contrasting must be **between** biological and psychological explanations not **within** to be creditworthy.

STRATEGY 1:

Indicative AO1.

When addressing biological and/or psychological explanations of depression it is legitimate for candidates to do so ‘directly’ via theory (e.g., the influence of genes) or to illustrate the explanations via empirical studies (such as family studies).

There are of course a number of different biological explanations for depression. The ones most likely to be offered by candidates include the influence of genetic factors, brain biochemistry (e.g., the permissive amine theory) and the influence of the endocrine system. The influence of genetic factors has been extensively studied via family studies (e.g., Gershon, 1990), adoption studies (e.g., Wender et al., 1986) and twin studies (e.g., Allen’s 1976 review). The influence of brain biochemistry is often examined via the effects of anti-depressants whereas the influence of the endocrine system is often studied through the influence of PMS.

Psychological explanations of depression include learning theory/behaviourism (e.g., learned helplessness); psychodynamics (e.g., Freud’s explanation by reference to coping with the loss of a significant other); cognitive explanations (e.g., Beck & Clark’s 1988 work on schemas) and life events (e.g., Brown and Harris’s 1978 interviews with women living in London).

Answers which focus upon the clinical characteristics of depression should receive credit only insofar as they might serendipitously make points relevant to theoretical explanations.

Candidates are required to offer a plurality of explanations of depression, if only one is given partial performance penalties apply (see mark allocations). This means at least one biological explanation and one psychological explanation must be given; candidates do not need to supply more than one of each.

Examiners should be mindful of the depth/breadth trade-off when marking the work of candidates who offer one biological explanation and one psychological explanation and those offering more than this.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The synoptic requirement of this question is a plurality of theoretical explanations of depression. Additional synoptic possibilities include;

- Psychology as a science (biological being regarded as more scientific as psychological)
- Nature/nurture (biological supporting nature more than psychological explanations)
- Links to other areas of the specification (e.g., biological and psychological explanations of psychological abnormality on AS).

AO2:

See description of similarities and differences and evaluation of these below.

Partial performance – similarities or differences would be partial performance for **AO2** (see mark allocations).

STRATEGY 2

AO1: Similarities/differences:

It must be remembered that these must be described explicitly.

Examples which candidates may explore include the following although it is impossible to be prescriptive since much will depend on which explanations are selected by the candidate.

Similarities:

- ◆ The explanations lead to treatment of the mental illness
- ◆ The majority are reductionist
- ◆ Explanations focus on the individual rather than cultural norms

Differences:

- ◆ Assumptions of the aetiology of mental illness (e.g., somatic versus learned)
- ◆ Level and nature of reductionism (e.g., molecular versus behavioural)
- ◆ Different explanations will give rise to different treatments
- ◆ Although they focus on the individual they differ in which aspects of the individual they focus on (e.g., behavioural versus biology; the role of social factors)

Additional synoptic possibilities:

These include:

- Culture bias (e.g., factors associated with the apparently low incidence of depression in countries such as India and Pakistan)
- Nature-nurture (biological favouring the former)
- Psychology as science (biological explanations being regarded as more scientific)

Partial performance for **AO1** and **AO2** if only similarities or differences (see mark allocations).

AO2: Similarities & differences

Rather than evaluating specific theories or studies candidates will be evaluating similarities and differences between theories/studies. The following evaluative criteria are taken from Starbuck (1998) and may be useful when comparing the two (or more) explanations (e.g., which one satisfies the criteria better?):

- How well do they help open up or extend debate?
- How well have they helped the way psychologists look at a particular issue or area?
- Do they employ concepts/definitions that can be criticised?
- Do they reflect the values of a perspective or the psychologist?
- Are they outdated?
- Are they supported by empirical evidence?
- Can assertions or findings be generalised?
- How well do they satisfy the requirements of reliability/validity?
- Are there biases? (e.g. ethnocentricity, androcentricity, heterosexism)
- Are there alternative explanations/interpretations?
- Have they helped clarify the meaning of any concepts in psychology?
- Have they added to our understanding in the relevant area of psychology?
- Are they likely to be of any use to psychologists in the future?
- Are they useful to society in general?

As is consistent with the **AO2** marking criteria, higher marks will tend to awarded to those answers which show elaboration which is reasonable or better.

STRATEGY 1**Question 2 Assessment Objective 1**

Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations of depression

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations of depression 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). 'In-question' synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations of depression 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	Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations of depression 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	Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations of depression 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	Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations of depression 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

Assessment Objective 2

Consideration of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Consideration of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). 'In-question' synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Consideration of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Consideration of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and coherent (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Consideration of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6) <i>Partial performance is limited and reasonably effective with reasonable elaboration.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Consideration of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and restricted with some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

OR STRATEGY 2

Question 2 Assessment Objective 1

Description of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression 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). 'In-question' synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Description of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression 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 similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression 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 similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression 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 similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression 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

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). 'In-question' synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and coherent (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6) <i>Partial performance is limited and reasonably effective with reasonable elaboration.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of similarities and differences between/within biological and psychological explanations of depression is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and restricted with some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

3**Total for this question: 30 marks**

“Some psychologists claim that behavioural therapies are unethical and of limited value because they treat symptoms rather than causes.”

Discuss behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation above. (30 marks)

Discuss is an **AO1 and AO2** term which requires the candidate both to describe and evaluate. The **AO1** component requires the candidate to present his or her knowledge of behavioural therapies with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation. The **AO2** component of the question requires the candidate to make reference to different, if not contrasting points of view about behavioural therapies with reference to issues such as the issues raised in the quotation.

Indicative AO1:

Candidates may deal with this question in two ways. They may describe behavioural therapies *and* related issues, such as those raised in the quotation. Or they may describe the therapies and use issues as a means of evaluation. Both approaches are creditworthy. However an answer which focuses solely on issues, with no description of behavioural therapies should be limited to a mark of **Band 2** for **AO1** and **AO2**.

Candidates may focus upon therapies deriving from classical conditioning (e.g. flooding, systematic desensitisation and aversion therapy); operant conditioning (e.g. token economy treatment) and SLT (e.g. modelling therapy). Given their treatment in the major textbooks it is likely that candidates can offer full and well- detailed descriptions of the mode of operation and implementation of such treatments.

Notice that is not necessary for candidates to link the treatments back to their theoretical underpinnings.

There are three issues which are raised in the quotation:

- Behavioural therapies are unethical
- They are of limited value
- They treat symptoms rather than causes

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The question has the synoptic feature of behavioural therapies (plural). The following are some additional possibilities:

- ethics, e.g., the relative ‘reversibility’ of behavioural therapies (as opposed to somatic treatments).
- reductionism, i.e., behavioural reductionism.
- psychology as a science, e.g., the standing of behavioural therapies as opposed to, say, somatic treatments of psychoanalytic interventions.
- links across the specification, e.g., nature of abnormality (AS).

Indicative AO2:

Given the wording in the specification candidates are likely to focus on effectiveness of treatment. A key factor here is the nature of the illness or psychological disorder it is being used with (e.g. phobias versus schizophrenia). Another key issue is whether it is successful – when it is – because of the nature of the treatment of other co-occurring factors such as attention, expectations and therapist variables.

Ethical issues are likely to be those in the quote or commentary on issues credited as **AO1**.

Other likely issues include the accusation that it mechanistic (and does not give insight such as humanistic treatments do, for example); that it only deals with symptoms rather than underlying causes; symptom substitution; lack of generalisation; and the exclusive focus upon behaviour.

Candidates may also gain credit for commentary on issues that have been offered at a descriptive level.

Examiners should be particularly mindful of the need for candidates to provide sustained critical commentary when awarding **AO2** marks. The focus of the question is on behavioural therapies and material on alternatives (e.g., bio-therapies; psychoanalysis) should only receive **AO2** credit insofar as they are explicitly and consistently used to evaluate the behavioural therapies.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** additional 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.

There is no penalty if the candidate does not refer to the quotation. The wording of the question means that the candidate does not have to engage with these particular issues but may chose his or her own.

Candidates are required to offer a plurality of behavioural therapies, if only one is given partial performance penalties apply (see mark allocations for **AO1** and **AO2**).

Question 3 Assessment Objective 1

Description of behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation.

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation 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). 'In-question' synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Description of behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation 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 behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation 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 behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation 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 behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation 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

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). 'In-question' synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and coherent (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6) <i>Partial performance is limited and reasonably effective with reasonable elaboration.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of behavioural therapies for treating mental disorders with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and restricted with some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

SECTION B: Issues and debates in Psychology.

4

Total for this question: 30 marks

With reference to two or more theories, discuss gender bias in psychology. (30 marks)

Discuss is an **AO1 and AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate. The **AO1** component requires the candidate to present his or her knowledge gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories. The **AO2** component of the question requires the candidate to make reference to different, if not contrasting points of view about gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories.

Indicative AO1:

It is likely that candidates will adopt one of two approaches here. The first will be to organize their answers around a description of different *types* of gender bias (e.g., alpha, beta and androcentrism). Thus the description will be primarily in terms of the nature of gender bias. The second approach will be more ‘applied’ and will be driven by illustration of gender bias ‘in practice’ (i.e. in the two or more theories). Likely examples include Freud, Kohlberg and Erikson. As long as both aspects (gender bias in psychology) and two or more theories are addressed the balance is immaterial.

Note that the focus is on gender bias rather than gender differences. The latter should receive no credit.

In the unlikely event of gender bias being described at a wholly general level (e.g. without any reference to psychological principles, examples or theories) a maximum of **Band 2** marks may be awarded for **AO1** and **AO2**.

If psychological studies are the vehicle for illustration credit may only be awarded insofar as the material may serendipitously be relevant to theories.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

The question has the synoptic feature of the issue of gender or cultural bias in psychological research but the following are some additional possibilities:

- different theoretical perspectives (for example psychoanalysis)
- different methodologies (for example the argument that women ‘perform’ better in interviews than men because of their allegedly superior verbal skills)
- ethics (for example giving legitimacy to beliefs which may result in prejudice and/or discrimination)
- nature-nurture issues (for example, concerning the ‘permanence’ of gender differences).

Indicative AO2:

Descriptive accounts of gender bias with reference to two or more psychological theories should be credited as **AO1**. Commentary/evaluation/analysis of these constitutes the **AO2** part of the candidate's response. Examples would include specific critical work for instance that of Gilligan critique of Kohlberg's theory of moral development. Alternatively candidates may offer general evaluative criteria relating to gender bias. An example of this would be that Freud's work (for instance) was a product of its time/culture and it is unreasonable to expect any researcher to be independent of the 'historical' or cultural value dominant at that particular time or in that particular culture.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** are relevant here but can 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.

Candidates are required to offer a plurality of psychological theories, if only one is given partial performance penalties apply (see mark allocations).

Examiners should be mindful of the depth/breadth trade-off when marking the work of candidates who offer two theories and those offering more than this.

Question 4 Assessment Objective 1

Description of gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories 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). ‘In-question’ synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Description of gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories 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 gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories 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 gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories 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 gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories 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

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories.

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). ‘In-question’ synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and coherent (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of gender bias in psychology with reference to two or more theories is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6) <i>Partial performance is limited and reasonably effective with reasonable elaboration.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of two or more psychological theories in terms of their gender bias is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and restricted with some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

5

Total for this question: 30 marks

“Psychology has tended to present a view of human behaviour that applies only to members of Western cultures and tells us little about the vast majority of humankind.”

Discuss cultural bias in psychological research (theories **and/or** studies) with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation above. (30 marks)

Discuss is an **AO1 and AO2** term which requires the candidate both describe and evaluate. The **AO1** component requires the candidate to present his or her knowledge of issues such as the one raised in the quotation about cultural bias in psychological research. The **AO2** component of the question requires the candidate to make reference to different, if not contrasting points of view such as about the issue raised in the quotation about cultural bias in psychological research.

Indicative AO1:

The issue raised in the quotation relates to sampling/generalisability (frequently identified as the problem of so-called Universal Man in many of the textbooks).

Note that the wording means that candidates do not have to address this particular issue and are free to choose which ones they wish, although the wording will mean they are likely to.

Candidates are likely to focus on one of two approaches (or combine both).

Specific examples of psychological theories and/or research. For example:

1.

- Kohlberg’s (1963) theory of moral development which is accused of Western, middle –class and individualistic bias.
- Freud’s psychoanalysis (ditto).
- So-called economic theories of interpersonal attraction, e.g., Social exchange theory (Homans, 1961).
- Examples of research into psychopathology characterised by ethnocentricity.
- Research into race and IQ.

An exploration of types of cultural bias in psychological research.

Haralambos & Rice (2002) give the following examples:

2.

- ignoring culture (important because it leaves out a key determinant of behaviour);
- culture doesn’t matter (all human life is pretty much of a much-ness. Re. The Universal Man argument noted above);
- culture change doesn’t matter (a lack of historical perspective);
- culture and psychology (e.g., the accusation of Western bias);
- ethnocentrism (interpreting behaviour through the values of one particular (dominant) society);
- emic/etic bias.

For the **AO1** marks these accounts should be descriptive.

Examiners should be mindful that the focus of the question is on cultural bias and not cultural differences. No credit should be awarded for the latter unless it is serendipitously relevant.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

The question has the synoptic feature of cultural bias (see p.6) but the following are some additional possibilities:

- cultural variation (for example the debates surrounding culture-bound syndromes).
- ethical issues such as Socially Sensitive Research which marginalizes certain cultural/sub-cultural groups (e.g., gay research).
- links to other parts of the specification (such as Developmental Psychology) in Unit 4 which carry examples of culturally biased research.

Indicative AO2

The material here is evaluative/ analytical. A popular approach is a critical consideration of whether or not the examples of cultural bias given for **AO1** can be justified. An example here would be appraisal of the Universal Man argument such as that in the area of biological psychology it could be argued that it does not matter if all participants in psychological studies are drawn from the same culture as our biological 'equipment' and functioning varies little across the world. Conversely, candidates could use examples such as those from social psychology (e.g., altruism in individualist/collectivist cultures) where it could be argued that there are clear cultural differences and ignoring these is biased and unacceptable.

The relatively recent rise of Afro-centric psychology would be an acceptable evaluation of cultural bias (as a response to it).

Additional synoptic possibilities:

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** are relevant here but can 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.

There is no penalty for candidates who do not make explicit reference to the quotation.

Note that it is not intended that this question requires a plurality performance: the number of issues offered will constitute the breadth of response.

If candidates discuss cultural bias but not in the context of psychological research marks should be limited to Band 2 (**AO1** and **AO2**).

Question 5 Assessment Objective 1

Description of cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation 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). ‘In-question’ synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Description of cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation 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 cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation 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 cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation 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 cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation 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

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). ‘In-question’ synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6)	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of cultural bias in psychological research with reference to issues such as the one raised in the quotation is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

6

Total for this question: 30 marks

Critically consider arguments **against** reductionist explanations in psychology. (30 marks)

Critically consider is an **AO1 and AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe **and** evaluate arguments against reductionism in psychology.

Indicative AO1:

The focus here is on arguments (against reductionism) and so answers which focus on examples of reductionism (e.g., biological explanations of psychological phenomena such as pathologies) should receive credit only insofar as it may be serendipitously relevant to arguments.

Eysenck & Flanagan (2001) identify the following as disadvantages of reductionist explanations:

- That much human behaviour cannot be understood solely in terms of, for example, basic biological processes.
- That psychologists typically describe processes whereas physiologists tend to describe structures.
- That reductionism has not worked very well in practice.
- That lower-level explanations often contain many details which are irrelevant to psychologists.

We could also add

- A failure to appreciate holistic principles such as those expounded by Gestalt and Humanistic psychologists
- That some psychological phenomena such as human consciousness are not easily amenable to reductionism

There are two potential pitfalls for candidates in answering this question. One is to focus too heavily on reductionism *per se* and the other is to get drawn into inappropriately detailed accounts of particular psychological theories and/or studies and fail to relate them sufficiently to reductionism.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The focus of the question is itself synoptic because it is concerned with a debate in psychology but other synoptic possibilities may be relevantly raised. These include:

- theoretical perspectives (e.g. behaviourism versus humanistic psychology or Gestalt psychology);
- methodologies (e.g. psychometric tests versus open-ended interviews);
- other issues/debates such as the use of non-human animals in psychology, free-will/determinism and psychology as a science.
- Links may also be made to other parts of the specification, e.g. biopsychology and AS coverage of biological versus psychological explanations (of psychological abnormality).

Indicative AO2:

There are two main ways in which candidates may demonstrate **AO2** in answering this question. The first is for them to analyse and/or evaluate the arguments which they have described as being against reductionism in psychology for their **AO1** marks. The second is for them to offer arguments for reductionism in psychology as these will constitute counter-points to the arguments against. For example Eysenck & Flanagan give the following:

- That it has immediate appeal
- That it has scientific status
- That it can assist compatibility with disciplines such as physiology.
- To these we can add simplicity and parsimony.

Candidates may be credited for arguments **for** reductionism insofar as they represent evaluation of arguments **against** reductionism, provided they are clearly related (i.e., not separate, unrelated points).

Additional synoptic possibilities:

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** are relevant here but can 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.

Examiners should be mindful of the depth/breadth trade-off when marking the work of candidates who offer two arguments and those offering more than this.

Note that it is not intended that this question requires a plurality performance: the number of arguments offered will constitute the breadth of response.

Question 6 Assessment Objective 1

Description of arguments against reductionism in psychology.

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of arguments against reductionism 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). 'In-question' synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Description of arguments against reductionism 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).	12-10
Band 3	Description of arguments against reductionism 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).	9-7
Band 2	Description of arguments against reductionism in psychology 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 arguments against reductionism 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).	3-0

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of arguments against reductionism in psychology

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of arguments against reductionism in psychology is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). 'In-question' synopticity is sufficient to earn full credit.	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of arguments against reductionism in psychology is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of arguments against reductionism in psychology is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of arguments against reductionism in psychology is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of arguments against reductionism in psychology is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

7

Total for this question: 30 marks

- | |
|---|
| (a) Explain what is meant by the terms nature and nurture. (5 marks) |
| (b) Outline the history of the nature-nurture debate in psychology. (10 marks) |
| (c) To what extent is it possible to explain behaviour in terms of only nature or nurture? (15 marks) |

Part (a): Explain is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to demonstrate his or her knowledge of what is meant by nature and nurture.

Part (b): Outline is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to offer a summary description of the history of the nature-nurture debate in psychology.

Part (c): ‘To what extent’ is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to consider the extent to which it is possible to explain behaviour in terms of nature or nurture.

Part (a) Indicative AO1:

Nature is what we may think of as ‘pre-wiring’ and is influenced by genetic inheritance and other biological factors. Nurture is generally taken as being the influence of external factors following the birth of an individual (for example the product of exposure, experience and learning) although external (to the individual) factors may exert an influence on him or her before birth.

Candidates may use examples to enhance or illustrate their answers but this is not necessary, of course.

It is quite acceptable for candidates to embed their definitions in an explanation of the nature-nurture debate.

Part (b) Indicative AO1:

In the Debates section of the A2 Specification there are explicit references to historical perspectives: the development of psychology as a separate discipline in *Psychology as science* and the history of the nature-nurture debate in that section.

All that is required here is that there is some sense of time perspective in candidates’ answers, for example by showing how earlier work influenced later work or how later work was a reaction to some earlier work. Another possibility would be to show how a particular piece of psychological research reflected dominant concerns or values held at a particular time. Galton’s work on intelligence would be a good example of this. Answers which indicate no sense of time perspective at all should be limited to a maximum of **Band 2** as the response would be no better than Basic.

Examples can of course be drawn from any part of the Specification, although intelligence testing is likely to be a favourite as is the different developmental positions taken by Piaget and Vygotsky. Aggression from Social Psychology is likely to be another favourite with Bandura’s Bobo doll studies showing how reinforcement is not essential for learning to take place. Candidates may focus on the relatively recent development of schema theory to explain gender differences.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The focus of the question is itself synoptic but additional possibilities include:

- Biological versus psychological explanations of phenomena.
- Ethics (e.g., of the relative permanence of factors attributed to nature such as those in the field of education/education).
- Gender and culture bias (for example, biology as destiny for the former).

Part (c): Indicative AO2:

The question refers to 'behaviour'. An acceptance of the full range of behaviours from the most molar to the most molecular is of course acceptable. Additionally we should take a broad view of what constitutes 'behaviour' and include, for example, thinking and memory. The wording of the question makes it legitimate to focus upon human and/or animal behaviour.

It is likely that candidates will adopt two approaches: via research (studies and/or theory) or via a general 'philosophical' (non-empirical) orientation. A maximum of **Band 2** may be awarded for descriptive, scene-setting of studies, etc. but the remainder must be evaluative/analytical.

For candidates taking the empirical route likely favourites might include bio-psychology (e.g. lateralisation of brain function) for the influence of nature and social psychology (e.g. cultural and sub-cultural differences in relationships) for nurture. Perception is another likely favourite. A majority of candidates are likely to focus upon interactionism. Pathologies (e.g. schizophrenia and depression) would be an example of a topic area which would service this well as would the determination of IQ/intelligence debate.

The effectiveness of **AO2** material is related to the degree to which candidates address the 'to what extent' component of this question part.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The focus of the question is itself synoptic but additional possibilities include:

- Theories (e.g., of motivation)
- Methodologies (e.g., twin studies)
- Ethics (e.g., socially sensitive research such as 'gay-gene')
- Psychology as a science (nature being seen as more scientific)

Question 7(a). Assessment AO1.

Explanation of what is meant by nature and nurture

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	Explanation of nature and nurture is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	5-4
Band 2	Explanation of nature and nurture is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent . <i>Partial performance: Explanation of nature OR nurture is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent.</i> AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	3-2
Band 1	Explanation of nature and nurture is weak and muddled . <i>Partial performance: Explanation of nature OR nurture is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent.</i> AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	1-0

7(b). Assessment Objective 1

Outline of the history of nature-nurture debate in psychology

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Outline of the history of 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 10 MARKS.	10-9
Band 4	Outline of the history of 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 10 MARKS.	8-7
Band 3	Outline of the history of 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 10 MARKS.	6-5
Band 2	Outline of the history of 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 10 MARKS.	4-3
Band 1	Outline of the history of 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 10 MARKS.	2-0

7(c). Assessment Objective 2.

Evaluation of possibility of explaining behaviour in terms of only nature or nurture

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of possibility of explaining behaviour in terms of only nature or nurture is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of possibility of explaining behaviour in terms of only nature or nurture is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of possibility of explaining behaviour in terms of only nature or nurture is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of possibility of explaining behaviour in terms of only nature or nurture is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of possibility of explaining behaviour in terms of only nature or nurture is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

SECTION C: Approaches.**8****Total for this question: 30 marks**

A survey has shown that a large number of people have a dread of ageing. They are particularly worried about looking old and spend a great deal of time and money to ensure that they look young for as long as possible.

- (a) Describe how **two** approaches might try to explain the desire to look young. (6 marks + 6 marks)
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations for the desire to look young in terms of its strengths and limitations. (6 marks)
- (c) How would **one** of these approaches investigate the desire to look young? (6 marks)
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating the desire to look young. (6 marks)

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 in question. 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.

Two possible approaches here are:

Cognitive psychology. It may be that there are schema associated with looking young and, conversely, older –whatever one’s age – and these are desirable and undesirable. The emphasis here is not on how such schema could have arisen (e.g., conditioning or psychoanalytic dynamics) or their source (e.g., social constructionism) but upon their nature and their impact upon the individual. They focus, of course, upon (largely) conscious ‘internal’ factors such as thought processes rather than repressed emotions or behaviours

Evolutionary psychology. Looking youthful is generally held to be associated with reproductive strength and desirability. Consequently it may be the case that people want to make themselves maximally attractive in the ‘mating game’. Conventional evolutionary psychology would hold that this would be particularly important for females.

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

Examples here would be:

A cognitive psychologist would use methodologies suitable for investigating belief systems. Examples could be self-report, e.g., questionnaires or Q-sorts. He/she could also carry out experiments such as where participants have to provide ratings of attractiveness of photographs of young and non-young faces (which would be the IV).

An evolutionary psychologist might explore a desire to look young to see if it is indeed the case that youthful appearance is valued by others in the ‘mating game’. One way in which this could be done would be correlational analysis of (perceived) age and attractiveness or a study of ‘actual’ data such as that which could be drawn from an analysis of personal ads columns or popular magazines.

In all parts of the Approaches questions candidates are required to engage with the stimulus material, as distinct from presenting pre-prepared material on Approaches. Some candidates may simply add a few appropriate words (such as ‘desire to look young’). This strategy is unlikely to raise a candidate’s mark above **Band 1** (Basic). On the other hand, some candidates may *shape* their responses in order to address issues in the stimulus material. Such responses could gain full marks depending on the degree of shaping for purpose. The extent to which candidates have used their knowledge to effectively answer the four parts of the question constitutes the merit of their response.

If no explicit reference is made to the stimulus material marks should be limited to a maximum of **Band 1**.

Some candidates may describe a way of **investigating** the phenomenon which is clearly appropriate to one approach identified in (a) but operationalises the variables without explicit reference to the stimulus. Such responses may gain credit insofar as they accurately portray methodology and assumptions of the chosen approach.

Question 8(a) Assessment Objective 1

AO1: 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 or there is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0

Question 8 (b) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For assessment of strengths and weaknesses of one approach

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 . <i>If there is partial performance, strengths or limitations is reasonably thorough and engagement with the stimulus material is coherent. Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with material is coherent.</i>	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 or there is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material. <i>If there is partial performance, strengths or limitations is limited. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonably.</i>	2-0

Question 8 (c) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For one approach investigating the phenomenon

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 or there is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0
	If the method is not appropriate to either of the approaches identified in (a) = 0 marks.	

Even if (c) is not appropriate, examiners must read part (d) as it might contain information, which can be exported. Examiners should not rule out therapeutic techniques as ways of investigating in part (c). The marks awarded must depend on plausibility/how candidates have used the material.

Question 8 (d) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For evaluation of the investigative approach given in (c).

Band	<i>Mark allocation</i>	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 or there is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0
	If the evaluation is of a method which is not appropriate to either of the approaches in (a) = 0 marks.	

Exporting is possible between (a) & (b) and between (c) & (d).

9 Total for this question: 30 marks

Selina and her friends love going out to clubs on Friday and Saturday nights. They particularly enjoy dancing for hours and meeting new people. They see going to clubs and dancing for hours as the best thing in their lives, and get a tremendous amount of pleasure from it.

- (a) Describe how **two** approaches might try to explain the enjoyment derived from going out to clubs. *(6 marks + 6 marks)*
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations for the enjoyment derived from going out to clubs in terms of its strengths and limitations. *(6 marks)*
- (c) How would **one** of these approaches investigate how going out to clubs produces enjoyment in young people? *(6 marks)*
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating how going out to clubs produces enjoyment in young people. *(6 marks)*

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 in question. 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.

Two possible approaches here are:

Biological psychology. There are many facets to biological psychology but the main emphasis here would probably be on brain chemistry and the influence of hormones. Another possibility is that certain individuals, in this case Selina and her friends, may have a genetic proclivity towards seeking excitation or arousal which may explain her love of clubbing.

Behaviourism. The stimulus material makes it clear that not only do Selina and her friends love clubbing but it is also a highly social activity for her (by reference to her friends involvement) therefore it is clearly not solitary. Behaviourists could explain her behaviour through reference to classical conditioning (perhaps how the behaviour was initially acquired) and operant conditioning (perhaps how it was maintained)

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

Examples here would be:

Biological psychology. A field experiment is a possibility but the practical and ethical implications of carrying out, for example, urine tests in clubs means that this is very unlikely to be feasible. A simulation experiment is therefore much more likely where a stimulating social situation is engendered by the researcher and measures of biological functioning (including urine and blood tests and possibly PET scans) could be taken.

Behaviourism. Once again an experiment is the most likely research methodology. For example, a group of young (important for purposes of generalisability) participants could be divided into two groups one of whom is reinforced for engaging in the activity and another who is not. Candidates could usefully identify an independent variable, dependent variable and possible confounding variables (such as previous reinforcement histories in such situations).

In all parts of the Approaches questions candidates are required to engage with the stimulus material, as distinct from presenting pre-prepared material on Approaches. Some candidates may simply add a few appropriate words (such as ‘going out to clubs’). This strategy is unlikely to raise a candidate’s mark above **Band 1** (Basic). On the other hand, some candidates may *shape* their responses in order to address issues in the stimulus material. Such responses could gain full marks depending on the degree of shaping for purpose. The extent to which candidates have used their knowledge to effectively answer the four parts of the question constitutes the merit of their response.

If no explicit reference is made to the stimulus material marks should be limited to a maximum of **Band 1**.

Some candidates may describe a way of **investigating** the phenomenon which is clearly appropriate to one approach identified in (a) but operationalises the variables without explicit reference to the stimulus. Such responses may gain credit insofar as they accurately portray methodology and assumptions of the chosen approach.

Question 9(a) Assessment Objective 1

AO1: 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 or there is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0

Question 9 (b) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For assessment of strengths and weaknesses of one approach

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 . <i>If there is partial performance, strengths or limitations is reasonably thorough and engagement with the stimulus material is coherent. Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with material is coherent.</i>	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 or there is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material. <i>If there is partial performance, strengths or limitations is limited. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonably.</i>	2-0

Question 9 (c) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For one approach investigating the phenomenon

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 or there is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0
	If the method is not appropriate to either of the approaches identified in (a) = 0 marks.	

Even if (c) is not appropriate, examiners must read part (d) as it might contain information, which can be exported. Examiners should not rule out therapeutic techniques as ways of investigating in part (c). The marks awarded must depend on plausibility/how candidates have used the material.

Question 9 (d) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For evaluation of the investigative approach given in (c).

Band	<i>Mark allocation</i>	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 or there is no meaningful attempt to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0
	If the evaluation is of a method which is not appropriate to either of the approaches in (a) = 0 marks.	

Exporting is possible between (a) & (b) and between (c) & (d).

Assessment Grid

Question	AO1	AO2
1(a)	15	
1 (b)		15
2	15	15
3	15	15
4	15	15
5	15	15
6	15	15
7 (a)	5	
7 (b)	10	
7 (c)		15
8(a)	12	
8(b)		6
8(c)		6
8(d)		6
9(a)	12	
9(b)		6
9(c)		6
9(d)		6
QoWC	4	
Total marks for 3 questions	42	48
Total marks for paper	46	48