



Advanced Extension Award

Psychology 6881

6881 AEA

Mark Scheme

2006 examination – June series

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

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)	Identify one area of psychology or psychological research and discuss at least one form of bias in relation to this area.	<i>(9 marks)</i>
-----	---	------------------

Marking criteria

Candidates are free to choose any one area of psychology, furthermore the wording of the question is such that this can be a broad area of psychology (eg social psychology) or psychological theory or empirical research. If it is clear that two or more areas are given (eg environmental psychology and relationships) and they are separate, free-standing accounts, all should be marked but only the best one credited.

Examples of bias at both micro and macro levels are appropriate and these may be actual or hypothetical.

Illustrative examples are:

- Researcher bias. This could be general or related to the selection of issues worthy of study, biases in design and implementation of research and/or interpretation of results/research findings.
- Social/cultural bias, for example in terms diagnosis, intelligence testing.
- Gender bias, for example in moral development, mental health.
- Research **on** bias, for example eyewitness testimony, prejudice, feminist psychology.

A breadth/depth trade-off should be exercised by examiners when marking the work of candidates who offer one form of bias and those whose discussion involves more than one form of bias.

The discussion is likely to involve an outline of the bias, and some indication of the effects/implications of the bias. For answers, in band 2 and band 3 candidates will need to engage in genuine discussion, for example, by presenting arguments or evidence to illustrate the ‘benefits’ and damage caused by bias.

Note that there is no requirement on the candidate to say how this bias may have been avoided, overcome, or its consequences, although this would be creditworthy and is likely to be needed for the discussion and evaluation at Band 2 and Band 3. It would also be legitimate – although again not a requirement – for the candidate to discuss the consequences of the bias, in relation to the results or generalisability of a study.

A discussion of bias without a contextualisation within an identifiable area of psychology, maximum mark is Band 1.

Marking allocations

Discussion of one or more biases in relation to one clearly identifiable area of psychology/psychological research.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Thorough discussion of one or more biases in relation to one clearly identifiable area of psychology/psychological research. Highly effective selection and use of material. Coherent, focused discussion presented in a clear precise and logical style. Effective use of range of appropriate terminology.	7-9 marks
Band 2	Clear discussion of one or more biases in relation to one clearly identifiable area of psychology/psychological research. Effective selection and use of material. A generally focused consideration, presented appropriately , with effective use of terminology.	4-6 marks
Band 1	Limited discussion of one or more biases in relation to one clearly identifiable area of psychology/psychological research. Inappropriate selection of and/or use of material. Discussion is superficial and lacks focus . Appropriate use of psychological terminology may sometimes be employed.	0-3 marks

- | | | |
|-----|--|------------------|
| (b) | Most psychologists consider ethical issues important when carrying out research. Identify one ethical issue and discuss its impact on psychological research. | <i>(6 marks)</i> |
|-----|--|------------------|

Marking criteria

The focus of the question is upon one ethical issue and its impact on psychological research. Consequently what may be largely pre-prepared material on (general) ethical issues in particular areas of psychology, for example social influence, animal research, abnormal psychology is inappropriate and should only earn credit insofar as it contributes to a legitimate approach to the question.

Given that ethical guidelines have arisen out of psychologists' attempts to address ethical issues in their discipline, focus upon particular guidelines is acceptable. Given the wording of the question it is acceptable for candidates to focus wholly on an ethical issue concerning animal research in psychology, however the answer must address examples from within psychology. Ethical issues relating to medical research for example would not be acceptable although those relating to therapeutic procedures are acceptable. The consideration also needs to be framed in a practical context as opposed to a theoretical/philosophical one.

Discussion of unethical practices alone (eg impact on participants) will not be creditworthy unless linked to research (eg participants changing their behaviour).

If candidates offer more than one ethical issue as a separate freestanding account, all should be marked and the best one credited; but if consideration of a second issue is integral to the discussion it should be credited.

If a candidate only identifies the ethical issue and does not discuss its impact on psychological research, maximum of 2 marks (Band 1).

Likely issues are deception, consent and protection from harm. Discussion is likely to focus on how this issue might be dealt with and the resultant impact on research:

- procedures of psychological investigations eg securing informed consent, parental consent, inclusion of debriefing
- vetting of research proposals eg by ethical committees
- the areas selected as worthy of/appropriate for research (socially sensitive research)
- the effectiveness of the research, manipulation of the IV, the effect on participants behaviour, demand characteristics
- effects on the type of research that is conducted (eg Milgram)
- effects on public scepticism and social sensitive issues.

If a candidate only identifies the ethical issue and does not discuss its impact on psychological research, maximum mark is Band 1.

Marking allocations

Discussion of the impact of one ethical issue on psychological research.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Thorough discussion of the impact of one ethical issue on psychological research. Highly effective selection and use of material. Coherent, focused discussion presented in a clear precise and logical style. Effective use of range of appropriate terminology.	5-6 marks
Band 2	Clear discussion of the impact of one ethical issue on psychological research. Effective selection and use of material. A generally focused consideration, presented appropriately , with effective use of terminology.	3-4 marks
Band 1	Limited discussion of the impact of one ethical issue on psychological research. Inappropriate selection of and/or use of material. Discussion is superficial and lacks focus . Appropriate use of psychological terminology may sometimes be employed.	0-2 marks

Answer **either** part (c) **or** part (d).

(c) Please read the following extract and answer parts (c) (i) and (c) (ii) which follow.

(i)	List the main points being made by Lickorish in the extract.	(3 marks)
-----	--	-----------

The key points made by Lickorish in the extract are:

- Relating psychology to ‘hard’ science
- The attractions of this link
- Status issues related to the psychology/hard science issue
- Jung’s assertion concerning the limitations of experimental psychology
- Methods used in psychology being determined by subject matter
- The assertion that statistical methods are not always suitable
- Ending ‘the current dehumanising practice’ of employing statistical analysis as a convenience.

Marks	Mark Descriptors
3 marks	Accurate list making reference to several of the main points. No notable errors of interpretation.
2 marks	Generally accurate list with one or two errors of interpretation OR accurate list but only of one or two of the main points.
1 mark	Very brief or inaccurate/muddled interpretation.
0 marks	No relevant content.

(ii)	Discuss Lickorish’s view in the context of the debate about the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology.	(12 marks)
------	---	------------

Marking criteria

Note that it is a requirement in answering Section A questions that candidates explicitly engage with the resource material. Answers not engaging with the material should receive a maximum of Band 1 marks.

The focus of the question is on qualitative/quantitative data in psychology and answers should be directed towards this. This can be descriptive or evaluative, for example how some psychological research necessarily leads to the generation of quantitative data (eg psychometric testing) and how appropriate this is (for example, in studying personality).

Issues raised in the extract include:

- subject matter determining methods used (ideally?)
- statistical methods used as ‘default’
- studying human behaviours ‘as it really happens’
- dehumanising practices
- fitting our subject matter to a convenient statistic.

Candidates may focus upon one or several of these.

Additional issues raised by candidates could include:

- converting one form of data into another
- reliability/validity
- psychology as a science
- subjectivity/objectivity
- a relating to different perspectives (eg humanistic psychology).

When candidates present a very concise outline and compensate with more extensive evaluation marks can be transferred to the second set of marks.

Marking allocations

Description of Lickorish's view in the context of the debate about the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Accurate and detailed description of Lickorish's view in the context of the debate about the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology. A range of highly pertinent material is selected giving an appropriate balance of depth and breadth showing thorough understanding of the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology.	4-5 marks
Band 2	Accurate and detailed description of Lickorish's view in the context of the debate about the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology. A range of relevant material is selected, giving a balance of depth and breadth showing clear understanding of the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology.	2-3 marks
Band 1	Lickorish's view in the context of the debate about the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology is identified . Material presented represents either depth or breadth . Limited understanding of the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology.	0-1 marks

Commentary on Lickorish's view in the context of the debate about the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Highly effective commentary on Lickorish's view in the context of the debate about the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology is evident in a clear, well developed line of argument. Highly effective use of material to support line of argument. Coherent, focused and well structured response presented in a clear precise and logical style . Effective use of a range of appropriate terminology .	6-7 marks
Band 2	Effective commentary on Lickorish's view in the context of the debate about the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology in a well reasoned series of arguments . Effective choice of material to support the arguments presented. Clear, logical, structured response which is generally focused and is presented in an appropriate style, using appropriate terminology .	3-5 marks
Band 1	Limited, superficial commentary on Lickorish's view in the context of the debate about the use of qualitative and quantitative data in psychology with little evidence of evaluation . Some material to support the discussion is presented. Response lacks focus and structure though appropriate terminology may be employed .	0-2 marks

(d) Please read the following extracts and answer parts (d) (i) and (d) (ii) below.

(i) Explain what is meant by *determinism*. (3 marks)

Explanation should refer to the idea that behaviour and thought are determined by forces beyond the person's control. Candidates may distinguish between soft and hard determinism. Determinism is an alternative to free-will as a determinant of behaviour and has traditionally, both in philosophy and in psychology, been contrasted with it in the free-will/determinism debate. Stratt (1990) defines it thus:

Definition removed due to electronic copyright restrictions.

Candidates may well give examples of different types of determinism (eg environmental determinism or physiological determinism) or illustrations of determinism in psychology (eg behaviourism or psychoanalysis) to illustrate their answers.

Marks	Mark Descriptors
3 marks	Accurate and clear explanation of determinism. No notable errors.
2 marks	Generally accurate definition with only one or two minor errors or areas of muddle.
1 mark	Very brief or inaccurate/muddled explanation.
0 marks	No relevant content.

(ii) Discuss the above statements in relation to the free will and determinism debate in psychology. (12 marks)

Note that it is a requirement in answering Section A questions that candidates explicitly engage with the resource material. Answers not engaging with the material should receive a maximum of Band 1 marks.

Aspects of the debate raised by the statements include:

- human beings being characterised by free will
- the evolution of free will (characteristic of humans but not creatures lower down the phylogenetic scale)
- the comparability of free will to other human 'creations'
- the linkage of science and determinism
- the phenomenological experience of free will.

Issues related to this debate include:

- the mind/body debate from philosophy
- the distinction between hard and soft determinism (James, 1890)
- arguments for determinism (eg those forwarded by behaviourists Watson and Skinner)
- psychological theories/perspectives associated with free will and determinism (eg humanistic psychology and bio-determinism).

Note that candidates are not required to present a balanced debate with equal weight being given to free will and determinism. Psychology has tended to be heavily orientated towards the latter.

The question also stipulates that the discussion of the statements should be in the context of the free will and determinism debate in psychology. This can be at a micro and/or macro level (eg the interpretation of particular empirical studies or broad schools of psychology). Those which are not written with reference to psychology may earn credit insofar as the material may be (implicitly) relevant to psychology or to have influenced/been influenced by psychology.

Marking allocations

Understanding of the statements in relation to knowledge and understanding of the free-will/determinism debate.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Accurate and detailed understanding of the statements in relation to the free-will/determinism debate. A range of highly pertinent material is selected giving an appropriate balance of depth and breadth. Showing thorough understanding of issues relating to the free-will/determinism debate, in the context of the resource material.	4-5 marks
Band 2	Accurate and detailed understanding of the statements in relation to the free-will/determinism debate. A range of relevant material is selected, giving a balance of depth and breadth showing clear understanding of issues relating to the free-will/determinism debate, in the context of the resource material.	2-3 marks
Band 1	Issues relating to the free-will/determinism debate, in the context of the resource material are identified . Material presented represents either depth or breadth . Limited understanding of issues relating to the free-will/determinism debate, in the context of the resource material.	0-1 marks

Evaluation, analysis and synthesis of statements in relation to the free-will/determinism debate.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Effective analysis and synthesis is evident in a clear, well developed line of argument. Highly effective use of material to support line of argument. Coherent, focused and well structured response presented in a clear precise and logical style . Effective use of a range of appropriate terminology .	6-7 marks
Band 2	Analysis and synthesis evident in a well reasoned series of arguments . Effective choice of material to support the arguments presented. Clear, logical, structured response which is generally focused and is presented in an appropriate style, using appropriate terminology .	3-5 marks
Band 1	Limited, superficial discussion with little evidence of analysis and synthesis . Some material to support the discussion is presented. Response lacks focus and structure though appropriate terminology is employed .	0-2 marks

SECTION B: METHODOLOGY

2

Total for this question: 30 marks

A psychology student planned a study for her coursework. She wanted to see whether positive experience affected self-esteem.

The student intended to use an opportunity sample of twenty participants from her friends at school. She decided to divide them into two groups of ten: a high positive experience group and a low positive experience group. She planned to do this by tossing a coin. Each participant would be required to approach three of his or her teachers for help.

The teachers would be confederates of the experimenter.

The participants allocated to the high positive experience group would receive a positive response from all three teachers (ie the teachers would agree to the request and would be friendly); those allocated to the low positive experience group would receive a positive response from only one of the teachers and refusals from the other two teachers.

Finally, the student intended to ask each participant to fill out a psychometric test which measured self-esteem. The test would have thirty statements, each with five possible responses.

Below are two examples of the statements.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
After reading each statement, circle the number which is an accurate description of how you feel about the statement.					
On most days I feel pretty good about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel proud of my achievements.	1	2	3	4	5

(a)	Explain how the student should analyse her results. Give reasons for your answer.	(6 marks)
-----	---	-----------

Marking criteria:

The essential point is that the student's experiment is testing for a difference between two groups in which the IV has been systematically varied. Therefore a test of correlation would be inappropriate and should receive no credit.

Candidates may or may not be familiar with inferential statistics in their preparation for AEA, so those who do not focus upon tests of significance may not be penalised. The trade-off is that those who offer only descriptive analysis (eg measures of central tendency, standard deviation, graphical representation and analysis) can be expected to do so in greater detail than those who do offer inferential analysis. In making this judgement examiners should be mindful that the question is only carrying 6 marks.

Candidates who offer an explanation of how to get from the individual question scores to an overall test score or how the reliability and/or validity of responses might be checked should be credited.

Given that the data generated by the student experimenter is ordinal and that the design is independent an appropriate test of significance would be Mann-Whitney.

It is difficult to imagine a convincing case being made for qualitative analysis here, however candidates could make a case for using a parametric test by reference to the test as being 'standardised' or by reference to 'common practice' of using parametric tests.

In order to access Band 3, material should explicitly and consistently engage with the resource material.

Marking allocations:

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Explanation and justification for analysis are appropriate and accurate . They are coherent with commentary which is relevant to the chosen design. Answers are systematic and well organised/structured.	5-6 marks
Band 2	Explanation and justification for analysis of data are largely appropriate and accurate . They are sometimes coherent and mostly relevant to the chosen design. OR <i>Explanation OR justification for analysis is appropriate and accurate. It is coherent with commentary which is relevant to the chosen design. Answers are systematic and well organised/structured.</i>	3-4 marks
Band 1	Analysis is vague . Material is generic and engagement with the design is of marginal relevance .	0-2 marks

(b) Identify **two** weaknesses in the student’s study. Explain how she could rectify them.
(6 marks + 6 marks)

Marking criteria:

Some of the likely (acceptable) flaws/shortcomings of the student’s study will include:

- questionable nature of sampling (eg opportunity sampling)
- independent design with small n number
- (apparent) lack of pilot study
- allocation to groups (given sample size)
- issues surrounding use of self-report measure
- demand characteristics
- how convincing was performance of stooges?
- was the experience really positive or negative?
- no evidence of reliability/validity assessment of psychometric test or reference to the appropriateness of a test of generalised SE to this investigation
- length of test
- possible response set
- no baseline data
- ethical issues.

The recommendations given for correction should be clear, follow from the shortcoming and be methodologically sound.

If more than two shortcomings are given, all should be marked and the best two credited.

Marking allocations:

For each of the two shortcomings given:

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Explanation and correction of the shortcoming are appropriate and accurate . They are coherent with commentary which is relevant to the chosen design. Answers are systematic and well organised/structured.	5-6 marks
Band 2	Explanation and correction of the shortcoming are largely appropriate and accurate . They are sometimes coherent and mostly relevant to the chosen design OR <i>Explanation OR correction of the shortcoming is appropriate and accurate. It is coherent with commentary which is relevant to the chosen design. Answers are systematic and well organised/structured.</i>	3-4 marks
Band 1	Analysis is vague . Material is generic and engagement with the design is of marginal relevance .	0-2 marks

TOTAL: 6 marks x 2.

(c) Design a study using a completely different methodology to investigate positive experience and self-esteem. Justify your design decisions. (12 marks)

The question requires the candidate to design a study using a different methodology and justify decisions.

Note the question does not require an examination of effects of positive experience on self-esteem – candidates could for example design a study to investigate whether people with higher self-esteem tended to see events in a more positive way.

Quality of answers is likely to vary as a function of the detail of the exposition (permitting replication) and the plausibility/appropriateness of the design (see Marking allocations below).

Specific details will clearly depend upon the methodology chosen. The following are merely illustrative of what one could expect to be covered:

- natural experiment where experience of positive or negative experience was not controlled/manipulated by the experimenter
- correlational study where participants are not divided into two groups but receive different amounts of positive feedback, which is then correlated against self-esteem
- clinical case study exploring aspects of positive or negative life experiences and their influence upon the value a person has of himself/herself.

If only design or justification is offered, partial performance marks should be awarded as detailed below.

Marking allocations

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Design is plausible, appropriate and clearly described. The description of the design is sufficiently detailed for replication. There is appropriate use of specialist terms. AND Thorough evaluation/justification of design decisions. Material has been elaborated and used in a highly effective manner. In both instances there is awareness of ethical, gender, race and cultural issues where appropriate.	9-12 marks
Band 2	Design is plausible and appropriate design decisions have been made. The description is sufficiently detailed for some replication. There will be some use of specialist terms. AND Adequate but slightly limited evaluation/justification of design decisions. Material has sometimes been elaborated and used in a reasonably effective manner. <i>Partial performance: Design is plausible, appropriate and clearly described. The description of the design is sufficiently detailed for replication. There will be appropriate use of specialist terms. OR Thorough evaluation/justification of design decisions. Material has been elaborated and used in a highly effective manner.</i> In both instances there is awareness of ethical, gender, race and cultural issues where appropriate.	5-8 marks
Band 1	Design is muddled and/or largely inappropriate. Replicability will be difficult or impossible due to omissions. Little or no use of specialist terms. AND Limited or inappropriate evaluation of design decisions. Material is not used effectively or may be irrelevant. Material is generic and is not related to the proposed design. <i>Partial performance: Design is plausible and appropriate design decisions have been made. The description is sufficiently detailed for some replication. There will be some use of specialist terms. OR Adequate but slightly limited evaluation/justification of design decisions. Material has sometimes been elaborated and used in a reasonably effective manner.</i>	0-4 marks

SECTION C: APPROACHES AND APPLICATIONS

3

Total for this question: 30 marks

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

Discuss the contribution of psychology to our understanding of issues related to parenting **and/or** how children develop. (30 marks)

Marking criteria

The key factor is how well the candidate can apply his or her knowledge of psychology to explaining the contribution of psychological theory and/or evidence to the understanding of issues related to parenting and/or child development. 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 with the stimulus material in Section C.

Candidates will need to identify issues related to parenting/child development in order to discuss the contribution of psychology to our understanding of them.

Relevant issues include:

- not being brought up in a ‘traditional’ family
- fathering
- effects on cognitive and/or social development/behaviour (eg Piaget, Vygotsky)
- effects on mental health
- moral development
- effects on parent-child interaction
- hothousing
- disability
- discipline.

Good candidates will discuss what is meant by ‘contribution’ in terms of theory, practice and dissemination to general public.

Issues can be processes of parenting and/or outcomes.

Alternatively, candidates may identify issues and analyse these to show how psychology has contributed to our understanding of them.

It is likely that candidates will adopt one of two strategies in answering this question (or perhaps a mix of the two): to focus upon particular psychological theories or particular psychological studies and discuss issues which have been addressed by the research. In terms of the former the theories could be specific to (say) developmental psychology – eg attachment theory; Freudian theory; - or broader perspectives such as bio-psychology, evolutionary psychology or behaviourism. Relevant ‘reference’ studies may be drawn from a large number of other areas eg health psychology, abnormality, comparative psychology.

Examiners should exercise a breadth/depth trade-off when marking answers which offer, say, one or two theories/studies and those offering a larger number.

Marking allocations

Use of knowledge and understanding of the contribution of psychology to our understanding of issues relating to parenting and/or how children develop.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Substantial, accurate and detailed use of knowledge and understanding of the contribution of psychology to our understanding of issues relating to parenting and/or how children develop. A range of highly pertinent material is selected, giving an appropriate balance of depth and breadth. Thorough understanding of issues relating to parenting and/or how children develop.	9-12 marks
Band 2	Accurate and detailed use of knowledge and understanding of the contribution of psychology to our understanding of issues relating to parenting and/or how children develop. A range of relevant material is selected, giving a balance of depth and breadth. Clear understanding of issues relating to parenting and/or how children develop. 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 knowledge and understanding of the contribution of psychology to our understanding of issues relating to parenting and/or how children develop are described . Material presented represents either depth or breadth. Limited understanding of issues relating to parenting and/or how children develop.	0-4 marks

Analysis, synthesis and evaluation of the contribution of psychology to our understanding of issues relating to parenting and/or how children develop.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Effective analysis/synthesis is evident in a clear, well-developed psychological consideration of issues relating to parenting and/or how children develop. Evaluation is informed and thorough . Highly effective use of material to support lines of argument.	9-12 marks
Band 2	Analysis/synthesis is evident in a clear discussion of psychological consideration of issues relating to parenting and/or how children develop. Evaluation is slightly limited . Effective choice of material to support the lines of argument.	5-8 marks
Band 1	Limited, superficial psychological consideration of issues relating to parenting and/or how children develop, with little evidence of analysis/synthesis . Evaluation of consideration is limited . Some material to support the lines of argument is presented.	0-4 marks

Structure and Coherence.

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

4

Total for this question: 30 marks

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

Discuss how a behaviourist approach **and one other** psychological approach could explain behaviour such as that described in the extract above. *(30 marks)*

Marking criteria

The key requirement for the candidate is to **apply** his or her understanding of the principles of behaviourist and one other psychological approach to the identified area(s). The ‘comfort zone’ response of merely reiterating the principles out of context and not shaping them for purpose should attract a maximum of Band 1 marks.

Examples from behaviourism & neo behaviourism are likely to include:

- operant conditioning
- modelling/vicarious learning.

Likely examples for the ‘other’ psychological approach include:

- social psychology
- bio-psychology
- psychodynamics.

The quality of the answers is likely to be determined by the standard of the psychological understanding (eg how does negative reinforcement differ from punishment) and how well this is applied to the given context. Another key factor is plausibility. So, for example, some weaker answers addressing bio-psychology might focus on an IKEA gene! Answers clearly must show evidence of being psychologically informed.

An example from behaviourism is, a candidate could write about the reinforcing value of owning a ‘must-have’ item of (usually expensive) furniture at a bargain price. This reinforcement (eg approval/acceptance/social status) would be enhanced by the difficulty of attaining the goal. Bio-psychologists could explain it in terms of competition for scarce resources.

Candidates are required to offer both behaviourist and one other perspective (although the two need not be equally balanced). If only one is offered the candidate is partially performing (see Mark Allocations overleaf).

Marking allocations

Use of knowledge and understanding of how a behaviourist and one other psychological approach could explain behaviour such as that described in the extract above.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Substantial, accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of how a behaviourist and one other psychological approach could explain behaviour such as that described in the extract above. A range of highly pertinent material is selected, giving an appropriate balance of depth and breadth. Thorough understanding of behaviourist and one other psychological approach in this context.	9-12 marks
Band 2	Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of how a behaviourist and one other psychological approach could explain behaviour such as that described in the extract above. A range of relevant material is selected, giving a balance of depth and breadth. Clear understanding of behaviourist and one other psychological 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 detailed knowledge and understanding of how either a behaviourist or one other psychological approach could explain behaviour such as that described in the extract above. A range of highly pertinent material is selected, giving an appropriate balance of depth and breadth. Thorough understanding demonstrated in discussing behaviourist and one other psychological approach in this context.</i>	5-8 marks
Band 1	Knowledge and understanding of how a behaviourist and one other psychological approach could explain behaviour such as that in the text are described . Material presented represents either depth or breadth. Limited understanding of behaviourist and one other psychological approach in this context. <i>Partial performance: Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding demonstrated in discussing how either a behaviourist or one other psychological approach could explain behaviour such as that in the text. A range of relevant material is selected, giving a balance of depth and breadth. Clear understanding of either a behaviourist or one other psychological approach in this context.</i>	0-4 marks

Evaluation/analysis/synthesis demonstrated in relation to behaviourist and one other psychological approach applied to the area of concern.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Effective analysis/synthesis is evident in a clear, well-developed discussion of behaviourist and one other psychological approach applied to this area of concern. Evaluation is informed and thorough . Highly effective use of material to support lines of argument.	9-12 marks
Band 2	Analysis/synthesis is evident in a clear discussion of behaviourist and one other psychological approach applied to this area of concern. Evaluation demonstrated is slightly limited . Effective 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/synthesis is evident in a clear, well-developed discussion of either behaviourist or one other psychological approach applied to this area of concern. Evaluation is informed and thorough. Highly effective use of material to support lines of argument.</i>	5-8 marks
Band 1	Limited, superficial discussion of behaviourist and one other psychological approaches applied to this area of concern with little evidence of analysis/synthesis . Evaluation is limited . Some material to support the lines of argument is presented. <i>Partial performance: Analysis/synthesis is evident in a clear discussion of behaviourist and one other psychological approach applied to this area of concern. Evaluation demonstrated is slightly limited. Effective choice of material to support the lines of argument.</i>	0-4 marks

Structure and Coherence.

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

5

Total for this question: 30 marks

Social influence research, such as that carried out by Milgram and Zimbardo, has given us significant insight into aspects of everyday life. Discuss the impact of **two other** areas of psychological research on everyday life. *(30 marks)*

Marking criteria

The wording is taken directly from the AEA specification but this is as open-ended a question as it is possible to have. It is consequently difficult to anticipate which areas of psychology candidates will choose. All that can be required is that it is an area of psychology, rather than – for example – sociology, biology, medical issues, or even more so, common sense. Given the wide variety of psychology covered by students of the different specifications they have a very considerable range to choose from.

Candidates will need to identify the two areas of psychological research.

Some of the ways in which research has impacted on everyday life include:

- behaviour (both individual and collective)
- policies (eg cognitive interviews)
- practices (eg educational)
- funding
- attitudes/opinions (eg to child rearing)
- clinical therapies
- applied psychology (eg health campaigns, advertising)
- environmental issues (eg crowding behaviour)
- training (eg relationship counselling).

Key features examiners should look out for are:

- The reference being to ‘impact’ therefore one is looking for (an) outcomes. Accounts of studies or writings will attract little or no credit (depending on whether they inform the answer at all). ‘Procedural detail’ is not what is required here. An example would be the difference between detail of attachment theory and the impact this had (for example on hospital visiting and child care practices).
- The term ‘area’ being relatively non-specific therefore candidates are free to focus at a macro or a micro level. Approaches, the ‘orientation’ of specific studies and general topic areas are all acceptable.
- Sub-sets of areas (eg two different impacts of memory) are acceptable.

Note that the wording of the question precludes candidates focusing on social influence research and the work of Milgram and Zimbardo.

The requirement is for candidates to focus on the impact of two areas of psychology. If more than two areas are offered, all should be marked and the best two marked. If only one is given then the candidate is partially performing, see marking guidelines below.

Marking allocations

Use of knowledge and understanding of the impact of two areas of psychological research on everyday life.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Substantial, accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of the impact of two areas of psychological research on everyday life. A range of highly pertinent material is selected, giving an appropriate balance of depth and breadth. Thorough understanding of the impact of two areas of psychological research on everyday life.	9-12 marks
Band 2	Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of the impact of two areas of psychological research on everyday life. A range of relevant material is selected, giving a balance of depth and breadth. Clear understanding of the impact of two areas of psychological research on everyday life. THESE DESCRIPTORS ARE <u>GENERALLY SATISFIED AT THE TOP OF THE BAND BUT ONLY OCCASIONALLY AT THE BOTTOM</u> . <i>Partial performance: Substantial, accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of the impact of one area of psychological research on everyday life. A range of highly pertinent material is selected, giving an appropriate balance of depth and breadth. Thorough understanding of the impact of one area of psychological research on everyday life.</i>	5-8 marks
Band 1	Knowledge and understanding of the impact of two areas of psychological research on everyday life are described . Material presented represents either depth or breadth. Limited understanding of the impact of two areas of psychological research on everyday life. <i>Partial performance: Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of the impact of one area of psychological research on everyday life. A range of relevant material is selected, giving a balance of depth and breadth. Clear understanding of the impact of one area of psychological research on everyday life.</i>	0-4 marks

Evaluation/analysis/synthesis demonstrated in relation to the impact of two areas of psychological research on everyday life.

Band	Mark Descriptors	Marks
Band 3	Effective analysis/synthesis is evident in a clear, well-developed discussion of the impact of two areas of psychological research on everyday life. Evaluation is informed and thorough . Highly effective use of material to support lines of argument.	9-12 marks
Band 2	Analysis/synthesis is evident in a clear discussion of the impact of two areas of psychological research on everyday life. Evaluation demonstrated is slightly limited . Effective choice of material to support the lines of argument. THESE DESCRIPTORS ARE <u>GENERALLY SATISFIED AT THE TOP OF THE BAND BUT ONLY OCCASIONALLY AT THE BOTTOM</u> . <i>Partial performance: Effective analysis/synthesis is evident in a clear, well-developed discussion of the impact of one area of psychological research on everyday life. Evaluation is informed and thorough. Highly effective use of material to support lines of argument.</i>	5-8 marks
Band 1	Limited, superficial discussion of the impact of two areas of psychological research on everyday life with little evidence of analysis/synthesis . Evaluation is limited . Some material to support the lines of argument is presented. <i>Partial performance: Analysis/synthesis is evident in a clear discussion of the impact of one area of psychological research on everyday life. Evaluation demonstrated is slightly limited. Effective choice of material to support the lines of argument.</i>	0-4 marks

Structure and Coherence.

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