



General Certificate of Education

Psychology 5181/6181 *Specification A*

PYA5 Individual Differences and Perspectives

Mark Scheme

2006 examination - June series

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.

UNIT 5 (PYA5)
QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION
(QoWC)

Band 3	The work is characterised by some or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• clear expression of ideas• use of a good range of specialist terms• few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.	4-3 marks
Band 2	The work is characterised by: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• reasonable expression of ideas• the use of some specialist terms• reasonable grammar, punctuation and spelling.	2-1 marks
Band 1	The work is characterised by: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• poor expression of ideas• the use of a limited range of specialist terms• 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 (eg iatrogenesis).

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

It is quite acceptable (ie 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 constructionism, humanistic psychology, evolutionary psychology.
- Approaches deriving from other, related disciplines such as sociology, biology and philosophy.

SECTION A: INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

1

Total for this question: 30 marks

‘ICD and DSM were developed in an attempt to improve the reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis of psychological abnormality.’

Discuss research into the reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis of psychological abnormality. (30 marks)

Marking Criteria

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 research into reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis. The AO2 component of the question requires the candidate to evaluate this research.

AO1

Candidates are required to offer a descriptive account of research into the reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis. It is likely that the quotation will cue candidates into focusing on the diagnostic manuals. The requirement in this part of the question is for research related to reliability and validity – straight descriptions of the two major classification systems are not appropriate here and will not attract credit. A number of studies have been carried out to investigate the reliability and validity of the diagnostic systems (eg Zigler & Phillips, 1961, Beck et al. 1962, DiNardo et al. 1993, etc.). Candidates could also legitimately refer to the different versions of the manuals which have been developed in an attempt to improve reliability and validity. It is not, however, necessary for them to know about the most up-to-date versions.

Given that the study by Rosenhan (1973) is suggested in the specification, it is likely that candidates will describe this and his follow-up research. However, this is an old study and there is a considerable body of more recent research. Candidates could also refer to the CIDI, a computer program developed to improve diagnostic reliability and validity.

Since reliability and validity are not entirely independent, it is difficult for candidates to discuss one in the absence of the other. Partial performance does not, therefore, apply.

AO2

There is considerable scope for evaluation with respect to the Rosenhan study in terms of ethical and methodological issues. Candidates should also be aware of the date of the study and of the fact that diagnostic practice has moved on considerably in the interim.

Other legitimate areas for discussion would include the problems of establishing aetiology in mental disorders, the lack of physical tests to confirm diagnosis and the overlap of symptoms between diagnostic categories (and with the ‘normal’ population). It would also be appropriate to consider labelling theory, Szasz’ anti-psychiatry stance and the idea of cultural relativism. Candidates could also consider issues of gender and race bias in classification and diagnosis.

Marking Allocations*AO1: Description of research into reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of research into reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis 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.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of research into reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis is reasonable . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure is reasonably coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.	11-8
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of research into reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities.	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of research into reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities.	3-0

AO2: Evaluation of research into reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of research into reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of research into reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities.	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation of research into reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities.	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of research into reliability and validity of classification and diagnosis is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities.	3-0

2

Total for this question: 30 marks

(a) Outline **two or more** psychological explanations of schizophrenia.

(15 marks)

(b) To what extent is it possible to explain schizophrenia purely in terms of psychological explanations?

(15 marks)

Marking Criteria

Part (a) Outline is an AO1 term which requires the candidate to offer summary descriptions of two or more psychological explanations of schizophrenia.

Part (b) ‘To what extent’ is an AO2 term which requires the candidate to consider the arguments for explaining schizophrenia purely in psychological terms.

Part (a) AO1

The requirement here is for psychological explanations. In keeping with the suggestions on the specification, these can legitimately include explanations based on social and family relationships. However, they **cannot** include biological explanations based on genetics and biochemistry.

Candidates are likely to focus on the explanations most frequently given in the text books. These include psychodynamic, behavioural and cognitive explanations as well as family systems theories such as double-bind, schizophrenogenic mothers and expressed emotion.

The question requires the description of **two or more** explanations, so candidates should be expected to cover at least two. Where candidates describe more than two, examiners should bear in mind the breadth/depth trade-off.

If candidates offer only one psychological explanation, they are showing partial performance.

Part (b) AO2

This part of the answer requires an evaluative/analytical consideration of the adequacy of psychological explanations. These explanations do not need to be restricted to the ones described in part (a). Examiners should be mindful of the need for candidates to provide sustained critical commentary when awarding AO2 marks. The focus of this question is on psychological explanations and material on biological explanations should only receive credit insofar as it is explicitly and consistently used to consider the adequacy of the psychological explanations. Material that is only implicitly relevant is restricted to Band 2.

Marking Allocations**Part (a): AO1: Description of two or more psychological explanations of schizophrenia.**

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more psychological explanations 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.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more psychological explanations of schizophrenia is reasonable . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure is reasonably coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well detailed. (N.B. maximum 9 marks)</i>	11-8
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more psychological explanations of schizophrenia is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more psychological explanations of schizophrenia is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is basic and not well detailed.</i>	3-0

Part (b): AO2: Evaluation of whether psychological explanations account for schizophrenia.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of whether psychological explanations account for schizophrenia is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of whether psychological explanations account for schizophrenia is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities.	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation whether psychological explanations account for schizophrenia is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities.	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of whether psychological explanations account for schizophrenia is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities.	3-0

3

Total for this question: 30 marks

Outline and evaluate behavioural therapies based on classical conditioning **and** operant conditioning.
(30 marks)

Marking Criteria

AO1

There is a requirement here to consider therapies based *both* on classical and operant conditioning. Given the wording of the question, it is possible for candidates to access full marks by describing only one therapy based on classical conditioning and one on operant conditioning. It is more likely that candidates will offer descriptions of more than one of each type, and examiners should bear in mind the breadth/depth trade-off. Therapies based on classical conditioning include systematic desensitisation, flooding, implosion therapy and aversion therapy. Therapies based on operant conditioning aim to change behaviour through a process of behaviour modification. Techniques available to the behavioural modification therapist include extinction, selective punishment and selective reinforcement (eg token economies). Social skills training is a behavioural technique based on SLT, but candidates could make a case for this being an extension of operant conditioning.

Cognitive-behavioural therapies such as stress inoculation and RET are not acceptable.

If candidates only offer therapies based on classical conditioning (or, only those based on operant conditioning), they are showing partial performance. However, candidates do not need to give equal weighting to each type of therapy but for the top band a reasonable detailed coverage of both would be required.

AO2

There are many ways of evaluating the two types of therapy. Given the wording of the specification, it is likely that candidates will focus on issues relating to appropriateness and effectiveness. A key issue here is the nature of the disorder being treated, for example, the therapies might be more effective with phobias than with schizophrenia.

It is also legitimate to consider ethical considerations such as the issue of control and the possibility of undesirable/unpredictable effects. It is also likely that candidates will comment on the mechanistic quality of behavioural therapies and of their tendency to deal with symptoms rather than causes.

The focus of this question is on behavioural therapies and material on alternatives (eg somatic therapies and psychoanalysis) should only receive AO2 credit insofar as they are explicitly and consistently used to evaluate the behavioural therapies.

If candidates only evaluate therapies based on classical conditioning (or, only those based on operant conditioning), they are showing partial performance. However, candidates do not need to give equal weighting to each type of therapy.

Marking Allocations**AO1: Description of behavioural therapies based on classical and operant conditioning.**

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of behavioural therapies based on classical and operant conditioning 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.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of behavioural therapies based on classical and operant conditioning is reasonable . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure is reasonably coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well detailed. (N.B. maximum 9 marks).</i>	11-8
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of behavioural therapies based on classical and operant conditioning is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of behavioural therapies based on classical and operant conditioning is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is basic and not well detailed.</i>	3-0

AO2: Evaluation of behavioural therapies based on classical and operant conditioning.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of behavioural therapies based on classical and operant conditioning is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of behavioural therapies based on classical and operant conditioning is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and shows appropriate selection and coherent elaboration. (N.B. maximum 9 marks)</i>	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation of behavioural therapies based on classical and operant conditioning is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is limited. The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration.</i>	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of behavioural therapies based on classical and operant conditioning is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is basic. The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

SECTION B: ISSUES AND DEBATES IN PSYCHOLOGY

4

Total for this question: 30 marks

(a) Outline what is meant by <i>cultural bias</i> .	(5 marks)
(b) Describe cultural bias in two psychological studies.	(10 marks)
(c) ‘Psychological research carried out in Europe and the United States is relevant to all other cultures.’ Consider the extent to which this statement is true.	(15 marks)

Marking Criteria

Part (a): Outline is an AO1 term which requires the candidate to offer a summary description of the term cultural bias.

Part (b): Describe is an AO1 term which requires the candidate to demonstrate his or her knowledge about cultural bias in two psychological studies.

Part (c): ‘Consider the extent’ is an AO2 term which requires the candidate to consider the extent to which it is possible to generalise research carried out in Western cultures to other cultures.

Part (a) AO1

Cultures and subcultures guide and direct behaviour and can shape and influence thought. In spite of this, for most of its history, psychology has ignored culture and focused its research on Western cultures and then applied the findings generally. There are different kinds of cultural bias and candidates are likely to focus on the examples given in the specification eg ethnocentrism, historical bias and the imposed etc. It is not necessary to cover all three for full marks.

Markers should bear in mind that the allocation for this question is only 5, which means that it has a notional time allocation of about 6 minutes. It is, therefore, unreasonable to expect particularly detailed or lengthy answers.

Part (b) AO1

Candidates are required to describe cultural bias in two studies. The requirement here is for *studies* and so material on *theories* cannot be credited. It is important that candidates describe studies in terms of their cultural bias and not in terms of cultural differences. Straight descriptions of studies without any reference to their cultural bias are unlikely to gain credit.

Where candidates describe cultural bias in more than two studies, all should be marked and the best two credited. If candidates offer only one study, partial performance criteria will apply.

Markers should bear in mind that the allocation for this part of the question is 10 marks.

Part (c) AO2

Candidates are required to consider the validity of research based on a single culture in terms of its generalisability. They might consider issues such as the historical context of the research, emic/etic constructs, individualism versus collectivism and bias in experimental method. They do not need to refer back to studies described in part (b) although this is perfectly acceptable.

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 made specifically relevant.

Marking Allocations**Part (a): AO1: Outline of what is meant by cultural bias.**

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 3	Outline of cultural bias is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	5-4
Band 2	Outline of cultural bias is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	3-2
Band 1	Outline of cultural bias is weak and muddled . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	1-0

Part (b): AO1: Description of cultural bias in two studies.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of how two studies are culturally biased 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. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	10-9
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of how two studies are culturally biased 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. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS. <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well detailed. (N.B. maximum 6 marks)</i>	8-6
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of how two studies are culturally biased is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	5-3
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of how two studies are culturally biased is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding . The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is basic and not well detailed.</i>	2-0

Part (c) AO2: *Consideration of the generalisability of research from one culture to another.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Consideration of the generalisability of research from one culture to another is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Consideration of the generalisability of research from one culture to another is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities.	11-8
Band 2	Basic Consideration of the generalisability of research from one culture to another is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities.	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Consideration of the generalisability of research from one culture to another is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities.	3-0

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

Discuss the ethics of socially sensitive research in psychology.
--

(30 marks)

Marking Criteria

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 the ethics of socially sensitive research. The AO2 component requires the candidate to assess issues arising from socially sensitive research.

AO1

It is important that candidates focus on ethics in the context of socially sensitive research rather than in a general way. Candidates can gain credit for explaining what is meant by socially sensitive research and why it poses particular ethical problems.

Stating/identifying the issue(s) that makes the research socially sensitive gains AO1 credit.

They are likely to describe ethical issues such as privacy, confidentiality, the need for sound and valid methodology, justice and equitable treatment, scientific freedom etc but this must be in the context of socially sensitive research.

Candidates are likely to use studies to illustrate their answers, but descriptions of studies will only gain credit insofar as they are explicitly focused on the ethical issues that they raise. It is acceptable to use animal research provided that candidates make clear why such research could be seen as socially sensitive.

Indicative AO2

The material here must be evaluative/analytical and provide commentary on the issues described for AO1. One possibility is a discussion of the ‘hanged if you do, hanged if you don’t’ argument ie the social responsibility of psychological researchers not to ignore important areas of investigation in spite of the controversy such research might provoke. There could also be a discussion of the wide-ranging implications (eg political, social, economic) of some types of socially sensitive research. Another possibility would be to consider ways in which psychologists have tried to deal with ethical issues in such research (eg use of guidelines, peer appraisal etc.).

Marking Allocations

AO1: Description of the ethics of socially sensitive research.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of 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.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the ethics of socially sensitive research is reasonable . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure is reasonably coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.	11-8
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the ethics of socially sensitive research is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities.	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the ethics of socially sensitive research is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities.	3-0

AO2: Evaluation of the ethics of socially sensitive research.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of the ethics of socially sensitive research is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of the ethics of socially sensitive research is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities.	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation of the ethics of socially sensitive research is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities.	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of the ethics of socially sensitive research is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities.	3-0

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

Discuss reductionism with reference to two or more psychological theories.

(30 marks)

Marking Criteria

Discuss is an AO1 and AO2 term which requires the candidate both to describe and evaluate examples of reductionism in psychological theories.

AO1

Candidates are required to describe reductionism with reference to at least two psychological theories. Candidates who describe studies rather than theories can gain no credit. Candidates might describe different kinds of reductionism eg:

- biological reductionism
- evolutionary reductionism
- environmental reductionism
- machine reductionism
- experimental reductionism.

However, they must relate it to psychological theory. There are two potential pitfalls for candidates here: they might describe psychological theories without reference to reductionism, or, they might describe reductionism without relating it to psychological theories. An answer which only describes psychological theories with *no* reference to reductionism will gain *no* credit. An answer which refers to reductionism but has *no* reference to psychological theories can achieve a maximum of band 2.

The question requires the description of reductionism in **two or more** theories, so candidates should be expected to cover at least two. Where candidates describe more than two, examiners should bear in mind the breadth/depth trade-off.

If candidates offer only one psychological theory, partial performance will apply.

AO2

The material here should be evaluative/analytical. The nature of the evaluation will depend to a large extent on the examples of theories chosen for AO1. Alternatives to theories that are reductionist eg the humanistic approach or the eclectic approach could be discussed provided they are used explicitly to evaluate reductionism in psychological theory.

As with AO1, the candidates should refer to at least two theories. Where they evaluate reductionism with reference to more than two, examiners should bear in mind the breadth/depth trade-off. If candidates evaluate only one, they are showing partial performance.

Answers which evaluate reductionism without reference to psychological theories can achieve a maximum of Band 2.

Marking Allocations

AO1: *Description of reductionism with reference to two or more psychological theories.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of reductionism with reference to two or more psychological 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.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of reductionism with reference to two or more psychological theories is reasonable . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure is reasonably coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well detailed. (N.B. maximum 9 marks)</i>	11-8
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of reductionism with reference to two or more psychological theories is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of reductionism with reference to two or more psychological theories is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is basic and not well detailed.</i>	3-0

AO2: *Evaluation of reductionism with reference to two or more psychological theories.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of reductionism with reference to two or more psychological theories is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of reductionism with reference to two or more psychological theories is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and shows appropriate selection and coherent elaboration. (N.B. maximum 9 marks)</i>	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation of reductionism with reference to two or more psychological theories is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is limited. The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration.</i>	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of reductionism with reference to two or more psychological theories is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is basic. The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

7

Total for this question: 30 marks

- (a) Explain what is meant by the *nature-nurture debate*. (5 marks)
- (b) Discuss different views regarding the relationship between nature and nurture in psychological theory (eg gene-environment interaction). (25 marks)

Marking Criteria

Explain is an AO1 term that requires the candidate to demonstrate his or her knowledge of what is meant by the nature-nurture debate. Discuss is an AO1 and AO2 term which requires the candidate both to describe and evaluate different views regarding the relationship between nature and nurture.

Part (a) AO1:

Nature is what we think of as ‘pre-wiring’ and is influenced by genetic inheritance and other biological factors. Nurture is generally taken as the influence of external factors eg the product of exposure, experience and learning on an individual. The nature-nurture debate is concerned with the relative contribution that both influences make to human behaviour. It is acceptable, but not necessary, for candidates to use examples from psychological research to illustrate their answer. The most likely areas are: intelligence, gender development, acquisition of language and the development of psychological disorders.

Markers should bear in mind that the allocation for this question is only 5, which means that it has a notional time allocation of about 6 minutes. It is, therefore, unreasonable to expect particularly detailed or lengthy answers.

Part (b) AO1:

It is widely accepted now that heredity and the environment do not act independently. Instead of defending extreme nativist or nurturist views, most psychological researchers are now interested in investigating the ways in which nature and nurture interact. One model with which most candidates are likely to be familiar is the diathesis-stress model and it would be legitimate for candidates to describe this for AO1 credit. In psychopathology, this means that both a genetic predisposition and an appropriate environmental trigger are required for a mental disorder to develop. It would also be legitimate for candidates to describe the distinction between genotype and phenotype.

Given the wording of the specification and the information provided in brackets in the question, candidates are likely to focus on describing the gene-environment interaction. Plomin et al (1977) have identified 3 types of gene-environment:

- passive gene-environment interaction
- reactive gene-environment interaction
- active gene-environment interaction.

Some candidates might also describe behaviour genetics where researchers attempt to quantify the extent to which the variability of a given trait (eg intelligence, depression etc), can be attributed to (i) genetic differences (ii) shared environments, and (iii) non-shared environments.

It is important that candidates focus on the relationship between nature and nurture. General accounts of the nature-nurture debate and descriptions of studies/theories which support one or other side of the debate can only be credited insofar as they relate to the interrelationship of nature and nurture. General nature/nurture debate answers should be limited to a maximum of Band 2 for both AO1 and AO2.

Part (b): AO2

The material here should be evaluative/analytical and provide commentary on the relationship between nature and nurture in psychological theory. It could take the form of evaluation of examples of psychological research. For example, the diathesis stress model requires a genetic predisposition and an environmental trigger, but the severity of the stressor can vary widely from mild to extreme, which accounts for the fact that even people from supportive, well-balanced families can develop depression if the stressor is severe enough. Another approach would be to look at some of the methodological difficulties of investigating genetic/environmental influences eg a discussion of evidence from twin studies.

Marking Allocations

Part (a) AO1: *Explanation of the nature-nurture debate.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 3	Explanation of the nature-nurture debate is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	5-4
Band 2	Explanation of the nature-nurture debate is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	3-2
Band 1	Explanation of the nature-nurture debate is weak and muddled . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	1-0

Part (b) AO1: *Description of different views regarding the relationship between nature and nurture.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of different views regarding the relationship between nature and nurture 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. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	10-9
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of different views regarding the relationship between nature and nurture 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. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	8-6
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of different views regarding the relationship between nature and nurture is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	5-3
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of different views regarding the relationship between nature and nurture is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding . The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	2-0

Part b: AO2: Evaluation of different views of the relationship between nature and nurture.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of different views of the relationship between nature and nurture is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of different views of the relationship between nature and nurture is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities.	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation of different views of the relationship between nature and nurture is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities.	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of different views of the relationship between nature and nurture is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities.	3-0

SECTION C: APPROACHES

8

Total for this question: 30 marks

Many people in Western countries respond to appeals that are launched following major disasters in other parts of the world: for example, the Asian tsunami. During fundraising events, such as Comic Relief and Live Aid, millions of pounds are donated for victims of famine and disease in Africa.

- (a) Describe how giving money in response to appeals might be explained by **two** different approaches. (6 marks + 6 marks)
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations of why people give money to appeals in terms of its strengths and limitations. (6 marks)
- (c) How might giving money in response to appeals be investigated by **one** of these approaches? (6 marks)
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating why people give money to disaster appeals. (6 marks)

Marking Criteria

The approaches question requires candidates to show knowledge of two approaches, but, more, importantly, to use this knowledge effectively to explain the behaviour outlined in the question.

Possible approaches here are:

Behavioural approach: It might be that people give money to charity because of the positive reinforcement they gain from doing so. People who give to charity range from children sending a few pence from their pocket money to large corporate organisations donating thousands of pounds. This suggests that the reinforcers are likely to be different for different people. For example, they may simply feel good about themselves because they have been generous. People who raise money by sponsored runs/swims etc might be rewarded by the opportunity to engage in an enjoyable activity. Large companies might gain in terms of their public image which might indirectly increase their sales. Negative reinforcement might also be a factor eg the distress caused by watching TV footage of misery and destruction might be alleviated by giving money. SLT could be offered as an extension of behavioural theory or as a free-standing explanation. People might give money because they see other people donating – this is particularly relevant to people who give money in response to televised appeals from well-known celebrities who act as role models.

Psychodynamic approach: This behaviour could be explained through the characteristics associated with particular personality types eg the anally expulsive type who is generous with money. It could also be explained in terms of defence mechanisms, for example, rationalisation or displacement. It could also be explained in terms of the influence of the superego ie feelings of guilt about living in relative comfort and luxury while other people are suffering.

It is also possible, for example, to explain the behaviour in evolutionary, socio-biological, cognitive and humanistic terms.

Part (a): Candidates must clearly identify 2 approaches. They can take a broad view eg identify the behavioural approach and include a variety of explanations within this such as classical conditioning, operant conditioning and SLT; or, equally, acceptably, they could take a narrower focus and offer traditional learning theory as one approach and SLT as a second. There is obviously a depth/breadth trade-off here.

They must explicitly link the theoretical explanation to the behaviour outlined in the stimulus material. General answers on eg psychodynamic theory without any clear engagement with the stimulus material are limited to a maximum of 2 marks (**NB** such an account does not automatically attract 2 marks – for that it must be detailed and accurate). For *top band marks*, the answers must engage very specifically with the stimulus material. For example, in this question, it is not giving money to charity per se, but giving in response to appeals.

The accounts must be plausible. For example, in behavioural theory, classical conditioning can only account for a relatively small range of behaviours and should not attract marks where it is implausible. Similarly, genetic susceptibility is a legitimate way of explaining, for example, certain aspects of personality (eg generosity), but not for giving to ‘Comic Relief’.

Where candidates offer more than two explanations, all should be marked and, usually, the best two should be credited. However, the examiner needs to look at parts (b) and (c) as well before deciding what to credit in part (a).

Part (b): Candidates can use either of the 2 approaches identified in part (a). They will gain no marks if they assess a completely different approach. Marks will be restricted to Band 1 if the strengths and limitations are not specific to a clearly identifiable approach.

Candidates must include strengths **and** limitations, although not necessarily with equal weight. Where candidates offer only strengths or only limitations, partial performance will apply. Marks are awarded for the extent to which the candidates engage with the material. Where there is no meaningful attempt to engage with the material, a maximum of 2 marks can be awarded. Some candidates may simply add a few words such as ‘responding to appeals’, but this tactic is not likely to raise a candidate’s mark above Band 1.

Candidates often repeat in part (b) what they have already described in part (a). For example, they might write that ‘The behaviourist explanation is good because it shows that we donate money to charity because we are rewarded or by copying our friends.’ This is simply a rehash of the explanation – the candidate will need to explain why this is ‘good’ to earn credit in part (b).

Part (c): Candidates can choose either of the approaches offered in part (a), but will gain no marks if they introduce a completely new approach here. The method must be one that could be plausibly used by one of the approaches described in part (a). The investigation must embrace the principles of the approach chosen. It is unlikely, for example, that behaviourists would use questionnaires to explore the ‘feelings’ of people donating money to disaster appeals.

Candidates sometimes offer descriptions of therapeutic techniques in part (c). Candidates should not describe a treatment or therapy unless it is specifically presented as a way of investigating the behaviour in the stimulus material. It must also be a plausible way of investigating the behaviour. It is inappropriate, for example, to suggest that people require psychoanalytic therapy or systematic desensitisation to ‘cure’ them of donating money to charities.

The candidate is not meeting the requirement ‘to demonstrate psychological knowledge’ if the method of investigation is implausible, impractical or completely unethical. No marks can be awarded to answers which describe completely implausible methods. Answers which are substantially implausible can earn up to 2 marks provided there is some part of the method which is appropriate.

To gain Band 3 marks, the answer should be explicitly engaged with the stimulus material, plausible and well detailed in terms of sampling, design, methods etc. The purpose of the investigation should be identifiable.

Part (d): This answer must be related to the method outlined in part (c). There must be consistency between the two parts. For example, candidates who describe random sampling in part (c) should not be credited for evaluating a matched pairs design in part (d).

If the answer to part (c) has gained no marks, examiners should still read part (d) as it may be appropriate to export material to (c).

General evaluations of the underlying *approach* rather than of the *method* will not gain marks. Such evaluation is more appropriate to part (b). However, it cannot be exported from (d) to (b) – exporting can only occur between parts (a) and (b) and parts (c) and (d).

In order to gain Band 3 marks, candidates must explicitly evaluate the use of the method as a way of investigating why people donate money to disaster appeals. Candidates who have described *wholly* implausible or *grossly* unethical methods in part (c) cannot gain marks for criticising those aspects of the methods in part (d). The wording of this part of the question does not require a consideration of strengths and limitations so partial performance does not apply.

Traditionally, holidays have been seen as an opportunity to relax and rest, for example, by going to the beach and swimming. However, some people are using their holidays to do something adventurous, perhaps even dangerous: for example, some people go trekking or mountaineering in remote areas, or take up activities such as white-water rafting or paragliding.

- (a) Describe how the desire for adventure holidays might be explained by **two** different approaches. (6 marks + 6 marks)
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations of the desire for adventure holidays in terms of its strengths and limitations. (6 marks)
- (c) How might the desire for adventure holidays be investigated by **one** of these approaches? (6 marks)
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating the desire for adventure holidays. (6 marks)

Marking Criteria

The approaches question requires candidates to show knowledge of two approaches, but, more, importantly, to use this knowledge effectively to explain the behaviour outlined in the question.

Possible approaches here are:

Biological: It might be explained in terms of neurotransmitter or hormone activity that leads to thrill-seeking activity, or because of stimulation of the limbic system or hypothalamus which produces a sensation of pleasure. It could be that many people have sedentary jobs and lead relatively risk-free lives and this makes them feel apathetic or depressed. When they have a chance to get away from their dull routine, they engage in activities that raise levels of certain neurotransmitters/hormones and so elevate their mood. It could also reflect extraversion as described by, for example, Eysenck eg in terms of chronic cortical underarousal. Evolutionary explanations could be offered as part of the biological approach or as a separate, free-standing approach. It could be, for example, that prowess at dangerous activities would help an individual survive in hard times and would, therefore, be behaviour that is naturally selected.

Psychodynamic: It could be explained in terms of eros, the life drive that leads to the pursuit of thrills and pleasure. In individuals where the id is dominant, there is little sense of moderation or understanding of risk and this may lead to reckless behaviour. It might be that the ego is attempting to regulate the desires of the id and tries to channel the excess of energy – the libido-, which might otherwise lead to aggressive, anti-social behaviour, into more socially acceptable behaviours such as sport. This is a similar idea to the defence mechanism of sublimation.

Humanistic: It could be explained in terms of Maslow's and/or Roger's theories relating to self-actualisation eg pushing themselves to their limits, discovering themselves, being the best. It is also possible, for example, to explain this behaviour using behavioural or cognitive approaches.

Marking Allocations for Questions 8 and 9

Question 8 & 9(a)

AO1: *For description of each approach.*

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	Psychological content is reasonably thorough and is accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is sustained, coherent and plausible . Appropriate aspects of the approach have been selected.	6-5
Band 2	Psychological content is limited and generally accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable and substantially plausible .	4-3
Band 1	Psychological content is basic and flawed/inaccurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled and/or minimal . Or the psychological content is accurate and thorough but there is no attempt at engagement with the stimulus material.	2-0

Question 8 & 9(b)

AO2: *For assessment of strengths and limitations of one approach.*

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Strengths and limitations must be considered, although not necessarily given the same weight. Material has been used in an effective manner. The approach is evaluated in the context of its appropriateness in explaining the stimulus material.	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). There is some attempt to evaluate the explanation in the context of its appropriateness to the stimulus material. <i>If there is partial performance (either strengths or limitations), commentary and evaluation are reasonably thorough. The approach is evaluated in the context of its appropriateness in explaining the stimulus material. Material has been used in an effective manner.</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, minimal or the commentary/evaluation is sound but there is no engagement with the stimulus material . <i>If there is partial performance (either strengths or limitations), commentary and evaluation is limited. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. There is some attempt to evaluate the explanation in the context of its appropriateness to the stimulus material. No marks can be awarded for an answer which considers only strengths or weaknesses and makes no attempt to engage with the stimulus material.</i>	2-0

Question 8 & 9(c)*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. There is a clear indication of the intentions of the investigation and a reasonably detailed account of how this could be implemented. The method described is plausible as a way of investigating the behaviour in the stimulus material. It is also appropriate to the approach chosen and this approach is identifiable. The method is practicable and if ethical concerns arise, they are minor. There is sustained and coherent engagement with the stimulus material.	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. There is some indication of the intentions of the investigation and a limited account of how these could be effected. The method described is reasonably plausible as a way of investigating the behaviour in the stimulus material. It is reasonably appropriate to the approach chosen and this approach is identifiable. The method is reasonably practicable and, if ethical concerns arise, they are minor. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonably coherent .	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 substantially inappropriate . Engagement with the material is muddled, minimal or commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic is sound but there is no engagement .	2-0

Question 8 & 9(d)*AO2: For evaluation of this investigative approach.*

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. There is explicit reference to the intentions offered in (c) and an evaluation of its effectiveness. 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. There is some attempt to refer to the intention offered in (c) and an evaluation of its effectiveness. 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. Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled, minimal or the commentary/evaluation is sound but there is no engagement with the stimulus material .	2-0

Assessment Grid

Question	AO1	AO2
1	15	15
2(a)	15	
2(b)		15
3	15	15
4(a)	5	
4(b)	10	
4(c)		15
5	15	15
6	15	15
7(a)	5	
7(b)	10	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