



**General Certificate of Education**

**Psychology 6181**

*Specification A*

**Unit 5 (PYA5)**

**Individual Differences and Perspectives**

**Mark Scheme**

*2007 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2007 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.

---

**QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION  
(QoWC)**

<b>Band 3</b>	The work is characterised by some or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• clear expression of ideas</li><li>• use of a good range of specialist terms</li><li>• few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li></ul>	<b>4-3 marks</b>
<b>Band 2</b>	The work is characterised by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• reasonable expression of ideas</li><li>• the use of some specialist terms</li><li>• reasonable grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li></ul>	<b>2-1 marks</b>
<b>Band 1</b>	The work is characterised by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• poor expression of ideas</li><li>• the use of a limited range of specialist terms</li><li>• poor grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li></ul>	<b>0 marks</b>

---

## **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**

‘Some psychologists believe that the symptoms of dissociative identity disorder arise spontaneously. Others suggest that this disorder is iatrogenic (manufactured by the therapist).’

Discuss research into dissociative identity disorder with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation above. (30 marks)

**Marking Criteria****AO1**

The main focus for AO1 is research into dissociative identity disorder.

It is probable that candidates will illustrate their answers by describing case studies and this is perfectly acceptable AO1. The most likely ones are those of Eve, Sybil and Ken Bianchi since these are the ones most frequently mentioned in the textbooks.

It is also acceptable to describe the dissociative identity disorder (DID) diagnostic criteria for AO1 credit since the quotation refers to symptoms and since the diagnostic manuals are based on research.

A straight description of the two opposing views of the nature of DID, ie the post-traumatic model and the sociocognitive model is also creditworthy AO1.

Candidates can address the issues raised in the quotation and identification of these issues counts as AO1. However, discussion of the issues constitutes AO2.

The issues raised in the quotation are as follows:

- there is disagreement amongst psychologists as to the origins of DID
- some believe that the disorder is a spontaneous phenomenon
- some believe that it is an iatrogenic phenomenon.

Given the wording of the question, candidates do not have to address any of these issues. Similarly, it is acceptable to identify other relevant issues, eg the reliability/validity of DSM/ICD categories. Identification and description of the issues constitute AO1 material.

**AO2**

The question requires the candidates to evaluate research into DID. They can do this by offering commentary on the case studies or by discussing other related research, eg Spanos (1985), Scropo et al (1988). Straight descriptions of research constitute AO1 material – candidates must evaluate the research or discuss in the context of some of the issues in order to gain AO2 credit.

It is also possible to gain AO2 marks by discussing slightly broader issues, eg difficulties of diagnosis, cultural bias in the identification of DID, false memory syndrome and ethical issues surrounding the most well known cases of DID.

## Marking Allocations

**AO1:** *Description of research into DID and/or description of issues such as those raised in the quotation.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
<b>Band 4</b>	<b>Substantial</b> Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of research into DID and/or description of issues such as those raised in the quotation is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.	<b>15-12</b>
<b>Band 3</b>	<b>Reasonable</b> Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of research into DID and/or description of issues such as those raised in the quotation is <b>reasonable</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure are <b>reasonably coherent</b> . There is <b>evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.	<b>11-8</b>
<b>Band 2</b>	<b>Basic</b> Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of research into DID and/or description of issues such as those raised in the quotation is <b>basic and not well detailed</b> . There is <b>some focus on the question</b> . There is <b>little</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.	<b>7-4</b>
<b>Band 1</b>	<b>Rudimentary</b> Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of research into DID and/or description of issues such as those raised in the quotation is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.	<b>3-0</b>

**AO2:** *Evaluation of research into DID with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
<b>Band 4</b>	<b>Thorough</b> Evaluation of research into DID with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is <b>thorough</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.	<b>15-12</b>
<b>Band 3</b>	<b>Reasonable</b> Evaluation of research into DID with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is <b>limited</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . There is <b>evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.	<b>11-8</b>
<b>Band 2</b>	<b>Basic</b> Evaluation of research into DID with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is <b>basic</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner and shows <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.	<b>7-4</b>
<b>Band 1</b>	<b>Rudimentary</b> Evaluation of research into DID with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak, muddled and incomplete</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> and may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> . There is <b>little or no evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.	<b>3-0</b>

---

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

Discuss **at least one** biological and **at least one** psychological explanation of any **one** anxiety disorder. *(30 marks)*

### Marking Criteria

#### AO1

Candidates must identify **one** anxiety disorder and where candidates offer explanations for more than one anxiety disorder, only the best account should be credited. However, examiners should note that phobic disorder covers several different types of phobia and candidates could legitimately refer to more than one, eg specific, social, agoraphobia. The most likely choices of anxiety disorder are phobic disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), since these are mentioned on the specification. However, other anxiety disorders, eg panic disorder, generalised anxiety disorder are perfectly acceptable.

The question requires an account of **at least one** biological and **at least one** psychological **explanation** of an anxiety disorder. Straight descriptions of the characteristics of anxiety disorders are not creditworthy except where the symptoms are used explicitly in the context of explanations. For example, signs of anxiety such as pupil dilation and increased heart rate are directly attributable to underlying biological mechanisms, but cognitive/emotional symptoms might be caused by other mechanisms.

The question requires a description of **both** biological **and** psychological explanations and where candidates offer only one, partial performance criteria apply. However, the wording of the question allows candidates to offer **one or more** biological explanations and **one or more** psychological explanation so examiners should be mindful of a depth/breadth trade-off here.

#### AO2

Candidates are required to evaluate each of their chosen explanations. If they evaluate only one, they are partially performing. Candidates must refer to the same anxiety disorder throughout. Reference to other anxiety disorders is only creditworthy if it is used as effective evaluation, eg the point could be made that psychological explanations are more plausible for some anxiety disorders than others.

The nature of the evaluation will vary depending on the explanations chosen, but evaluation/commentary is likely to include issues such as quality of empirical evidence and the difficulties of disentangling cause and effect. AO2 marks could also be gained by considering broader issues such as reductionism and the nature/nurture debate. The effectiveness of therapies could also be made relevant provided the candidate uses such evidence to evaluate the underlying explanation.

Candidates who offer general evaluations of, for example, psychodynamic or behavioural explanations without making them relevant to anxiety disorders are not using material effectively and cannot, therefore, access the higher mark bands.

## Marking Allocations

**AO1: Description of at least one biological and at least one psychological explanation of any one anxiety disorder.**

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
<b>Band 4</b>	<p><b>Substantial</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of <b>at least one</b> biological and <b>at least one</b> psychological explanation of an anxiety disorder is <b>substantial</b>. It is <b>accurate and well detailed</b>. The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>coherent</b>. There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities with a reasonable balance between the two approaches.</p>	<b>15-12</b>
<b>Band 3</b>	<p><b>Reasonable</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of <b>at least one</b> biological and <b>at least one</b> psychological explanation of an anxiety disorder is <b>reasonable</b>. It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b>. The organisation and structure are <b>reasonably coherent</b>. There is <b>evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (NB: maximum 9 marks).</i></p>	<b>11-8</b>
<b>Band 2</b>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of <b>at least one</b> biological and <b>at least one</b> psychological explanation of an anxiety disorder is <b>basic</b> and <b>not well detailed</b>. There is <b>some focus on the question</b>. There is <b>little</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i></p>	<b>7-4</b>
<b>Band 1</b>	<p><b>Rudimentary</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of <b>at least one</b> biological and <b>at least one</b> psychological explanation of an anxiety disorder is <b>rudimentary</b>. It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is basic and not well-detailed.</i></p>	<b>3-0</b>



**AO2: Evaluation of at least one biological and at least one psychological explanation of any one anxiety disorder.**

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 4</b>	<p><b>Thorough</b> Evaluation of at least one biological and at least one psychological explanation of an anxiety disorder is <b>thorough</b>. The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b>. There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.</p>	<b>15-12</b>
<b>Band 3</b>	<p><b>Reasonable</b> Evaluation of at least one biological and at least one psychological explanation of an anxiety disorder is <b>limited</b>. The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration</b>. There is <b>evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (NB: maximum 9 marks).</i></p>	<b>11-8</b>
<b>Band 2</b>	<p><b>Basic</b> Evaluation of at least one biological and at least one psychological explanation of an anxiety disorder is <b>basic</b>. The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner and shows <b>some evidence of elaboration</b>. There is <b>some evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i></p>	<b>7-4</b>
<b>Band 1</b>	<p><b>Rudimentary</b> Evaluation of at least one biological and at least one psychological explanation of an anxiety disorder is <b>rudimentary</b>. It is <b>weak, muddled and incomplete</b>. The material is <b>not used effectively</b> and may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b>. There is <b>little or no evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities. <i>Partial performance is basic and not well-detailed.</i></p>	<b>3-0</b>

---

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

- |     |  |            |
|-----|--|------------|
| (a) | Outline <b>three</b> different biological therapies.   | (15 marks) |
| (b) | Evaluate <b>one or more</b> of these biological therapies in terms of some of the issues surrounding their use (eg appropriateness and effectiveness). | (15 marks) |

**Marking Criteria****Part (a) AO1**

Candidates are required to provide brief descriptive accounts of three **distinct** biological therapies. It is likely that candidates will offer outlines of chemotherapy, ECT and psychosurgery since these are required by the specification. It is possible for candidates to gain full AO1 marks, eg by describing three distinct drug therapies. However, this is only possible if candidates make a clear distinction between the different drugs in terms of their underlying modes of action.

There is no requirement for all three therapies to be covered in exactly the same detail, but there should be reasonable equivalence for answers which access the top bands.

If candidates offer only one or two therapies, partial performance criteria apply and a maximum of 9 marks can be awarded. Examiners should be mindful of a breadth/depth trade-off in partial performance so that candidates who offer only one therapy would need to provide more detail for the 9 marks than candidates offering two in slightly less detail.

No evaluation of the therapies is required in this part of the question and any evaluative material can be exported to part (b) where appropriate.

**Part (b) AO2**

Candidates are likely to focus on the issues mentioned in the brackets. Issues of appropriateness could include: the nature of the psychological disorder for which the therapy is being applied (eg is the therapy more likely to be successful for schizophrenia than for an anxiety disorder?); factors that affect choice of treatment (eg financial constraints or the availability of the appropriate therapist); ethical issues (eg the issue of consent for highly invasive treatments such as psychosurgery).

Issues of effectiveness could include: problems of measuring effectiveness (eg when to measure, how to define what is meant by successful treatment); placebo effects (eg is the change in behaviour brought about simply because of increased attention); side effects from the treatment that could interfere with outcomes.

Candidates could also broaden out their evaluation by considering ethical issues associated with the use of biological therapies.

Examiners should remember that candidates need to provide sustained critical commentary when awarding AO2 marks. The focus of this question should be on the issues surrounding the use of biological therapies – material on alternative therapies should only receive credit insofar as it is explicitly and consistently used to evaluate the biological therapies.

Candidates are only required to evaluate **one** therapy. If they evaluate more than one therapy examiners should be mindful of the breadth/depth trade-off. Partial performance occurs in the unlikely event that they evaluate the therapy in terms of only **one** issue surrounding their use.

## Marking Allocations

### AO1: Description of three biological therapies.

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

### AO2: Evaluation of one or more biological therapies.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	<p><b>Thorough</b></p> <p>Evaluation of one or more biological therapies is <b>thorough</b>. The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b>. There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.</p>	15-12
Band 3	<p><b>Reasonable</b></p> <p>Evaluation of one or more biological therapies is <b>limited</b>. The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration</b>. There is <b>evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.</p> <p><i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (NB maximum 9 marks).</i></p>	11-8
Band 2	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>Evaluation of one or more biological therapies is <b>basic</b>. The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner and shows <b>some evidence of elaboration</b>. There is <b>some evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.</p> <p><i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i></p>	7-4
Band 1	<p><b>Rudimentary</b></p> <p>Evaluation of one or more biological therapies is <b>rudimentary</b>. It is <b>weak, muddled and incomplete</b>. The material is <b>not used effectively</b> and may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b>. There is <b>little or no evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.</p> <p><i>Partial performance is basic and not well-detailed.</i></p>	3-0

---

**SECTION B: ISSUES AND DEBATES****4****Total for this question: 30 marks**

‘Socially sensitive research can be controversial and some people say it should not be carried out at all. However, other people argue that such research is important because it can have beneficial effects.’

- (a) Explain what is meant by the term *socially sensitive research* in psychology. (5 marks)
- (b) Discuss the ethics of socially sensitive research in psychology. (25 marks)

**Marking Criteria****Part (a) AO1**

This part requires the candidates simply to explain what is meant by ‘socially sensitive research’ without offering any evaluation. Socially sensitive research was defined by Sieber and Stanley in 1988 as: ‘... studies in which there are potential social consequences or implications, either directly for the participants of the research or the class of individual represented by the research.’

Given that the injunction requires an explanation, candidates need to offer more than this to access the top band. They could legitimately expand on this definition by providing relevant psychological examples of socially sensitive research.

**Part (b) AO1**

For this part of the question, candidates are likely to describe ethical issues such as privacy, confidentiality, the need for sound and valid methodology, justice and equitable treatment, scientific freedom, ownership of data. It is important that candidates focus on ethics in the context of socially sensitive research rather than in a general way and it is hoped that the question in part (a) will serve to focus them.

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 socially sensitive issues they raise. Identification of ethical issues in studies by Milgram and Zimbardo will only be creditworthy if their socially sensitive nature is made explicit. It is acceptable to use animal research provided that candidates make it clear why such research could be seen as socially sensitive.

**NB: examiners must remember that there are only 10 marks available for AO1 for this part of the question.**

**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 the use of guidelines, peer appraisal).

## Marking Allocations

### Part (a) AO1: *Explanation of the term socially sensitive research.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 3	Explanation of the term socially sensitive research is <b>reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	5-4
Band 2	Explanation of the term socially sensitive research is <b>limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	3-2
Band 1	Explanation of the term socially sensitive research is <b>weak and muddled</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	1-0

### Part (b) AO1: *Description of the ethics of socially sensitive research.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	<b>Substantial</b> Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the ethics of socially sensitive research is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial</b> evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	10-9
Band 3	<b>Reasonable</b> Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the ethics of socially sensitive research is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>reasonably</b> constructed. There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	8-6
Band 2	<b>Basic</b> Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the ethics of socially sensitive research is <b>basic</b> and <b>not well detailed</b> . There is <b>some focus</b> on the question. There is <b>little</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	5-3
Band 1	<b>Rudimentary</b> Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the ethics of socially sensitive research is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled understanding</b> . The answer may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	2-0

**AO2: Evaluation of the ethics of socially sensitive research.**

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

---

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

‘Some researchers believe that non-human animals are so similar to humans that they provide suitable subjects for research into human behaviour. However, if they really are so similar, such research raises significant ethical issues.’

Discuss the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation above. (30 marks)

**Marking Criteria****AO1**

A description of how animals have been used in psychological investigations is creditworthy.

The issues raised in the quotation are as follows:

- some people believe that the physiology of non-human animals is very similar to that of humans
- if this is the case, non-human animals become acceptable models for human behaviour
- however, if non-human animals are so similar to humans, their use in psychological investigations must inevitably give rise to very similar ethical considerations to those associated with human research.

Given the wording of the question, candidates do not have to address any of these particular issues. It is acceptable to identify other relevant issues, eg the practical advantages and disadvantages of using non-human animals in research. Identification and description of issues constitute AO1 material. In addressing the last bullet point, candidates can legitimately describe ethical concerns that have relevance for both humans and animals, eg protection from harm, intrusion (relevant where animals are studied in their natural habitat), cost/benefit analysis.

Candidates are likely to describe studies that have used non-human animals. Descriptions of studies are only creditworthy as AO1 if their relevance to the issues is made clear.

**AO2**

The material here must be evaluative/analytical and provide commentary on the issues described for AO1. One possibility is for candidates to question the assumptions made in the quotation. For example, they might provide evidence of the differences between human and non-human animals that make generalisability dubious. They might also discuss alternatives to using non-human animals, eg brain scanning procedures, computer modelling. They could also explore ways in which researchers can improve the quality of their research with non-human animals and minimise the potential risks.

## Marking Allocations

### AO1: Description of the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	<p><b>Substantial</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>substantial</b>. It is <b>accurate and well detailed</b>. The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>coherent</b>.</p> <p>There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.</p>	15-12
Band 3	<p><b>Reasonable</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>reasonable</b>. It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b>. The organisation and structure are <b>reasonably coherent</b>. There is <b>evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.</p>	11-8
Band 2	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>basic</b> and <b>not well detailed</b>. There is <b>some focus on the question</b>. There is <b>little</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.</p>	7-4
Band 1	<p><b>Rudimentary</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>rudimentary</b>. It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.</p>	3-0

### AO2: Evaluation of the issues surrounding the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations.

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



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

- (a) Describe **two or more** examples of reductionism in psychological theories and/or studies. *(10 marks)*
- (b) Outline arguments **for** reductionist explanations in psychological theories and/or studies and evaluate those arguments. *(20 marks)*

**Marking Criteria****Part (a) AO1**

Candidates are required to describe two or more examples of reductionism in psychological theories and/or studies.

Candidates might choose to describe different types of reductionism as identified by Rose (1997) since these are included in some of the text books:

- methodological reductionism – eg the experimental method which involves breaking down a complex issue by manipulating the IV in order to investigate the effects on the DV
- philosophical reductionism – the idea that there is a single, overarching theory that can explain everything
- ideological reductionism – this is when reductionism serves ideological or political ends, eg explaining political dissidence as a symptom of underlying mental illness.

Alternatively, they could describe, in a more general way, the reductionist nature of certain theories, eg the environmental reductionism of behaviourist theory, the reduction of complex behaviours to cellular explanations found in physiological psychology, the principles of natural selection embodied in evolutionary theory.

There are two main pitfalls for candidates answering this part of the question. One is to focus too heavily on reductionism per se and the other is to write out detailed accounts of psychological theories/studies without relating them sufficiently to reductionism.

Candidates who provide only one relevant example meet the criteria for partial performance. For candidates who provide more than two relevant examples, there is a depth/breadth trade-off.

**NB: markers need to be aware that there are only 10 marks for this part of the question.**

**Part (b) AO1**

Candidates are required to outline **arguments for** reductionist explanations in psychological research. Examples of reductionism in psychological research are not relevant here and, where appropriate, should be exported to part (a). Identification and brief description of the arguments for reductionism constitute AO1. The main arguments for reductionist explanations in psychological research are:

- the intuitive appeal of reductionist explanations
- the scientific status it affords psychology
- the compatibility with related disciplines, eg physiology
- the simplicity/parsimony of reductionism.

**NB: markers need to be aware that there are only 5 marks for AO1 in this part of the question.**

**AO2**

There are two main ways in which candidates can demonstrate AO2 in answering this question. The first is for them to analyse/evaluate the arguments they have outlined **for** reductionist explanations. The second is for them to consider arguments **against** reductionism in psychology as these will constitute counter-points to the arguments for. However, they need to be used as part of a sustained argument. A simple list of counter arguments cannot access high mark bands.

**Marking Allocations**

**Part (a) AO1: Description of two or more examples of reductionism in psychological research.**

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 4</b>	<p><b>Substantial</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more examples of reductionism in psychological research is <b>substantial</b>. It is <b>accurate and well detailed</b>. The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>coherent</b>. There is <b>substantial</b> evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities with a reasonable balance between the two examples.</p> <p>AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.</p>	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 3</b>	<p><b>Reasonable</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more examples of reductionism in psychological research is <b>limited</b>. It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b>. The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>reasonably</b> constructed. There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.</p> <p>AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.</p> <p><i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well detailed. (N.B. maximum of 6 marks)</i></p>	<b>8-6</b>
<b>Band 2</b>	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more examples of reductionism in psychological research is <b>basic</b> and <b>not well detailed</b>. There is <b>some focus</b> on the question. There is <b>little</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.</p> <p>AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.</p> <p><i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i></p>	<b>5-3</b>
<b>Band 1</b>	<p><b>Rudimentary</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more examples of reductionism in psychological research is <b>rudimentary</b>. It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled understanding</b>. The answer may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.</p> <p>AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.</p> <p><i>Partial performance is basic and not well-detailed.</i></p>	<b>2-0</b>

**Part (b) AO1: Outline of arguments for reductionist explanations in psychological research.**

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 3	Outline of arguments for reductionist explanations in psychological research is <b>reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	5-4
Band 2	Outline of arguments for reductionist explanations in psychological research is <b>limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	3-2
Band 1	Outline of arguments for reductionist explanations in psychological research is <b>weak and muddled</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	1-0

**Part (b) AO2: Evaluation of arguments for reductionist explanations in psychological research.**

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

---

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

Outline and evaluate arguments <b>for</b> the claim that psychology is a science.
---

(30 marks)
------------

**Marking Criteria****AO1**

AO1 marks will be gained by presenting the claim that psychology is a science. There are certain characteristics that sciences seem to share and candidates could legitimately describe these criteria for AO1 credit. However, to access the higher mark bands, candidates need to explain how these criteria relate to psychology.

Criteria include:

- objectivity
- replicability
- falsifiability
- generation of theory
- generation of predictions
- usage of certain preferred methodologies (eg laboratory experiments).

Candidates can address any aspect of psychology in order to explore its scientific status. Examples could include specific pieces of empirical research or theory. Broader issues such as scientific funding could also be raised. It is also acceptable for candidates to focus on issues relating to the philosophy of science or to focus on particular research methods.

**AO2**

This part of the answer is an evaluative/analytical consideration of the arguments for the claim that psychology is a science described for AO1. It is acceptable for arguments against the claim that psychology is a science to be counted as AO2 provided the candidate has used the arguments effectively. If arguments against are simply listed marks are unlikely to access the higher mark bands and will be limited to the top of Band 3.

Candidates can also gain AO2 credit by covering broader issues such as whether psychology should aim to be a science at all. It could also be argued that science is difficult to define because it embraces such a broad range of disciplines and because it is a flexible and changing concept.

## Marking Allocations

### AO1: Description of arguments for the claim that psychology is a science.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	<p><b>Substantial</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of arguments for the claim that psychology is a science is <b>substantial</b>. It is <b>accurate and well detailed</b>. The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>coherent</b>.</p> <p>There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.</p>	15-12
Band 3	<p><b>Reasonable</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of arguments for the claim that psychology is a science is <b>reasonable</b>. It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b>. The organisation and structure are <b>reasonably coherent</b>. There is <b>evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.</p>	11-8
Band 2	<p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of arguments for the claim that psychology is a science is <b>basic</b> and <b>not well detailed</b>. There is <b>some focus on the question</b>. There is <b>little</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.</p>	7-4
Band 1	<p><b>Rudimentary</b></p> <p>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of arguments for the claim that psychology is a science is <b>rudimentary</b>. It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.</p>	3-0

### AO2: Evaluation of arguments for the claim that psychology is a science.

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

**SECTION C: PERSPECTIVES – APPROACHES**

8

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

Sometimes students delay writing up homework or revising for examinations even though they want to succeed and achieve high grades. Instead, they may go out with friends, watch television or even do things that they would not normally do, such as tidying their room or doing the washing up. This tendency to put off tasks, in this case homework or examination revision, is called procrastination.

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

**Marking Criteria****Possible approaches here are:**

**Cognitive approach:** It might be that people who procrastinate have unrealistic schemas and irrational beliefs. They might, for example, be perfectionists and so avoid tasks at which they fear they might not succeed. The perfectionist says things like 'I must get straight As', 'I must do everything right first time'. This kind of thinking can then lead to thoughts such as 'If I can't do it perfectly, it's better not to do it at all.' This is linked with the idea of self-handicapping whereby people protect themselves from failure by giving themselves an external reason, ie 'I would have done well at this task if I had taken time over it but I chose to do other things instead.'

**Behavioural approach:** A student who wants to get good grades but also enjoys socialising might choose to go out with friends because the essay deadline seems to be in the distant future. He/she will get more immediate rewards from going out (positive reinforcement) than writing the essay for which he/she will only get feedback much later and so the socialising takes precedence. Negative reinforcement might also play a role here – all the while the student is filling his/her time with social activities (pleasant activity), he/she does not have to think about the essay (unpleasant activity). Only when the deadline starts to get very close does the student start to work for the reward of getting a decent mark or even staying on the course. The student might then still achieve a reasonable grade and so is positively rewarded for the delaying behaviour. The student has been rewarded for work carried out under extreme time pressure and, therefore, might associate this with success. This leads to a recurring pattern of counter-productive behaviour.

**Psychodynamic approach:** Psychoanalysts might explain this behaviour in terms of repressed anger or hostility. The students might have felt over controlled as children and they now resent the demands of teachers at an unconscious level. They express this resentment in their overt behaviour by withholding their best efforts and, by setting their own schedule, they feel that they have reasserted their autonomy. Such behaviour could also be related to anal personality types.

9

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

Lots of people find it very difficult to throw away any of their possessions. When people hang on to their possessions in this way, it is called hoarding. Some people hoard old letters, clothes, childhood toys etc and become irritated with friends or partners who try to persuade them to get rid of things they do not use any more.

- (a) Describe how hoarding might be explained by **two** different approaches. (6 marks + 6 marks)
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations of hoarding in terms of its strengths and limitations. (6 marks)
- (c) How might hoarding be investigated by **one** of these approaches? (6 marks)
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating hoarding. (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 approach:** Compulsive hoarding sometimes runs in families and it is possible that there is some kind of genetic link with obsessive personality and impulse control disorders. Pathological collecting behaviour can also be found in people with disorders such as OCD, schizophrenia, Tourettes's syndrome and certain dementias. There is a common link here in that frontal lobe damage is often present in such people. Recent research has isolated a region in the frontal lobe of the brain that appears to play a role in hoarding behaviour.

**Evolutionary approach:** This approach might suggest that hoarding has survival value as a means of hoarding scarce resources. The hoarder would be sought after as a mate because he/she would be able to provide for other family members in times of shortage. The evolutionary perspective can be used as an extension of the biological approach or as a free-standing, second approach.

**Psychodynamic approach:** Psychoanalysts might explain the behaviour in terms of anally retentive personality. This is related to the anal stage of development where children develop a sense of mastery over their own bodies and can become fixated on the pleasure of retaining faeces. Such people could, in later life, feel the same kind of emotional distress at the prospect of discarding possessions.

It would also be possible to explain this kind of behaviour in cognitive or behavioural terms.

---

**Marking guidelines for Questions 8 and 9****Part (a)**

Candidates must clearly identify two 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 social learning theory (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.

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 or aptitude (eg impulsivity or obsessional behaviour), but not specifically for putting off writing an essay. 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 ‘hoarding old toys’, 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 hoard possessions 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 (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 who procrastinate although, in some circumstances, it would be legitimate to use questionnaires within the behavioural approach.



---

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 hoarding possessions.

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 (Qu.8) some students procrastinate or (Qu.9) people hoard possessions. Candidates who have described *wholly* implausible or *grossly* unethical methods in (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.

---

**Marking Allocations**
**Questions 8 and 9(a)****AO1:** *For description of each approach.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3</b>	Psychological content is <b>reasonably thorough</b> and is <b>accurate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>sustained, coherent and plausible</b> . <b>Appropriate</b> aspects of the approach have been selected.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 2</b>	Psychological content is <b>limited</b> and <b>generally accurate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>reasonable and substantially plausible</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1</b>	Psychological content is <b>basic</b> and <b>flawed/inaccurate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>muddled and/or minimal</b> . If there is no attempt at engagement, marks up to 2 can only be awarded if the psychological content is accurate and thorough.	<b>2-0</b>

**Questions 8 & 9(b)****AO2:** *For assessment of strengths and limitations of one approach.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3</b>	There is <b>reasonably thorough</b> commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Strengths <b>and</b> limitations must be considered, although not necessarily given the same weight. Material has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner. The approach is <b>evaluated</b> in the context of its appropriateness in explaining the stimulus material.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 2</b>	There is <b>limited</b> commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). There is <b>some attempt</b> 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>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1</b>	There is <b>basic</b> commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). The material has been used in a <b>restricted</b> manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>muddled, minimal or the commentary/evaluation is sound but there is no engagement with the stimulus material</b> . <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>	<b>2-0</b>

---

**Questions 8 & 9(c)**

**AO2:** *For one approach investigating the phenomenon.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3</b>	There is <b>reasonably thorough</b> commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. There is a <b>clear indication</b> of the intentions of the investigation and a reasonably detailed account of how this could be implemented. The method described is <b>plausible</b> as a way of investigating the behaviour in the stimulus material. It is also <b>appropriate</b> to the approach chosen and this approach is identifiable. The method is <b>practicable</b> and if ethical concerns arise, they are minor. There is <b>sustained and coherent</b> engagement with the stimulus material.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 2</b>	There is <b>limited</b> commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. There is <b>some indication</b> of the intentions of the investigation and a limited account of how these could be effected. The method described is <b>reasonably plausible</b> 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 <b>reasonably practicable</b> and, if ethical concerns arise, they are minor. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>reasonably coherent</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1</b>	There is <b>basic</b> commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is <b>substantially</b> inappropriate. Engagement with the material is <b>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.</b>	<b>2-0</b>

**Question 8 & 9(d)**

**AO2:** *For evaluation of this investigative approach.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3</b>	There is <b>reasonably thorough</b> commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. There is <b>explicit reference</b> to the intentions offered in (c) and an <b>evaluation</b> of its effectiveness. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 2</b>	There is <b>limited</b> commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. There is <b>some attempt</b> to refer to the intention offered in (c) and an evaluation of its effectiveness. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1</b>	There is <b>basic</b> commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>muddled, minimal or the commentary/evaluation is sound but there is no engagement with the stimulus material.</b>	<b>2-0</b>

---

**Assessment Grid**

<b>Question</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>
1	15	15
2	15	15
3(a)	15	
3(b)		15
4(a)	5	
4(b)	10	15
5	15	15
6(a)	10	
6(b)	5	15
7	15	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	
<b>Total marks for 3 questions</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Total marks for paper</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>48</b>