



# General Certificate of Education

## Psychology (Advanced Extension Award)

# 6881

# Mark Scheme

## *2005 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.

### **Advanced Extension Award (AEA)**

This Mark Scheme covers the Advanced Extension Award that AQA offers on behalf of all awarding bodies

**SECTION A – THEORETICAL ISSUES AND DEBATES**

**1**

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Using your knowledge of psychology, briefly explain the claim that is being made in the statement above. <span style="float: right;">(6 marks)</span>
---

**Marking criteria**

The quotation given is clearly intended to draw candidates into the nature/nurture (heredity/environment) debate and one would expect all but the weakest answers to clearly locate the quotation within this context.

The quality of the response will largely be a function of how well the candidate marries the quotation to the debate and makes links between the two.

Weaker answers will tend to be a literal ‘reading’ or re-wording of the claim and may get bogged down in the minutia of the quotation, for example, why ‘a few elementary movements’? What is genius? Although some of the detail is important – for example, what would a lack of movement tell us? Why would visual impairment be important? - Better answers will move beyond the literal and engage in genuine interpretation.

Candidates may pick up on the antiquity of the quotation, but this is not necessary.

The best answers are likely to link the quotation explicitly to key features of the nature/nurture debate, for example in terms of the key phrase “nothing from within to develop”. They may also focus on the use of the word behaviourists in the first sentence and consider how this statement illustrates the behaviourist position (or what this is). Alternatives to behaviourism are also acceptable, e.g. how a physiological psychologist would relate to the claim made. A social learning interpretation is also acceptable and perhaps a likely response.

In assessing the quality of the answer examiners should be mindful that this is only a 6 mark question (thus the candidate will only have a maximum of approximately 8 minutes to answer it).

Failure to engage with resource material maximum is band one.

**Marking allocation**

*Explanation of Watson’s statement.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 3	<b>Thorough</b> explanation of Watson’s statement. <b>Highly effective</b> selection and use of material. <b>Coherent, focused</b> explanation presented in a <b>clear precise and logical</b> style. <b>Effective</b> use of <b>range</b> of appropriate terminology.	5-6 marks
Band 2	<b>Clear</b> explanation of Watson’s statement. <b>Effective</b> selection and use of material. A <b>generally focused</b> explanation, presented <b>appropriately</b> , with <b>effective</b> use of terminology.	3-4 marks
Band 1	<b>Limited</b> explanation of Watson’s statement. <b>Inappropriate</b> selection of and/or use of material. Explanation is <b>superficial</b> and <b>lacks focus</b> . Appropriate use of psychological terminology may <b>sometimes</b> be employed.	0-2 marks

(b) Discuss methods that have been used to investigate the nature-nurture debate in psychology.  
(12 marks)

**Marking criteria**

The question specifies a plurality of methods therefore answers which offer only one will be partially performing (see Marking Allocations overleaf). However, it is quite acceptable for candidates to offer 'sub-sets' of a methodology, for example laboratory and field experiments, for their plurality.

Answers which focus on particular studies (e.g. Gottesman & Shields work) should receive credit only insofar as material may be extrapolated to illustrate methods. Similarly answers which focus on conceptual issues such as the nature of heritability should receive credit only for material included in such a discussion which is relevant to methodological issues.

Given the wide coverage in the popular textbooks, it is likely that many candidates will focus on methodologies which have been used in nature/nurture IQ studies. Twin studies and adoption studies are likely favourites.

Other likely favourites will include split-brain methodology associated with the work of psychologists such as Sperry and social psychological work emphasising the importance of learning (e.g. Skinner; Bandura). Case studies are relevant given the work of, for example, Money's work on gender and Freud's emphasis on instincts/drives. Cross-cultural methodology is also relevant.

**Marking allocations**

*Discussion of methods used to investigate the nature-nurture debate in psychology.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 4	<p><b>Thorough</b> description of methods. A <b>range of highly pertinent</b> material is selected giving an <b>appropriate</b> balance of depth and breadth. <b>Effective analysis and synthesis</b> is evident in a <b>clear, well-developed</b> critical discussion. <b>Highly effective</b> use of material to develop the discussion. <b>Coherent, focused</b> on nature-nurture and <b>well structured response presented in a clear, precise and logical</b> style. <b>Effective</b> use of a range of appropriate terminology.</p>	10-12 marks
Band 3	<p><b>Clear and detailed</b> description of methods. A <b>range of relevant</b> material is selected giving a <b>balance</b> of depth and breadth. Analysis and synthesis is <b>generally evident in a clear</b> critical discussion. <b>Effective</b> choice of material to support the discussion. <b>Clear, logical, structured</b> response which is <b>generally focused</b> on nature-nurture and is presented in an <b>appropriate style, generally using appropriate</b> terminology.</p> <p><i>Partial performance: Thorough description of one method. A range of highly pertinent material is selected giving an appropriate balance of depth and breadth. Effective analysis and synthesis is evident in a clear, well-developed critical discussion. Highly effective use of material to develop the discussion. Coherent, focused on nature-nurture and well structured response presented in a clear, precise and logical style. Effective use of a range of appropriate terminology.</i></p>	7-9 marks
Band 2	<p>Clear description of methods. A <b>range of relevant material</b> is selected, some of which is relevant. The answer does <b>not always directly address the question</b>. Analysis and synthesis is <b>occasionally/inconsistently</b> evident in the discussion. <b>Occasionally effective</b> choice of material to support the discussion. Response is <b>occasionally/inconsistently focused</b> on nature-nurture and is <b>generally presented in an appropriate style, sometimes using appropriate</b> terminology.</p> <p><i>Partial performance: Clear and detailed description of one method. A range of relevant material is selected giving a balance of depth and breadth. Analysis and synthesis is generally evident in a clear critical discussion. Effective choice of material to support the discussion. Clear, logical, structured response which is generally focused on nature-nurture and is presented in an appropriate style, generally using appropriate terminology.</i></p>	4-6 marks
Band 1	<p><b>Relevant</b> research methods are described. <b>Limited, superficial</b> discussion of methods is presented with <b>little evidence</b> of analysis and synthesis. <b>Some material</b> to support the discussion is presented. The response <b>lacks focus</b> on nature/nurture and structure, though <b>appropriate</b> terminology may sometimes be employed.</p> <p><i>Partial performance: Clear description of one method. A range of relevant material is selected, some of which is relevant. The answer does not always directly address the question. Analysis and synthesis is occasionally/inconsistently evident in the discussion. Occasionally effective choice of material to support the discussion. Response is occasionally/inconsistently focused on nature-nurture and is generally presented in an appropriate style, sometimes using appropriate terminology.</i></p>	1-3 marks

- |  |
|--|
| (c) Discuss the contribution of <b>one</b> non-behaviourist psychologist of your choice to the nature-nurture debate. <span style="float: right;"><i>(12 marks)</i></span> |
|--|

**Marking criteria**

Given this exclusion of behaviourists, likely favourites for selection may be Freud and Piaget but many candidates will probably focus upon particular areas of empirical research and discuss the contribution of the psychologist associated with this. Burt's work with intelligence is a likely candidate, as is work in other specific areas of psychological research (e.g. personality; mental illness; gender). The contribution of psychologists associated with one particular well-known (to students) study relevant to the nature-nurture debate may well be offered by candidates. This is perfectly acceptable. Likely favourites here may include Gottesman (1976) on IQ concordance between family members; Deregowski's (1972) cross-cultural work; Raine's (1997) work in physiology and abnormality; and Bandura's work.

A fairly liberal interpretation of the term psychologist can be taken here (e.g., someone whose work has been of psychological interest). Darwin, Lorenz, Mead, Rose, Dawkins, for example, would all be acceptable as would writers recognised as psychologists such as H.J. Eysenck.

Possible points which could be given are:

- the nature of the contribution (e.g. to our understanding of intelligence)
- consequences or implications of the position taken (e.g. to education)
- empirical support for the work or nature of the work undertaken if empirical itself
- counterpoints to the contribution/position given.

Likely potential pitfalls which examiners should be mindful of include:

- focusing upon empirical research findings in a particular field rather than the contribution of one specific psychologist
- focusing too heavily on the work of the psychologist (e.g. Freud or Buss) without relating it sufficiently to the nature/nurture debate
- focusing upon particular methodologies (e.g. twin studies) rather than how these have been used by a specific psychologist
- focusing too heavily on the features of the nature/nurture debate without relating it sufficiently to one specific psychologist.

**Marking allocations**

*Discussion of contribution.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 4	<b>Thorough</b> description of contribution. A <b>range of highly pertinent</b> material is selected giving an <b>appropriate balance</b> of depth and breadth. <b>Effective analysis and synthesis</b> is evident in a <b>clear, well-developed</b> discussion. <b>Highly effective</b> use of material to develop the discussion. <b>Coherent, focused and well structured</b> response presented in a <b>clear, precise and logical</b> style. <b>Effective</b> use of a range of appropriate terminology.	10-12 marks
Band 3	<b>Clear and detailed</b> description of contribution. A <b>range of relevant</b> material is selected giving a <b>balance</b> of depth and breadth. Analysis and synthesis is <b>generally evident in a clear</b> discussion. <b>Effective</b> choice of material to support the discussion. <b>Clear, logical, structured</b> response, which is <b>generally focused and is presented in an appropriate</b> style, <b>generally using appropriate</b> terminology.	7-9 marks
Band 2	Clear description of contribution. A <b>range</b> of material is selected, some of which is relevant. The <b>answer does not always directly address the question</b> . Analysis and synthesis is <b>occasionally/inconsistently</b> evident in the discussion. <b>Occasionally effective</b> choice of material to support the discussion. Response is <b>occasionally/inconsistently focused and is generally presented in an appropriate</b> style, sometimes using <b>appropriate</b> terminology.	4-6 marks
Band 1	The contribution is described. <b>Limited, superficial</b> discussion is presented with <b>little evidence</b> of analysis and synthesis. <b>Some</b> material to support the discussion is presented. The response <b>lacks focus and structure</b> , though <b>appropriate terminology may sometimes be employed</b> .	1-3 marks

(d) In the context of the nature-nurture debate in psychology, discuss issues raised by the extract above.  
(12 marks)

**Marking criteria**

Candidates are free to consider the nature-nurture debate in the context of sexualities (e.g. homosexuality/heterosexuality) or gender, or in a more general context. In other words the issues may be directly related to the subject matter of the quotation or may lead to a more general discussion. For example, candidates may focus on the specific aspect of the quotation relating to choosing or not choosing to “be that way” and may relate this to the free will/determinism debate. The latter is acceptable provided the candidate shows that the free will debate is pertinent to the quotation.

Given the wording of the question, however, it is essential for candidates to link their answer in some explicit way to the nature/nurture debate. If this is not done zero credit should be given.

Some of the most likely issues to be discussed include:

- socially sensitive research. The term ‘gay gene’ is likely to cue the debates surrounding the work of Hamer (1995)
- sexist bias in psychology and psychological research (e.g. Kitzinger & Coyle, 1995)
- heterosexism and ‘alternative sexuality’ in society including historical persecution
- ethical issues relating to sexuality and abnormal psychology (e.g. Heather, 1976)
- how nature and nurture factors might influence the development of sexuality (e.g., genes, families, culture)
- psychology in society (and the role/influence of the psychologist in informing debates and public opinion)
- challenge to other approaches in psychology
- problems inherent in disentangling nature and nurture (e.g. in the context of sexuality).

In the unlikely event of candidates discussing only one issue (e.g. one specific point in the quotation), partial performance rules apply.

**Marking allocations***Discussion of issues.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 4	<b>Thorough</b> description of issues. A <b>range of highly pertinent</b> material is selected giving an <b>appropriate</b> balance of depth and breadth. <b>Effective analysis and synthesis</b> is evident in a <b>clear, well-developed critical</b> discussion. <b>Highly effective</b> use of material to develop the discussion. <b>Coherent, focused and well structured</b> response presented in a <b>clear, precise and logical</b> style. <b>Effective use of a range of appropriate terminology.</b>	10-12 marks
Band 3	<b>Clear and detailed</b> description of issues. A <b>range of relevant</b> material is selected giving a <b>balance</b> of depth and breadth. <b>Analysis and synthesis is generally evident in a clear critical</b> discussion. <b>Effective</b> choice of material to support the discussion. <b>Clear, logical, structured</b> response which is <b>generally focused</b> and is presented in an <b>appropriate style, generally using appropriate terminology.</b> <i>Partial performance: Thorough description of one issue. A range of highly pertinent material is selected giving an appropriate balance of depth and breadth. Effective analysis and synthesis is evident in a clear, well-developed critical discussion. Highly effective use of material to develop the discussion. Coherent, focused and well structured response presented in a clear, precise and logical style. Effective use of a range of appropriate terminology.</i>	7-9 marks
Band 2	Clear description of issues. A <b>range of relevant</b> material is selected, some of which is relevant. <b>The answer does not always directly address the question.</b> Analysis and synthesis is <b>occasionally/inconsistently</b> evident in the discussion. <b>Occasionally effective</b> choice of material to support the discussion. Response is <b>occasionally/inconsistently focused and is generally presented in an appropriate</b> style, sometimes using <b>appropriate</b> terminology. <i>Partial performance: Clear and detailed description of one issue. A range of relevant material is selected giving a balance of depth and breadth. Analysis and synthesis is generally evident in a clear critical discussion. Effective choice of material to support the discussion. Clear, logical, structured response which is generally focused and is presented in an appropriate style, generally using appropriate terminology.</i>	4-6 marks
Band 1	The issues are described. <b>Limited, superficial</b> discussion of issues is presented with <b>little evidence of analysis and synthesis.</b> <b>Some</b> material to support the discussion is presented. The response <b>lacks focus and structure</b> , though <b>appropriate</b> terminology may be employed. <i>Partial performance: Clear description of one issue. A range of relevant material is selected, some of which is relevant. The answer does not always directly address the question. Analysis and synthesis is occasionally/inconsistently evident in the discussion. Occasionally effective choice of material to support the discussion. Response is occasionally/inconsistently focused and is generally presented in an appropriate style, sometimes using appropriate terminology.</i>	1-3 marks



**SECTION B – METHODOLOGY****2****Total for this question: 30 marks**

- |   |
|---|
| (a) (i) Design <b>two</b> studies, using different methodologies, to investigate whether there are age differences in how frightened people are by the rides. <span style="float: right;">(14 marks)</span> |
|---|

**Marking criteria**

The question requires the candidate to design two studies using different methodologies. Given that the two studies are ‘conflated’ into a single question cross-referencing is permitted (e.g., “This second study would have a similar aim to the previous one...”). A reasonably liberal view should be taken of what constitutes different methodologies. Laboratory experiment and field experiment would be acceptable, but two variants (e.g. different IV/DV) of the laboratory experiment would not.

Quality of answers is likely to vary as a function of the plausibility/appropriateness of the design and the consistency of engagement with the stimulus material scenario (see Marking allocations below).

Specific details will clearly depend upon the methodologies chosen. The following are merely illustrative of the things which one could expect to be covered for three particular methodologies:

- Laboratory experiment: hypothesis (null and/or alternate); IV and DV (including a clear identification of the experimental ‘task’) and CVs; sampling of participants; ethical issues.
- Structured interview: sampling of participants; instructions; selection of questions; piloting; reliability and validity.
- Observation: defining behavioural categories, sampling of behaviour, observer training.

**Marking allocations***Design of two studies*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 3	Hypotheses and/or aims are <b>appropriate and clearly stated</b> . The designs are <b>plausible, accurate and appropriate</b> for the study of the stimulus material scenario. There is <b>clear and consistent engagement</b> with the stimulus material. There will be <b>appropriate</b> use of specialist terms.	10-14 marks
Band 2	Hypotheses and/or aims are <b>generally appropriate and clearly stated</b> . The designs are <b>generally plausible, accurate and appropriate</b> . There is <b>partial/inconsistent engagement</b> with the stimulus material. There will be <b>some</b> use of specialist terms. THESE DESCRIPTORS ARE <u>GENERALLY</u> SATISFIED AT THE TOP OF THE BAND BUT ONLY <u>OCCASIONALLY</u> AT THE BOTTOM. <i>Partial performance: Hypothesis and/or aim is appropriate and clearly stated. The design is plausible, accurate and appropriate for the study of the stimulus material scenario. There is clear and consistent engagement with the stimulus material. There will be appropriate use of specialist terms.</i>	5-9 marks
Band 1	Hypotheses and/or aims are <b>largely inappropriate and/or unclearly stated</b> . The designs are <b>muddled and/or largely inappropriate</b> for the study of the stimulus material scenario. Answers <b>do not contain much structure or organisation</b> and it is <b>often difficult to understand</b> what was done. There will be <b>little or no use</b> of specialist terms. Material is <b>generic and there is no explicit engagement</b> with the stimulus material. <i>Partial performance: Hypothesis and/or aim is generally appropriate and clearly stated. The design is generally plausible, accurate and appropriate. There is partial/inconsistent engagement with the stimulus material. There will be some use of specialist terms.</i>	0-4 marks

If there is a considerable imbalance in the quality of the two studies given the following system should be used:

- One is top band and other is middle band: 9-11 marks.
- One is middle band and other is bottom band: 4-6 marks.
- One is top band and other is bottom band: 6-8 marks.

(ii) Explain how you would analyse the data (qualitative or quantitative) from **one** of these studies. (6 marks)

**Marking criteria**

Analysis can be either qualitative or quantitative but the analysis given must be appropriate for the study and must be accurate. In the case of the latter we cannot require the inclusion of inferential statistics as these are not mandatory on all GCE specifications. Examples of analyses include:

- Assessment of differences. This would include assessment of centrality (e.g. means) and dispersion (e.g. standard deviation). It is reasonable to expect that answers which do not offer inferential statistics would address these in more detail than those who did not.
- Correlational analysis, for example of age with fear. Measures could include Spearman’s rho and Pearson’s product moment, as appropriate (however note that candidates are not required to justify their choice of test). Those who do not mention significance of correlation can compensate by giving more detail (as above).
- Analysis of interviews. This will be driven by the nature of the interview (e.g. open-ended, structured) and can be either qualitative or quantitative. For example, category counting from a Likert scale.
- Analysis of observations (e.g. categorising different behaviours; establishing reliability/validity and inter-rater reliability).

**Marking allocations**

*Explanation of data analysis.*

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Proposals for analysis are <b>appropriate and accurate</b> . They are explained <b>coherently</b> with commentary which is relevant to the chosen design. <b>Answers are systematic and well organised/structured</b> .	5-6 marks
Band 2	Proposals for analysis of data are included, are largely appropriate and accurate, and are sometimes coherent and relevant to the chosen design.	3-4 marks
Band 1	Proposals for analysis are <b>sparsely detailed or vaguely mentioned or irrelevant</b> . Material is <b>generic and there is no explicit engagement</b> with the stimulus material.	0-2 marks

(b) Compare the effectiveness of the <b>two</b> studies you have designed in part (a) (i) above for studying possible age differences in ‘ride fright’. <i>(10 marks)</i>
--

**Marking criteria**

It is particularly difficult to be prescriptive here given that the content of the answers will be determined by the methods selected in part (a). If the methods compared in this question do not correspond to those given in (a) then 0 marks should be awarded here.

Quality of answers is likely to vary as a function of the accuracy of the psychological knowledge (e.g., what are the advantages of an experiment over an interview) and the degree to which this material is engaged with this specific scenario (see Marking allocations below).

Likely criteria for comparison of effectiveness include:

- importance of control/manipulation
- possibility and effects of demand characteristics
- practical considerations (the ‘do-ability’ factor)
- generating a certain (preferred) type of data, e.g. qualitative or quantitative
- reliability and/or validity
- whether nomothetic or idiographic
- whether cross-sectional or longitudinal (e.g. the ‘snap-shot’ study)
- generalisability.

The best answers will almost certainly engage with the issue of what constitutes ‘effectiveness’, specifically in the context of this scenario.

Reference to ethics is only creditworthy if related to effectiveness.

If there is no comparison, i.e. just two free-standing accounts of the effectiveness of the methodologies, marks should be restricted to the top of Band 2 (up to 7 marks).

**Marking allocations**

*Comparison of effectiveness of the two studies given in (a).*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 3	<b>Thorough</b> comparison of effectiveness of the two methodologies. Material has been <b>elaborated and described in a highly effective</b> manner. The comparison is <b>explicitly and consistently executed</b> in the context of the given scenario.	8-10 marks
Band 2	<b>Adequate</b> comparison of effectiveness of the two methodologies. Material is sometimes <b>elaborated and described in a reasonably effective</b> manner. The comparison is <b>generally executed</b> in the context of the given scenario but it sometimes generic.	3-7 marks
Band 1	<b>Limited or inappropriate</b> comparison of the two methodologies. Material is <b>not described effectively or may be irrelevant</b> . Material is <b>generic and there is little or no explicit engagement</b> with the stimulus material.	0-2 marks

## SECTION C – APPROACHES & APPLICATIONS

3

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

Please read the following newspaper extracts and answer the question below.

The extracts above claim that ordinary people buy gadgets they do not need and products, such as health pills, that may not work. A number of areas of psychology can explain why these and other similar behaviours occur. Describe and evaluate **two or more** of these explanations. (30 marks)

### Marking criteria

The key factor is how well the candidate can apply his or her knowledge of psychology to explaining these, or similar phenomena (e.g. people buying things they do not need or believing, and acting on spurious unscientific claims). The main danger is that the candidate drifts quickly into anecdote or common sense and does not make full and appropriate use of their psychology. Another, less likely, shortcoming will be that the candidate does not *apply* their psychology sufficiently. It is not necessary for candidates to engage explicitly with the stimulus material in Section C but they must do more than merely describing psychological knowledge (e.g. theories/perspectives).

Psychological explanations may be drawn from any area of the discipline. These may be at a macro level (e.g. behaviourism) or micro level (e.g. theories of persuasion and propaganda). Either – or a mixture of both – can earn full marks.

Some likely candidates for inclusion will include:

- bio psychology – e.g. arousal
- behaviourism – e.g. reinforcement for being seen to have ‘the right purchases’
- cognitive psychology – e.g. schemas of healthy living and body beautiful
- health psychology – e.g. life styles and health
- social psychology – e.g. group identification (by ownership of goods) or conformity
- personality factors – e.g. self concept; need for approval/acceptance.

Candidates need to offer two or more psychological explanations. Breadth/depth is likely to be a frequent feature for examiners to address (see Marking allocations overleaf).

**Marking allocations**

*Use of knowledge and understanding of psychology to explain issues such as those raised in the source(s).*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 3	<b>Substantial, accurate and detailed</b> knowledge to explain issues such as those raised in the source(s). A <b>range of highly pertinent</b> material is selected, giving an <b>appropriate balance</b> of depth and breadth. <b>Thorough understanding</b> of explanations of issues such as those raised in the source(s).	9-12 marks
Band 2	<b>Accurate and detailed</b> knowledge of psychological issues such as those raised in the source(s). A <b>range of relevant</b> material is selected, giving a <b>balance</b> of depth and breadth. <b>Clear understanding</b> of psychological issues such as those raised in the source(s). THESE DESCRIPTORS ARE <u>GENERALLY</u> SATISFIED AT THE TOP OF THE BAND BUT ONLY <u>OCCASIONALLY</u> AT THE BOTTOM. <i>Partial performance: Substantial, accurate and detailed knowledge to explain issues such as those raised in the source(s). A range of highly pertinent material is selected, giving an appropriate balance of depth and breadth. Thorough understanding of explanations of issues such as those raised in the source(s).</i>	5-8 marks
Band 1	Explanations of psychological issues raised in the source(s) are <b>described</b> . Material presented represents either depth or breadth. <b>Limited understanding</b> of explanations of psychological issues raised in the source(s). <i>Partial performance: Accurate and detailed knowledge of psychological issues such as those raised in the source(s). A range of relevant material is selected, giving a balance of depth and breadth. Clear understanding of psychological issues such as those raised in the source(s).</i>	0-4 marks

*Evaluation, analysis and synthesis of explanation such as those raised in sources(s).*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 3	<b>Effective analysis and synthesis</b> is evident in a <b>clear, well-developed</b> explanation of issues such as those raised in the source(s). Evaluation is <b>informed and thorough</b> . <b>Highly effective</b> use of material to support lines of argument.	9-12 marks
Band 2	<b>Analysis and synthesis</b> is evident in a <b>clear</b> explanation of issues such as those raised in the source(s). Evaluation is <b>slightly limited</b> . <b>Effective</b> choice of material to support the lines of argument. THESE DESCRIPTORS ARE <u>GENERALLY</u> SATISFIED AT THE TOP OF THE BAND BUT ONLY <u>OCCASIONALLY</u> AT THE BOTTOM. <i>Partial performance: Effective analysis and synthesis is evident in a clear, well-developed explanation of issues such as those raised in the source(s). Evaluation is informed and thorough. Highly effective use of material to support lines of argument.</i>	5-8 marks
Band 1	<b>Limited, superficial</b> explanation of the issues such as those raised in the sources(s), with <b>little evidence</b> of analysis and synthesis. <b>Evaluation is limited</b> . <b>Poor choice</b> of material to support the lines of argument. <i>Partial performance: Analysis and synthesis is evident in a clear explanation of issues such as those raised in the source(s). Evaluation is slightly limited. Effective choice of material to support the lines of argument.</i>	0-4 marks

*Structure and Coherence.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 3	<b>Coherent, focused and well structured</b> response presented in a <b>clear precise and logical</b> style. <b>Confident and effective use of a range of appropriate terminology.</b>	5-6 marks
Band 2	<b>Clear, logical, structured</b> response which is <b>generally focused</b> and is presented in an <b>appropriate style, using appropriate terminology.</b>	3-4 marks
Band 1	Response <b>lacks focus and structure</b> though <b>appropriate terminology</b> is employed.	0-2 marks

---

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

Discuss the way a behaviourist approach **and** a psychodynamic approach can be used to explain **one** area of concern to young people today. *(30 marks)*

**Marking criteria**

There is a key trade-off in this question, the topic (any one area of concern to young people today) is almost infinitely open-ended but set against this the psychological perspectives are specified (behaviourism and a psychodynamic approach).

It is practically impossible to predict what candidates will select as their area of concern but the most popular ones will probably correspond to derivations of the parts of the different specifications which candidates find most attractive (e.g., social psychology and conformity leading to a discussion of a crisis in law & order; eating disorders and abnormality; gender and sexualities). Examiners are unlikely to have to police the implementation of the terms ‘young people today’ and ‘concern’ but if this is an issue a liberal interpretation should be taken. However, if a plurality of topics is offered then all should be marked but only the best one credited.

Note: however that a candidate could legitimately write about eating disorders, drug addiction, sexual orientation all in the context of ‘the influence of the media’, for example. This must be made explicit by the candidate however.

Key features of behaviourist approaches in relation to the area of concern will include:

- the role of learning (versus instinct or biology, for instance)
- operant and/or classical conditioning, Social Learning Theory and how these ‘work’
- emphasis upon behaviour (rather than personality, for example)
- empirical and/or theoretical support for learning theory.

In the same manner there are many different forms of psychodynamic approaches, as there are different learning theories. It is likely however that the majority will focus upon the Freudian approach. Key features in relation to the area of concern will include:

- the interaction between id, ego and superego
- the importance of conflict and conflict resolution
- the role of the unconscious
- the importance of sexual and aggressive instincts.

If only a behaviourist or a psychoanalytic approach is offered the candidate is deemed to be partially performing (see Marking allocations overleaf)

If the answer does not achieve a reasonable balance between the two approaches maximum marks top of band 2 of the marking allocations.

**Marking allocations**

*Use of knowledge and understanding of how behaviourist and psychoanalytic approaches can be applied.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 3	<b>Substantial, accurate and detailed</b> explanation of how behaviourist and psychoanalytic approaches can be applied to the issue. A <b>range of highly pertinent</b> material is selected, giving an <b>appropriate balance</b> of depth and breadth. <b>Thorough</b> understanding demonstrated in discussing behaviourism and a psychoanalytic approach in this context.	9-12 marks
Band 2	<b>Accurate and detailed</b> explanation of how behaviourist and psychoanalytic approaches can be applied to the issue. A <b>range of relevant</b> material is selected, giving a <b>balance</b> of depth and breadth. <b>Clear</b> understanding demonstrated in discussing behaviourism and a psychoanalytic approach in this context. THESE DESCRIPTORS ARE <u>GENERALLY</u> SATISFIED AT THE TOP OF THE BAND BUT ONLY <u>OCCASIONALLY</u> AT THE BOTTOM. <i>Partial performance: Substantial, accurate and explanation of how behaviourist and psychoanalytic approaches can be applied to the issue. A range of highly pertinent material is selected, giving an appropriate balance of depth and breadth. Thorough understanding demonstrated in discussing behaviourism and a psychoanalytic approach in this context.</i>	5-8 marks
Band 1	<b>Explanations demonstrated</b> in discussing how behaviourist and psychoanalytic approaches can be applied to the issue. Material presented represents either depth or breadth. <b>Limited</b> understanding demonstrated in discussing behaviourism and a psychoanalytic approach in this context. <i>Partial performance: Accurate and detailed knowledge demonstrated in discussing how behaviourist and psychoanalytic approaches can be applied to the issue. A range of relevant material is selected, giving a balance of depth and breadth. Clear understanding demonstrated in discussing behaviourism and a psychoanalytic approach in this context.</i>	0-4 marks

*Evaluation, analysis and synthesis demonstrated in relation to behaviourist and psychoanalytic approaches applied to the area of concern.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 3	<b>Effective analysis and synthesis</b> is evident in a <b>clear, well-developed</b> discussion of behaviourist and psychoanalytic approaches applied to this area of concern. Evaluation is <b>informed and thorough</b> . <b>Highly effective</b> use of material demonstrated in discussing behaviourism and psychoanalysis in this context.	9-12 marks
Band 2	<b>Analysis and synthesis is evident in a clear</b> discussion of behaviourist and psychoanalytic approaches applied to this area of concern. Evaluation demonstrated is <b>slightly limited</b> . <b>Effective</b> choice of material to support the lines of argument. THESE DESCRIPTORS ARE <u>GENERALLY</u> SATISFIED AT THE TOP OF THE BAND BUT ONLY <u>OCCASIONALLY</u> AT THE BOTTOM. <i>Partial performance: Effective analysis and synthesis is evident in a clear, well-developed discussion of behaviourist and psychoanalytic approaches applied to this area of concern. Evaluation is informed and thorough. Highly effective use of material demonstrated in discussing behaviourism and psychoanalysis in this context.</i>	5-8 marks
Band 1	<b>Limited, superficial</b> discussion of behaviourist and psychodynamic explanations of area of concern with <b>little evidence of analysis and synthesis</b> . Evaluation is <b>limited</b> . <b>Some</b> material to support the lines of argument is presented. <i>Partial performance: Analysis and synthesis is evident in a clear presentation demonstrated in discussing behaviourism and a psychoanalytic approach in this context. Evaluation demonstrated is slightly limited. Effective choice of material to support the lines of argument.</i>	0-4 marks



*Structure and Coherence.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 3	<b>Coherent, focused and well structured</b> response presented in a <b>clear precise and logical</b> style. <b>Confident and effective</b> use of a range of <b>appropriate terminology</b> .	5-6 marks
Band 2	<b>Clear, logical, structured</b> response which is <b>generally focused</b> and is presented in an <b>appropriate</b> style, using <b>appropriate terminology</b> .	3-4 marks
Band 1	Response <b>lacks focus and structure though appropriate terminology</b> is employed.	0-2 marks

5

Total for this question: 30 marks

Critically consider how psychologists might explain the popularity of ‘reality TV programmes’ (for example Big Brother). (30 marks)

**Marking criteria**

This question is structurally similar to question 3, hence the same generic points about orientation and possible difficulties for candidates apply. The key factor is how well the candidate can apply his or her knowledge of psychology to explaining this phenomenon. The main danger is that the candidate drifts quickly into anecdote or common sense and does not make full and appropriate use of their psychology. Another, less likely, shortcoming will be that the candidate does not *apply* their psychology sufficiently. It is not necessary for candidates to engage explicitly with the resource material in Section C but they must do more than merely describing psychological knowledge (e.g. theories/perspectives).

Psychological explanations may be drawn from any area of the discipline. These may be at a macro level (e.g. behaviourism) or micro level (e.g. vicarious identification and peer participation). Either – or a mixture of both – can earn full marks.

Some likely candidates for inclusion will include:

- psychoanalysis – the relationship between reality and phantasy
- cultural factors – e.g. emphasis on the centrality of media in life
- social psychology – e.g. interpersonal relations; identification; disinhibition; peer acceptance
- learning theory – e.g. vicarious learning
- personality factors - e.g. acute introversion or shyness making social interaction difficult; self factors; self disclosure.

There is no partial performance in this question.

**Marking allocations**

*Use of knowledge and understanding of how psychologists might explain the popularity of reality TV.*

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	<b>Substantial, accurate and detailed</b> psychological knowledge of explanations of the popularity of reality TV. A <b>range of highly pertinent</b> material is selected, giving an <b>appropriate balance</b> of depth and breadth. <b>Thorough</b> understanding of explanations of popularity of reality TV.	9-12 marks
Band 2	<b>Accurate and detailed</b> psychological explanations of the popularity of reality TV. A <b>range of relevant</b> material is selected, giving a <b>balance</b> of depth and breadth. <b>Clear</b> understanding of explanations of popularity of reality TV. THESE DESCRIPTORS ARE <u>GENERALLY</u> SATISFIED AT THE TOP OF THE BAND BUT ONLY <u>OCCASIONALLY</u> AT THE BOTTOM.	5-8 marks
Band 1	Psychological explanations of the popularity of reality TV are <b>described</b> . Material presented represents either depth of breadth. <b>Limited</b> understanding of explanations of popularity of reality TV.	0-4 marks

*Evaluation, analysis and synthesis of how psychologists might explain the popularity of reality TV.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 3	<b>Effective analysis and synthesis</b> is evident in a <b>clear, well-developed</b> psychological explanation of the popularity of reality TV. Evaluation of explanation is <b>informed and thorough</b> . <b>Highly effective</b> use of material to support lines of argument.	9-12 marks
Band 2	<b>Analysis and synthesis</b> is evident in a <b>clear presentation</b> of psychological explanation of popularity of reality TV. Evaluation is <b>slightly limited</b> . <b>Effective</b> choice of material to support the lines of argument. THESE DESCRIPTORS ARE <u>GENERALLY</u> SATISFIED AT THE TOP OF THE BAND BUT ONLY <u>OCCASIONALLY</u> AT THE BOTTOM.	5-8 marks
Band 1	<b>Limited, superficial</b> psychological explanation of popularity of reality TV, with <b>little evidence of analysis and synthesis</b> . Evaluation of explanation is <b>limited</b> . <b>Some</b> material to support the lines of argument is presented.	0-4 marks

*Structure and Coherence.*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark Descriptors</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 3	<b>Coherent, focused and well structured</b> response presented in a <b>clear, precise and logical</b> style. <b>Confident and effective</b> use of a range of <b>appropriate</b> terminology.	5-6 marks
Band 2	<b>Clear, logical, structured</b> response which is <b>generally focused</b> and is presented in an <b>appropriate</b> style, using <b>appropriate</b> terminology.	3-4 marks
Band 1	Response <b>lacks focus and structure</b> though <b>appropriate</b> terminology is employed.	0-2 marks