GCE

Psychology

Advanced GCE

Unit **G544:** Approaches and Research Methods in Psychology

Mark Scheme for January 2013

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
AE	Attempts Evaluation
BOD	Benefit of Doubt
CONT	Context
✖	Cross
EVAL	Evaluation
▭	Extendable horizontal line
∿	Extendable horizontal wavy line
IRL	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
NAQ	Not answered question
✔	Tick
✔₊	Development of point
∧	Omission mark
?	Unclear
R/E	Good use of research/supporting evidence

SECTION A

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	The aim should follow logically from the research question and be clearly worded. **0 marks** – no aim is given/an aim is given that does not fit with any of the options. **1 mark** – an appropriate statement of the aim has been framed but it is not a close fit with the option/the option has not been elaborated upon. **2 marks** – an appropriate statement of the aim has been framed but it is not clearly stated. **3 marks** – an appropriate statement of the aim has been framed and it is clearly stated eg *To find out if men show more aggressive behaviour than women when watching a football match.*	3	An example for 1 mark is a statement related to friendly behaviour with no context. For 2 marks the answer can be worded as a question. For 3 marks the answer should be framed as a statement.
2	There should be a clear description of the method. Details should include, where appropriate, the type of sample and the way it was selected, the observation schedule and criteria, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings. **For replicability:** **0–4 marks** – The description of the sample, the way it was selected and the way participants were allocated to groups is **brief** and/or **unclearly stated**. Answers do not contain much **structure** or **organisation** and it is often difficult to understand what was done. There is **little or no use** of specialist terms. Examples of materials used are **missing** or **incomplete as** are details of the scoring, timing and conditions of the test. **5–8 marks** – The choice of sample and sampling technique is appropriate but could be described more fully. The structure and organization of the description of the procedure is generally plausible, appropriate and fairly detailed. There is some use of specialist terms. The investigation is not fully replicable as details are incomplete.	19	Do not reward a procedure that is clearly unrelated to the research question chosen and may have been learnt in order to be pigeon holed into any question. Start at the top band and move down to find the right band to fit the candidate's response. It is not necessary for candidates to describe materials in full for a top band answer or explicitly refer to ethical considerations.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			9–13 marks – At the top end the investigation is fully replicable. The type of sample and the way it was selected, the observation schedule and criteria, the conditions and timing, methods of learning and testing, scorings or ratings are all fully and clearly described. **For the quality of the design and its feasibility**: **1–2 marks** – the design should be appropriate to the research question but may not use event sampling **or** it fulfils the criteria for an observation using event sampling but does not logically follow from the research question. The description lacks clarity and it would be difficult to conduct the investigation from the description of the procedure. **3–4 marks** – the design should be appropriate to the research question ie is an observation but it is not practical [pragmatic] or ethical. The description of the procedure lacks clarity but it would be possible to conduct the investigation. **5–6 marks** – the design should be appropriate to the research question and is pragmatic and ethical. The description is clear, coherent and detailed.		No marks for an extremely unethical procedure or where data is not collected by observation. 1-2 marks The bottom band may be used for answers where the method is unclear/where procedure is unethical. 3-4 marks may be given if it is not explicit that event sampling is used. Or where the design is unclear. For 5 marks event sampling is identified. For 6 marks candidates will describe how event sampling is performed.
3			Possible answers include: there may be ethical concerns where observation is covert, lack of reliability if view of behaviour is limited. **0 marks** – no or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – a disadvantage described but not clearly. **2marks** – a disadvantage described clearly but not in the context of this practical project/a disadvantage described in the context of this practical project but not clearly. **3 marks** – a disadvantage described clearly in the context of this practical.	3	No marks for disadvantage of event sampling. Context needed for a 3 mark answer.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
4			Strengths may include easy to compare, analyse and present. Weaknesses may include reductionist, no explanation of behaviour. **0 marks** – no or irrelevant answer. **1–2** – A strength or weakness is identified and explained. **3–4 marks** – two strengths and/or weaknesses identified and explained. **5–6 marks** – at least two points of strengths **and** weaknesses identified and explained in context.	6	Most candidates will evaluate quantitative data but when candidates name a level of measurement but evaluate it as quantitative data they can achieve a maximum of 4 marks. Where qualitative data is justified as a type of data collected strengths could include descriptive and detailed. Weakness more difficult to analyse.
5			Most likely answer would be to present data in a bar chart or table of results, raw data, or mode for nominal level data. **0 marks**– no or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – brief description but not discussed in relation to this practical. **2 marks** – appropriate description but not in the context of the practical investigation. **3 marks** – appropriate description in the context of the practical investigation.	3	No marks for scattergraphs.
6			Ethical issues can, where appropriate, include informed consent, age of participants (over 16), confidentiality of the data, withdrawal, debriefing, avoiding stress, distress, harm or embarrassment to participants **0 marks** – incorrect answer **1 mark** – an appropriate ethical issue is identified **2 marks** – an appropriate ethical issue is identified and addressed but it lacks clarity or the issue is not discussed in relation to the investigation. **3 marks** – an ethical issue is clearly understood and addressed in relation to the investigation.	3	If ethical issue is not addressed no more than 1 mark can be gained even if context. A 2 mark answer may be clearly discussed but if it makes no reference to the candidate's proposed practical it cannot get 3 marks.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
7			Time sampling is taking a record on a time interval not for a time period e.g. a fixed number of observations are recorded, making an observation every one minute during a 30 minute time frame. **0 marks** – no or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – time sampling is described but not clearly. **2 marks** – time sampling is described, but it lacks clarity/not in context. **3 marks** – time sampling is clearly described and is in the context of the practical investigation.	3	
			Total	**40**	

SECTION B

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	(a)		Candidates should outline what is meant by reliability. Reliability refers to the consistency of a measurement. A test or measure is reliable if it gives similar results when carried out again in similar circumstances. Candidates could also refer to internal/external reliability, inter-rater reliability, standardisation of procedures in order to ensure consistency of the measure. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – Identification of the issue which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a sentence). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Reliability may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression poor. **2 marks** – The main components of the issue are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to reliability. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent. **3 marks** – The main components of the issue are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to reliability. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good. **4 marks** – The main components of the issue are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The answer is clearly related to reliability. The candidate clearly understands the issue in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.	4	No examples of psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks. A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant. A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding. For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer. Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.
	(b)		Reliability refers to the consistency of a measurement. A test or measure is reliable if it gives similar results when carried out again in similar circumstances. Candidates can use any piece of research high in reliability (or where part of a study that has high reliability) to answer this question. It is expected that they will draw from experimental research, but any relevant research must be given credit. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1–2 marks** – Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge	8	Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2. Do not reward evidence that is not high in reliability. If there is an imbalance in the quality between the two examples, identify the bands for the examples separately and then go half way between the two.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			(theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor. **3–4 marks** – Definition of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. **5–6 marks** – Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. **7–8 marks** – Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good.		Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response. For one piece of research, a maximum of 4 marks only can be awarded. For 3–4 marks the examples will lack detail or only one example which is fully detailed. For 5–6 marks the evidence may be very accurate and detailed but reliability may not be strongly emphasised/ reliability may be strongly emphasised but the evidence may not be detailed. For 7–8 marks accurate description of examples should explicitly highlight the reliability of behaviour.
	(c)		Strengths may include replicability, high control and hence causal relationships can be established/limitations may include lack of ecological validity, reductionist. Candidates should be given credit if emphasis is on reliable research rather than the issue of reliability. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1–3 marks** – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is basic. Range of points is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Points are not organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and demonstrates poor psychological knowledge. Sparse or no use of supporting examples from unit	12	Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe evidence that is high in reliability without referring to the strengths and weaknesses. Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response. At 1–3 marks the points are very basic and the psychological knowledge poor. For example the study may not be

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	content. There is very limited or no argument arising from points. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is sparse and understanding may not be evident. **4–5 marks** – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is limited. Range of points is limited (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates limited psychological knowledge. Poor use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is sparse. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sparse. Evaluation is lacking in detail and understanding is sparse. **6–7 marks** – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Range of points limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited. **8–9 marks** – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good. **10–12 marks** – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Range (eg two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced. Points are competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.		named and the details may be inaccurate. Points may not relate to the question of reliability. At 4–5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak. At 6–7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with more limited supporting evidence. At 8–9 marks there may be only 3 strengths/weaknesses, but these will be supported by very detailed examples. At 10–12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with well described impressive supporting evidence

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
	(d)		Candidates may draw comparisons between the types of data collected, or may use evaluation issues such as reductionism, determinism, ethics, usefulness, etc. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1–2 marks** – Explanation of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor. **3–4 marks** – Explanation of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/ studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. **5–6 marks** – Explanation of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. **7–8 marks** – Explanation of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout) Quality of written communication is very good.	8	Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence from experimental and other research without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks, if studies are in the context of the methods. For 1–2 marks the answer will either be very brief or have a limited discussion. For 3–4 marks the discussion will be more limited as will the examples. For 5–6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the methods with well supported examples. For 7–8 marks there should be at least two points of comparison linked with evidence from both the experimental method and the other method.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
	(e)		Candidates may use any areas of experimental research to answer this question but must focus on the usefulness of the research or parts of the research. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1–2 marks** – Discussion is basic. Range of supporting arguments is sparse or not present. There is little or no organisation. Selection of arguments is poor and is peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is lacking detail and there is very little understanding evident. **3–4 marks** – Discussion is reasonable. Range of supporting arguments is limited and has some organisation. Selection of arguments from a limited range of sources is vaguely related to the question and demonstrates some psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is inconsistent. Discussion has some detail and some understanding is evident. **5–6 marks** – Discussion is very good. Range of supporting arguments is well balanced and is organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is logically related to the question and demonstrates very good psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is generally well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is good. **7–8 marks** – Discussion is comprehensive. Range of supporting arguments is balanced and coherently organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is explicitly related to the question and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is clear and well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is thorough.	8	Do not reward responses that describe features of experimental research without reference to its usefulness Do not reward responses that describe evidence that refers to usefulness but is not experimental. For 1–2 marks the answer may be very brief or be very basic showing little psychological knowledge and understanding. For 3–4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples. For 5–6 marks there may only be 2 or 3 points discussed without the use of examples or 1 very well developed argument with supporting evidence. For 7–8 marks the candidate may have a well developed argument with 3 or 4 points without the use of examples. Alternatively they may take 2 or 3 arguments which are supported by psychological evidence from experimental research.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	**(a)**		Individual explanations are those that focus on innate/genetic characteristics such as personality and intelligence whereas situational explanations focus on environmental factors and learning experiences. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1 mark** – Identification of the debate which is very basic and lacks detail (eg a list). Very limited or no evidence of understanding. Individual/situational explanations may not be referred to at all. Psychological terms and concepts may be absent. Expression poor. **2 marks** – The main components of the debate are included, are generally accurate but errors may be evident. Detail is reasonable. There may be vague or no link to Individual/situational explanations. Some understanding is evident. Expression and use of psychological terminology is competent. **3 marks** – The main components of the debate are accurately described. Detail is good. The answer is linked to Individual/situational explanations. Understanding is good and expression and use of psychological terminology is also good. **4 marks** – The main components of the debate are clearly and accurately described. Detail is appropriate to level and time allowed. The debate is clearly related to individual/situational explanations. The candidate clearly understands the issue in question. Confident use of psychological terminology and concepts.	4	No examples from psychological research are needed in this answer to access full marks. A 1 mark answer will either be very brief or largely irrelevant. A 2 mark answer will have some inaccuracy or lack of understanding. For 3 marks the answer will be accurate but not as detailed as a 4 mark answer. Candidates can access 4 marks from a succinct description in two or three sentences.
	(b)		Candidates may use any research that they have studied throughout the AS or A2 course that support a situational explanation of behaviour. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1–2 marks** – Definition of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor.	8	Do not reward more than 2 pieces of research. If more than 2 are described, reward the best 2. Do not reward evidence which does not support a situational explanation of behaviour. For 1–2 marks one or two examples are given but are very basic.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			3–4 marks – Definition of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The range of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. **5–6 marks** – Definition of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. **7–8 marks** – Definition of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The range (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Description of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout). Quality of written communication is very good		For 3–4 marks the examples will lack detail or only one example which is fully detailed. For 5–6 marks the evidence may be very accurate and detailed but the situational aspects may not be strongly emphasised/ the situational aspects may be strongly emphasised but the evidence may not be detailed. For 7–8 marks accurate description of examples should explicitly highlight the situational explanation of behaviour.
	(c)		Strengths may include the usefulness/practical application of the explanation. Limitations may include reductionist/ ignoring individual factors. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1–3 marks** – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is basic. Range of points is sparse and may be only positive or negative. Points are not organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points may be peripherally relevant to the assessment request and demonstrates poor psychological knowledge. Sparse or no use of supporting examples from unit content. There is very limited or no argument arising from points. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is very limited or not present. Evaluation is sparse and understanding may not be evident.	12	Do not reward psychological evidence that does not support a situational explanation of behaviour. Do not reward parts of the answer that simply describe situational explanations of behaviour without referring to the strengths and weaknesses. Start at the top band and work down to see which criteria best fit the response.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			4–5 marks – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is limited. Range of points is limited (may be positive or negative only). Points are occasionally organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is sometimes related to the assessment request and demonstrates limited psychological knowledge. Poor use of supporting examples from unit content. Argument arising from points is sparse. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sparse. Evaluation is lacking in detail and understanding is sparse. **6–7 marks** – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is good. Range of points limited and may be imbalanced. Points are organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is often related to the assessment request and demonstrates good psychological knowledge. Limited use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is limited. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is sometimes evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is limited. **8–9 marks** – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is very good. Range of points is good and is balanced. Points are well organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is related to the assessment request and demonstrates competent psychological knowledge. Good use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument arising from points is often clear and well developed. Analysis (key points and valid generalisations) is often evident. Evaluation is quite detailed and understanding is good. **10–12 marks** – Evaluation (positive and negative points) is comprehensive. Range (eg two or more positive and two or more negative) of points is balanced. Points are competently organised into issues/debates, methods or approaches. Selection of points is explicitly related to the assessment request and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Effective use of supporting examples from unit content. Quality of argument (or comment) arising from points is clear and well developed. Analysis (valid conclusions that effectively summarise issues and arguments) is evident. Evaluation is detailed and understanding is thorough.		At 1–3 marks the points are very basic and the psychological knowledge poor. For example the study may not be named and the details may be inaccurate. Points may not relate to situational explanation but to the specific research. At 4–5 marks the psychological evidence will be limited and the strengths and weaknesses will be imbalanced/weak. At 6–7 marks there may be an imbalance between the strengths and weaknesses with more limited supporting evidence. At 8–9 marks there may be only 3 strengths/weaknesses, but these will be supported by very detailed examples. At 10–12 marks there will be at least 2 strengths and 2 weaknesses with well described impressive supporting evidence.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
	(d)		Any method can be accepted as long as it is justified and supported by relevant evidence **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1–2 marks** – Explanation of terms and use of psychological terminology is sparse or absent. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly inaccurate, lacks coherence and lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is poor. The answer is unstructured and lacks organisation. Quality of written communication is poor. **3–4 marks** – Explanation of terms is basic and use of psychological terminology is adequate. The supporting examples of theories/studies described is limited and may not be taken from two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/ studies) is often accurate, generally coherent but lacks detail. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is reasonable. The answer is lacking structure or organisation. Quality of written communication is adequate. **5–6 marks** – Explanation of terms is mainly accurate and use of psychological terminology is competent. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is mainly accurate, coherent and reasonably detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is good. The answer has some structure and organisation. Quality of written communication is good. **7–8 marks** – Explanation of terms is accurate and use of psychological terminology is comprehensive. The supporting examples (two or more) of theories/studies described is appropriate and taken from at least two different sources. Explanation of knowledge (theories/studies) is accurate, coherent and detailed. Elaboration, use of example, quality of description is very good. The answer is competently structured and organised (global structure introduced at start and followed throughout) Quality of written communication is very good.	8	Do not give full credit for parts of the answer that simply describe evidence supporting methods of situational and individual explanations of behaviour without comparing them. Maximum would be 4 marks. For 3–4 marks the comparison will be more limited as will the examples. For 5–6 marks the candidate needs to give at least one point of comparison between the two methods with well supported examples. For 7–8 marks the points can all be differences and the balance in the answer may be between different points made. There should be at least 2 differences with supporting evidence.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
	(e)		Candidates may use any areas of psychology to answer this question but must focus on the usefulness of individual explanations of behaviour. This is likely to focus on individual differences research. **0 marks** – No or irrelevant answer. **1–2 marks** – Discussion is basic. Range of supporting arguments is sparse or not present. There is little or no organisation. Selection of arguments is poor and is peripherally relevant to the question. Some psychological knowledge is evident. Quality of argument (or comment) is poor. Discussion is lacking detail and there is very little understanding evident. **3–4 marks** – Discussion is reasonable. Range of supporting arguments is limited and has some organisation. Selection of arguments from a limited range of sources is vaguely related to the question and demonstrates some psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is inconsistent. Discussion has some detail and some understanding is evident. **5–6 marks** – Discussion is very good. Range of supporting arguments is well balanced and is organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is logically related to the question and demonstrates very good psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is generally well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is good. **7–8 marks** – Discussion is comprehensive. Range of supporting arguments is balanced and coherently organised. Selection of arguments from a variety of sources is explicitly related to the question and demonstrates impressive psychological knowledge. Quality of argument (or comment) is clear and well developed. Discussion is detailed and understanding is thorough.	8	For 1–2 marks the answer may be very brief or be very basic showing little psychological knowledge and understanding and there may little mention of the usefulness of research giving individual explanations of behaviour. For 3–4 marks there may be only one or two points discussed without the use of examples. For 5–6 marks there may only be 2 or 3 points discussed without the use of examples or 1 very well developed argument with supporting evidence. For 7–8 marks the candidate may have a well developed argument with 3 or 4 points without the use of examples. Alternatively they may take 2 or 3 arguments which are supported by psychological evidence.
			Total	**40**	