



Advanced Extension Award

Psychology 6881

Mark Scheme

2008 examination - June series

Advanced Extension Award (AEA)

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

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

SECTION A: THEORETICAL ISSUES AND DEBATES**1****Total for this question: 30 marks**

| | | |
|-----|--|-----------|
| (a) | (i) In your own words, explain why quantitative methods are likely to result in 'high levels of reliability' and 'problems with validity'. | (4 marks) |
|-----|--|-----------|

Marking criteria

Explanations of why quantitative methods might produce 'high levels of reliability' may be:

- when investigations are repeated and similar results are obtained
- when there is a high level of control of extraneous variables
- when there is consistency of measure in an experiment, correlation, observation or interview using quantitative techniques.

In relation to the definitions, candidates may draw attention to quantitative analysis often being experimental and containing more of the features of reliability outlined above.

Explanations of why quantitative methods could produce 'problems with validity' may be:

- when the research fails to really measure what it is meant to measure
- when the study fails to measure the 'richness' of human behaviour and experience
- when the context of the study is significantly different from a real life setting
- when the participants cannot report their subjective experience.

Candidates may draw attention to qualitative analysis from interviews and case studies containing more of the features of validity outlined above.

If candidates explore internal validity or external validity, (in the context of the question), that would be acceptable.

Marking allocation

Explanations of why quantitative methods are likely to result in 'high levels of reliability' and 'problems with validity'.

| Marks | Mark Descriptors |
|----------------|--|
| 4 marks | Explanations of why quantitative methods are likely to be reliable but have validity problems are detailed and accurate . |
| 3 marks | Explanations of why quantitative methods are likely to be reliable but have validity problems are generally accurate . Explanation of one concept may be detailed and accurate. |
| 2 mark | Either a generally accurate explanation of why quantitative methods are reliable or have problems of validity is given. There may be a brief explanation of the other concept. |
| 1 marks | A brief or inaccurate/muddled explanation of why quantitative methods are likely to be reliable and/or have validity problems is given. |
| 0 marks | No relevant content. |

- (a) (ii) Explain why it can be argued that qualitative techniques ‘allow greater freedom’ for the researcher and the target of the research. Refer to **at least one** psychological study in your answer. (8 marks)

Marking criteria

The requirement is to discuss the availability of ‘greater freedom’ in the use of qualitative techniques with reference to at least **one** psychological study. Studies can be chosen from any area of psychology provided the candidate identifies the use of the qualitative technique. In discussing ‘greater freedom’, candidates may also address some limitations of quantitative techniques by way of comparison. There may be a depth/breadth trade off in the number of studies being discussed.

Candidates who discuss ‘greater freedom’ in the context of qualitative techniques but do not refer to at least **one** study will be restricted to Band 2.

Qualitative techniques are likely to be case studies, observations or interviews. Studies are likely to be chosen from psychodynamic approach, developmental (eg privation case studies) and other case studies that appear in the literature (eg observations on ‘Little Albert’).

Qualitative reports in experimental studies, eg participants’ self-reports of why they responded the way they did, eg in Milgram’s research, are acceptable.

Using, for example, Genie as a qualitative case study, the ‘greater freedom’ may be identified as:

- researchers’ freedom to explore detailed descriptions of Genie’s life from observations and speaking to her mother
- the freedom to report on the cognitive and emotional state of the whole child
- the freedom to observe how Genie developed in as natural a home environment as could be provided after she was found
- being able to observe Genie’s emotional/attachment development to see how she responded to other people caring for her
- it could be argued that Genie and her mother had *no freedom or choice* in the research which was carried out. The question of ‘freedom for whom?’ may be raised.

Candidates may discuss the benefits of ‘freedom’ for the researcher to explore meaning and ‘freedom’ for the participants to subjectively express their experiences.

Candidates may refer only to a study which uses quantitative techniques and point out limitations. This is acceptable but given the emphasis of the question to explain the ‘greater freedom’ in research using qualitative techniques, the choice of a quantitative based study could be limiting.

Weaker candidates who only *describe* an appropriate study, without giving any assessment in relation to the question will be restricted to Band 1.

Marking allocations

Explanations of why it can be argued that qualitative techniques allow for 'greater freedom' for the researcher and the target of the research. Reference to at least **one** psychological study.

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|---------------|--|------------------|
| Band 3 | Thorough explanation of why qualitative techniques allow for 'greater freedom' with reference to at least one psychological study. Highly effective selection and use of material. Coherent, focused explanation presented in a clear, precise and logical style. One study discussed in depth or more than one study in less depth. There may be comparison between 'freedom' available in qualitative and quantitative techniques. | 6-8 marks |
| Band 2 | Clear explanation of why qualitative techniques allow for 'greater freedom' with reference to at least one psychological study. Effective selection and use of material. A generally focused explanation , with effective use of terminology. One study discussed in reasonable depth or more than one study in less depth. Candidates who explain the 'greater freedom' of qualitative techniques without reference to an appropriate study will be restricted to Band 2 . | 3-5 marks |
| Band 1 | Limited explanation of why qualitative techniques allow for 'greater freedom' with reference to at least one psychological study. Explanation is superficial and lacks focus . An appropriate study may be selected and/or outlined, without any assessment in relation to the question. | 0-2 marks |

| |
|--|
| (b) (i) With reference to the extract, explain one difference between psychology and 'other sciences' in the way that ethical issues should be addressed. <i>(2 marks)</i> |
|--|

Marking criteria

Differences: since humans are the participants in research in psychology, unlike in 'other sciences':

- researchers have to take care to avoid treating humans in a thoughtless, abusive or unprofessional way
- if psychologists want to avoid suspicion, it is necessary to address the previous 'bad' reputation of some psychological research
- participants need to be re-assured that deception is used only when it is absolutely necessary.

Marking allocations

With reference to the extract **one** difference between psychology and 'other sciences' in the way that ethical issues should be addressed is explained.

| Marks | Mark Descriptors |
|----------------|---|
| 2 mark | One relevant difference and how it should be addressed is explained coherently. |
| 1 mark | One relevant difference and/or how it may be addressed is outlined briefly. |
| 0 marks | No relevant content. |

| |
|---|
| (b) (ii) 'The introduction of ethical guidelines has reduced the excesses of the past, but has at the same time limited the contribution of psychology to society.' Discuss. (8 marks) |
|---|

Marking criteria

Candidates may identify excesses of the past related to the conduct of studies, eg deception, potential physical and/or mental harm for participants, lack of privacy, lack of anonymity and confidentiality, involuntary participation. Wider issues such as the lack of sensitivity about the effects of research findings may be cited eg in areas of measured intelligence. Excesses may also focus on ethical arguments about the use of animals in psychological research. There may be a breadth/depth 'trade-off' in the number of issues identified.

Explanations of why the introduction of ethical guidelines has limited the contribution of psychologists to society may focus on:

- Guidelines such as those drawn up by the British Psychological Society (1990, 1993, 2006) and the American Psychological Association address issues such as consent, deception, debriefing, withdrawal from the investigation, confidentiality, protection of participants, observational research, giving advice and dealing with unethical work by colleagues. These guidelines may be judged to limit the range and type of research that can be conducted.
- Candidates may respond by discussing the way in which psychologists have addressed ethical/moral issues when animals are involved in research. This may involve discussion of the BPS (1985) *Guidelines for the Use of Animals in Research* and/or the necessity of working within the law (*The Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act, 1986*) and obtaining the necessary licences. It may be argued that restrictions now in place prevent important research on animals, such as the studies carried out by Harlow on attachment.
- Candidates may take a study based approach to this question discussing, for example, why *particular* research could not now take place. Examples are likely to be chosen from social psychology, such as Zimbardo's (1973) work. If candidates choose to approach this question by only *describing* the 'excesses' in the research and *not addressing* how the ethical guidelines would limit the contribution of psychologists by preventing such research, then marks should be restricted to Band 2.

Candidates might choose to argue that the introduction of ethical guidelines, far from limiting the contribution of psychologists, has in fact raised the status of psychologists in society, encouraged people to trust them and more willingly take part in their research. In itself, this may *expand* the contribution of psychologists to society.

It could be argued that the restrictions placed by guidelines have encouraged psychologists to develop different research techniques, eg obtaining prior general consent, carrying out role plays, which are more ethical alternatives rather than restrictions.

In order to access Band 3 marks candidates should address the role of ethical guidelines in reducing excesses of the past **and** discuss whether this has limited the contribution of psychologists to society. Discussion of these two factors does not have to be equally balanced.

Marking allocations

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|---------------|--|------------------|
| Band 3 | Thorough discussion of how ethical guidelines have reduced the excesses of the past and discussion of whether this has limited the contribution of psychologists to society, though not necessarily equally balanced. Highly effective selection and use of material. Coherent, focused discussion presented in a clear, precise and logical style . | 6-8 marks |
| Band 2 | Clear discussion of how ethical guidelines have reduced the excesses of the past and/or discussion of whether this has limited the contribution of psychologists to society. Effective selection and use of material. A generally focused discussion with effective use of terminology. | 3-5 marks |
| Band 1 | Limited discussion of how ethical guidelines have reduced the excesses of the past and/or discussion of whether this has limited the contribution of psychologists to society. Discussion is superficial and lacks focus . Inappropriate selection of and/or use of material. | 0-2 marks |

| | |
|-----|--|
| (c) | Discuss the nature-nurture debate in the context of one of the approaches in Psychology, for example, the biological, cognitive, psychodynamic or behavioural approach. <i>(8 marks)</i> |
|-----|--|

Marking criteria

Approaches in psychology are not restricted to the examples given. Although candidates are required to consider the debate in the context of **one** approach they may legitimately evaluate one approach by reference to a contrasting approach.

The nature-nurture debate concerns the role of genes and environment in determining behaviour. The nature-nurture debate could, for example, be discussed in the context of the **biological approach**. Examples could be given illustrating the genetic, neurological, chemical and/or evolutionary basis of development or behaviour. Nature-nurture in the development of measured intelligence may be discussed. Examples may be taken from the study of behavioural genetics or biological theories of mental disorder.

Nature-nurture debate in the **cognitive approach** may be set in the context of perception and studies of neonates considering, for example, the role of nature in form perception, face recognition, depth perception and constancy. Cross-cultural studies, deprivation studies and studies of cataract patients may be used to explore nurture aspects. The interaction between nature-nurture may be stressed. Chomsky's Language Acquisition Device may be cited as a nativist basis for explaining language.

In the **psychodynamic approach** the role of drives, or instinct suggest a role for nature whilst early psychosexual development is likely to be influenced by the family and parenting, suggesting a role for nurture.

The **behavioural approach** is the most extreme example of the strength of nurture in the debate. Consideration may be given to the role of the environment in learning, language acquisition, modifying measured intelligence through enrichment, and/or in the development of some mental disorders.

Candidates are required to discuss the debate in the context of **one approach**. If more than one approach is selected each approach should be marked and the highest scoring approach should be credited. If **the debate is outlined without reference to an approach**, the mark should be restricted to Band 1.

Marking allocations

Discussion of nature-nurture debate in the context of **one** of the approaches (eg the biological, cognitive, psychodynamic or behavioural approach)

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|---------------|---|------------------|
| Band 3 | Thorough discussion of the debate in the context of one of the approaches. Highly effective selection and use of material. Coherent, focused discussion presented in a clear, precise and logical style. Effective use of a range of appropriate terminology. | 6-8 marks |
| Band 2 | Clear discussion of the debate in the context of one of the approaches. Effective selection and use of material. A generally focused discussion presented appropriately with effective use terminology. | 3-5 marks |
| Band 1 | Limited discussion of the debate in the context of one of the approaches. Discussion is superficial and lacks focus . Appropriate use of psychological terminology may sometimes be employed. If the debate is outlined without reference to an approach , the mark will be restricted to Band 1 . Inappropriate selection of and/or use of material. | 0-2 marks |

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

The head teacher of a primary school is concerned about road safety outside the school. She is particularly concerned about the frequency of behaviours such as:

- drivers parking on the zig-zag lines outside school despite this being against the law
- drivers refusing to stop when requested to do so by the school crossing warden
- drivers ignoring the 20mph speed limit on the road outside the school

The head teacher wants to investigate:

- actual driver behaviour outside the school
- reasons why drivers ignore restrictions which aim to protect children

- (a) Design an observational study to investigate actual driver behaviour outside the school. In your answer, you should include justifications for your design decisions. You will be asked about ethical issues in part (c). (9 marks)

Marking criteria

Candidates are required to design an observation study to explore actual driver behaviour outside the school.

Key design features of the observation of **actual driver behaviour** are likely to be:

- The development and piloting of observation categories. Given the stimulus material, categories of driver behaviour may be identified including those that describe safe driver behaviour. *Candidates should not be credited for simply copying out the issues of concern to the headteacher.*
- methods of observation
- the task of observer(s)
- time and/or event sampling
- the development of a common method for coding/recording behaviour.

Candidates may focus more on defining observation categories than on sampling behaviour. There may be a focus on one or several aspects of relevant driver behaviour. Either approach is acceptable.

Justification is likely to take account of the need for accuracy in categorising/coding behaviour; ensuring driver behaviour can be sampled, observed and classified appropriately. The need to demonstrate reliability between observers may be addressed.

It is possible that some candidates may answer the data analysis question (d) within the design and justification question (a). If this occurs **marks may be exported from (a) to (d)**.

Marking allocations

Explanation of design of the observation to investigate actual driver behaviour

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|---------------|--|------------------|
| Band 3 | Design of observation is appropriate and clearly stated . The design is sufficiently detailed for replication and is plausible . There is appropriate use of specialist terms. | 5-6 marks |
| Band 2 | Design of observation is mostly appropriate and clearly stated . It is sufficiently detailed for some replication and is plausible . There is some use of specialist terms. | 3-4 marks |
| Band 1 | Design of observation is very limited and/or muddled or barely engages with the requirement to observe driver behaviour. There is little or no use of specialist terms. Replication will be difficult or impossible due to omissions. | 0-2 marks |

Justification of design decisions for observation of actual driver behaviour

| Marks | Mark Descriptors |
|----------------|---|
| 3 marks | Thorough justification of a range of design decisions in relation to observing driver behaviour. Material has been used in a highly effective manner. |
| 2 marks | Adequate but slightly limited justification of design decisions in relation to observing driver behaviour. The material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. |
| 1 mark | Limited justification of design decisions in relation to observing driver behaviour. Material is not used effectively or may be irrelevant . Material is generic and there is no explicit engagement with the stimulus material. |
| 0 marks | No relevant content. |

| | |
|-----|--|
| (b) | Design a study using either an interview or a questionnaire to investigate why drivers ignore restrictions which aim to protect children. In your answer, you should include justifications for your design decisions. You will be asked about ethical issues in part (c). <i>(9 marks)</i> |
|-----|--|

Marking criteria

Either a questionnaire **or** an interview technique should be explored to investigate the attitudes of drivers. **Key design features** could focus on:

- methods of identifying the population of drivers who take children to school and methods of sampling, or contacting all drivers
- design of questionnaire or interview focused on attitudes to children's safety
- nature of questions, open/closed
- structured/unstructured approach in interview
- possible issues of low response rate and how this could be addressed
- method for scoring questionnaire
- method for recording interview data
- addressing a possible social desirability effect in the responses.

Justification of design decisions is required throughout, for example to ensure the representativeness of the sample, the clarity of the questions, the appropriate order of questions, methods of recording an interview, checking consistency in answers.

It is possible that some candidates may answer the data analysis question (d) within the design and justification question (b). If this occurs **marks may be exported from (b) to (d)**.

Marking allocations

Explanation of design of the study of attitudes of drivers towards children's safety

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|--------|--|-----------|
| Band 3 | Design of study using questionnaire or interview is appropriate and clearly stated . It is sufficiently detailed for replication . Design suggestions for questionnaire or interview are plausible . There is appropriate use of specialist terms. | 5-6 marks |
| Band 2 | Design of study using questionnaire or interview is mostly appropriate and clearly stated . The design is sufficiently detailed for some replication . Design suggestions for questionnaire or interview are plausible . There is some use of specialist terms. | 3-4 marks |
| Band 1 | Design of study using questionnaire or interview is very limited and/or muddled or barely engages with the requirement to find out about drivers' attitudes. There is little or no use of specialist terms. Replication will be difficult or impossible due to omissions. | 0-2 marks |

Justification of design decisions in the study of attitudes of drivers towards children's safety

| Marks | Mark Descriptors |
|----------------|--|
| 3 marks | Thorough justification of a range of design decisions to relation to the use of questionnaire or interview. Material has been used in a highly effective manner. |
| 2 marks | Adequate but slightly limited justification of design decisions in relation to use of questionnaire or interview. This material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. |
| 1 mark | Limited justification of design decisions in relation to the use of questionnaire or interview. Material is not used effectively or may be irrelevant . Material is generic and there is no explicit engagement with the stimulus material. |
| 0 marks | No relevant content. |

- (c) Discuss how you would deal with the issue of participants' consent in **each** of the two studies you have designed in your answers to parts (a) and (b). (6 marks)

Marking criteria

Observation is to be carried out in a public place but there are issues of trust between the headteacher and the drivers, (who are mostly parents), which may need to be addressed. Drivers may feel they are being negatively targeted, so it would be important to explain the purpose of the research, though this is likely to have an impact on drivers' behaviour.

The right not to take part in the questionnaire or interview and to withdraw could be addressed. A letter sent home to parents and parents' meeting may address the informed consent issue but this is likely to inform the parents about the nature of the research and possibly produce a social desirability effect in the responses. Issues of anonymity and confidentiality of responses could be addressed when obtaining consent.

Some candidates may explore the relationship between designing research for the headteacher who has commissioned the studies and the 'independence' of the research. The research could be aiming to legitimise a 'cover' for action which the school wishes to pursue. Such a situation could not be considered as the basis for 'informed consent'.

Marking allocations

Discuss the issue of participants' consent in each of the **two** studies

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|---------------|---|-----------|
| Band 3 | Discussion of dealing with issues of participants' consent in the two studies is appropriate and accurate . The issues are explained coherently with commentary which is relevant to the chosen designs. Answers address both parts of the research though not necessarily equally . | 5-6 marks |
| Band 2 | Discussion of dealing with issues of participants' consent in the two studies is largely appropriate and accurate . It is sometimes coherent and mostly relevant to the chosen design. At the top of the band answers address both parts of the research though not necessarily equally . | 3-4 marks |
| Band 1 | Discussion of dealing with issues of participants' consent are vague . Material is generic and engagement with the design is of marginal relevance . Answers may address only one part of the research. | 0-2 marks |

- (d) Select **one** of the studies you have designed in parts (a) and (b). Explain how the data generated by this study could be analysed. (6 marks)

Marking Criteria

Data analysis can be quantitative or qualitative but must be appropriate for the study chosen. For quantitative analysis, descriptive techniques such as bar charts, pie charts, modal values and percentages may be suggested. Observational analysis could address measures of inter-rater reliability. Analysis of questionnaires could include measures to ensure reliability of answers eg split-half reliability of matched questions.

Qualitative responses could be analysed in terms of emergent themes, descriptive accounts, discourse analysis or (quantified) content analysis. Issues of reliability, such as two researchers separately coding taped interview material, may be addressed.

Better answers will focus on the construction of the descriptive statistics. To access the higher marks, data analysis should be linked, clearly and explicitly to the investigation design.

If both studies are selected for data analysis, each should be marked and the higher scoring answer should be credited.

(d) Explanation of data analysis of **one** study

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

SECTION C: APPROACHES AND APPLICATIONS**3****Total for this question: 30 marks**

Please read the following extract and answer the question below.

Identify and describe a **different** 'great idea' in psychology. Justify your choice by explaining why it is a 'great idea'. You may wish to discuss the contribution made to theory, research and/or the way the idea has been applied. (30 marks)

Marking criteria

The question requires the candidate to identify, describe and justify the contribution of a 'great idea' in psychology. Almost any psychological idea could be chosen and the success of the choice will depend on the candidate's ability to justify it. It is difficult to predict which idea will be chosen but it may be:

Behaviourism, or ideas from behaviourism (CC, OC), environmental influence on behaviour, role in explaining learning and language, basis of applied approaches in education and therapy, experimental method.

SLT including the 'flexibility' of vicarious learning, identification, imitation, cognitive variables in learning, basis of research in respect of media, useful in modelling therapy.

The cognitive revolution, Miller's 7+-2, information processing models in memory, work on attention and/or perception, information processing approaches to cognitive development (Case). Applications of working memory research.

Attachment, the importance of early relationships, Ainsworth and Bell, Bowlby, Schaffer, links to evolutionary theory, continuity hypothesis, internal working model, basis of adult relationships, importance of understanding children's emotional development. The Strange Situation; a cross-cultural research tool.

The experimental method, Wilhelm Wundt, Ebbinghaus, scientific respectability, basis of behaviourism, cognitive and much of social psychology. Causal explanations, control of variables, objectivity. Assessing educational practice and therapies through controlled experimental studies eg outcome research.

Explanations of obedience to authority, Milgram's experimental work, explanations of why people obey/disobey, applications to war crimes trials (William Calley, 1971), awareness of how 'ordinary people' can harm others, influence of context on obedience (distance from targets in high tech weaponry makes firing easier), influence of incremental demands, importance of questioning authority and disobedience.

Evolutionary psychology, Darwin's theory of Evolution emphasising inherited characteristics and the continuum between human and animal behaviour. Identification of genes as the causes of behaviour in eg altruism, aggression, parental investment in offspring and the 'good gene' theory of attraction. The indirect influence of genes through the environment. Applications of the Human Genome Project.

Candidates could identify a different/one 'great idea' from within Freudian Psychology (ie not the unconscious) and base their answer on this.

Evaluation may, for example, focus on the strengths and importance of the theory, research and/or applications of the idea. It could address supporting evidence for the idea, contribution to methodology, value in stimulating other research or debate, successfulness of applications or any other appropriate commentary. The request for evaluation allows for the limitations of 'the great idea' to be addressed, for example the problem of using western criteria to assess attachment in cross-cultural studies.

Marking allocations

Knowledge and understanding of a **different** 'great idea' and the contribution to psychology

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|---------------|--|-------------------|
| Band 3 | Substantial, accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of a 'great idea' in psychology. A range of highly pertinent material is selected from the contributions made to theory, research and/ or applied psychology. | 9-12 marks |
| Band 2 | Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of a 'great idea' in psychology. A range of relevant material is selected from the contributions made to theory, research and/or applied psychology. These descriptors are generally satisfied at the top of the band but only occasionally at the bottom. | 5-8 marks |
| Band 1 | Knowledge and understanding of a 'great idea' and its contribution and/or impact is limited . Material presented is basic and may cover only a narrow range or lack depth . | 0-4 marks |

Analysis/evaluation of the contribution of a **different** 'great idea' in psychology

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|---------------|---|-------------------|
| Band 3 | Effective analysis/evaluation is evident in a clear, well-developed consideration of the 'great idea' and contributions to theory, research and/or applied psychology. Evaluation is informed and thorough . Highly effective use of material to support lines of argument. | 9-12 marks |
| Band 2 | Analysis/evaluation is evident in a clear consideration of the 'great idea' and contribution to theory, research and/or applied psychology. Evaluation is slightly limited . Effective use of material to support lines of argument. | 5-8 marks |
| Band 1 | Analysis/evaluation is superficial in terms of the 'great idea' and its contribution to theory, research and/or applied psychology. Evaluation is limited . Some material is outlined to support lines of argument. | 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

Discuss how psychology could be used to explain why some people show more determination than others. *(30 marks)*

Marking criteria

This is an open-ended question which could legitimately be answered in a number of ways. Given its placement in Section C, many candidates might respond within the framework of different approaches. For example:

The behavioural approach might argue that showing determination is based on the learning of stimulus-response links. Rewarding outcomes in the past could have reinforced people showing determination. An association may have been learnt between previous challenges leading to rewards and present challenges requiring the same determination to produce a reward. Showing determination could be 'stamped in' from previous experience, as shown in The Law of Effect.

Drive reduction theory could suggest showing determination was linked to an effort to combat, eg hunger, thirst or pain.

Social Learning Theory could explain showing determination as a behaviour that has been learnt in expectation of future reinforcement. Rewards could be intrinsic. Showing determination could be linked to the need for self-efficacy or reinforcement of the agentic state. It could be behaviour based on identification and/or modelling.

Showing determination could be a manifestation of an Internal Locus of Control, whereby some people need to feel more in control of their behaviour and their choices.

Cognitive approach

Attribution theory may be used to explain that people who show determination believe that positive outcomes have internal causes (dispositional) and negative outcomes have external (situational) explanations. They may link showing determination to positive outcomes, thus the association of the two is reinforced. Showing determination could be linked to seeking self-actualisation in Maslow's hierarchy of human needs.

Seligman's work on depression may be used to suggest people who use stable, internal and global patterns of attribution are unlikely to show determination but may exhibit 'learned helplessness'; quite the opposite. An absence of a negative cognitive triad (Beck) may be associated with people showing determination.

Showing determination may be a manifestation of a cognitive need to try to be in control.

Psychodynamic approach might view showing determination as vehicle for a drive or instinct. Given the 'id driven' nature of Freudian theory, this may be an aggressive or sexual drive. Showing determination could manifest itself, in the extreme, as obsessive behaviour resulting from problems of early childhood development.

Biological approach could focus on evolutionary survival and the need to show determination to gather resources or to prove greater strength or cunning than an adversary or competitor. Some candidates may link showing determination to the 'fight or flight' response.

A different approach might be to examine the question as a corollary of parenting styles, perhaps suggesting Baumrind's authoritative style as most likely to encourage children to show determination. A developmental approach might suggest that children can be encouraged to show determination if they experience a guided learning environment (Piaget) or are encouraged to progress in the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky). By way of evaluation, the similarities and differences between these developmental theories could be explored in relation to the question.

Better answers will be evaluative/analytical in respect of the chosen explanation(s). The partial, deterministic and/or reductionist nature of the approaches may be explored. The 'theory driven' nature of psychodynamic and evolutionary approaches may be critically considered.

Whichever approach is taken, candidates are required to relate the concepts and principles to the context of the question.

Marking allocations

Knowledge and understanding of how psychology could explain why some people show more determination than others

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|---------------|--|-------------------|
| Band 3 | Substantial, accurate and detailed use of knowledge and understanding of how psychology could explain individual differences in showing determination. A range of highly pertinent material is selected. There is a balance of breadth and depth. | 9-12 marks |
| Band 2 | Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of how psychology could explain individual differences in showing determination. A range of relevant material is selected. There is breadth and depth but they are not necessarily balanced. <i>These descriptors are generally satisfied at the top of the band but only occasionally at the bottom.</i> | 5-8 marks |
| Band 1 | Knowledge and understanding of how psychology could explain individual differences in showing determination is limited . Material presented is basic and may cover only a narrow range or lack depth . | 0-4 marks |

Analysis/evaluation/synthesis of how psychology could explain why some people show more determination than others

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|---------------|--|-------------------|
| Band 3 | Effective analysis/evaluation/synthesis is evident in a clear, well-developed commentary on how psychology could explain individual differences in showing determination. Evaluation is informed and thorough . Highly effective use of material to support lines of argument. | 9-12 marks |
| Band 2 | Analysis/evaluation/synthesis is evident in a clear commentary on how psychology could explain individual differences in showing determination. Evaluation is slightly limited . Effective use of material to support lines of argument. | 5-8 marks |
| Band 1 | Analysis/evaluation/synthesis is superficial in terms of the commentary on how psychology could explain individual differences in showing determination. Evaluation is limited . Some material is outlined to support lines of argument. | 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

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

Describe and evaluate how **two** approaches in psychology might be used to explain out-of-control behaviour in young people. (30 marks)

Marking criteria

The requirement is to explore how any **two** approaches might be used to explain the 'out-of-control' behaviour in young people. This is not a question about how to deal with problem behaviour but rather, how psychological approaches can contribute to understanding the problem behaviour.

Biological approach might refer to genetic deficiency, neurochemical disorders and/or a developmental disorder contributing to the behaviour.

Evaluation: Explanations are likely to be reductionist, deterministic, probably underestimating the role of nurture and freewill. Young people may be presented as powerless in the face of the problem behaviour.

Behavioural approach is likely to focus on faulty learning experiences in childhood. Faulty conditioning may be said to lead to inappropriate stimulus-response links that re-inforce 'out-of-control' behaviour. Cognitive and emotional experiences may be seen as epiphenomena which result from behaviour shaping. Social Learning Theory may be included (or treated as a separate approach) to explain 'out-of-control' behaviour through identification, imitation and modelling.

Evaluation: Whilst placing a strong emphasis on understanding how anti-social behaviour can be learnt, in behavioural approach, attention may be drawn to a lack of explanation being offered to account for conscious choice about behaviour, the role of moral reasoning and the impact of mediated variables on behaviour. Cognitive variables in Social Learning Theory make this criticism less applicable in that context.

The psychodynamic approach is likely to focus on how early experience influences later behaviour and the role of the unconscious mind and drives in motivating anti-social behaviour. The role of the id in sexual and aggressive drives may be described. The use of defence mechanisms to enable the young person to cope with and justify 'out-of-control' behaviour may be considered. Erikson's psychosocial theory may be used to suggest the 'out-of-control' young person has not resolved the conflict in earlier stages of life.

Evaluation: It may be suggested that the psychodynamic approach does seek to address deep-seated problems and the influence of early family life on behaviour. It is however difficult to demonstrate empirical evidence and the theory is deterministic in its emphasis on innate forces

and early childhood experiences. There is little room for free will to explain young people's 'out-of-control' behaviour beyond saying it could be cathartic.

Cognitive approach focuses on understanding mental experiences and how they affect behaviour. 'Out-of-control' behaviour is likely to be explained as a faulty thought and/or faulty emotional experience. Faulty cognitions could have arisen as a result of early family experiences influencing the concept of the self, the locus of control and attributions. 'Out-of-control' behaviour, for example, turning to drugs, could be an escape or an attempt to find relief from depression.

Evaluation: In many ways the cognitive approach is the most optimistic because it holds within it not just the opportunity to change behaviour but also the opportunity to change cognitions, emotions and attitudes that produce 'out-of-control' behaviour.

It is also possible that candidates may use humanism or an evolutionary psychology approach in response to this question.

Candidates are required to offer **two** approaches in response to the question. If only **one** approach is offered, this should be marked as **partial performance**.

Marking allocations

Knowledge and understanding of how **two** approaches might be used to explain 'out of control' behaviour

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|---------------|---|-------------------|
| Band 3 | Substantial, accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of how two approaches could explain 'out-of-control' behaviour. A range of highly pertinent material is selected giving an appropriate balance of breadth and depth. | 9-12 marks |
| Band 2 | Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of how two approaches could explain 'out-of-control' behaviour. A range of relevant material is selected giving a balance of breadth and depth. These descriptors are generally satisfied at the top of the band but only occasionally at the bottom . <i>Partial performance: If the contribution of one approach only is described it should meet the descriptive criteria for Band 3.</i> | 5-8 marks |
| Band 1 | Knowledge and understanding of how two approaches could explain 'out-of-control' behaviour is limited . Material presented is basic and may cover only a narrow range or lack depth . <i>Partial performance: If the contribution of one approach only is described and it meets the descriptive criteria for Band 2 it should score at the top of this band (3 or 4 marks). If the contribution of one approach is described and it meets the descriptive criteria for Band 1 it should be limited up to 2 marks.</i> | 0-4 marks |

Analysis/evaluation/synthesis of how **two** approaches might be used to explain 'out-of-control' behaviour

| Band | Mark Descriptors | Marks |
|---------------|---|-------------------|
| Band 3 | Effective analysis/evaluation is evident in a clear, well-developed discussion of how two approaches could explain 'out of control' behaviour. Evaluation is informed and thorough . Highly effective use of material to support lines of argument. | 9-12 marks |
| Band 2 | Analysis/evaluation is evident in a clear discussion of how two approaches could explain 'out of control' behaviour. Evaluation is slightly limited . Effective use of material to support lines of argument. <i>Partial performance: If the contribution of one approach only is analysed/evaluated it should meet the analysis/evaluation criteria for Band 3.</i> | 5-8 marks |
| Band 1 | Analysis/evaluation is superficial in terms of how two approaches could explain 'out of control' behaviour. Evaluation is limited . Some material is outlined to support lines of argument. <i>Partial performance: If the contribution of one approach only is analysed/evaluated and it meets the analysis/evaluation criteria for Band 2, it should score at the top of this band (3-4 marks).</i> <i>If the contribution of one approach only is analysed/evaluated and it meets the analysis/evaluation criteria for Band 1, it should be limited up to 2 marks.</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 |