



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2004

GCE

Psychology A

Unit PYA5

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Mark Allocations for Assessment Objective 1

Mark bands	Content	Detail & accuracy	Organisation & structure	Breadth/depth of content and synoptic possibilities
15-13	Substantial	Accurate & well-detailed	Coherent	Substantial evidence
12-10	Slightly limited	Accurate & reasonably detailed	Coherent	Evidence
9-7	Limited	Generally accurate & reasonably detailed	Reasonably constructed	Some evidence
6-4	Basic	Lacking detail	Sometimes focused	Little evidence
3-0	Just discernible	Weak/muddled/inaccurate	Wholly/mainly irrelevant	Little or no evidence

Mark Allocations for Assessment Objective 2

Mark bands	Evaluation	Selection and elaboration	Use of material and synoptic possibilities
15-13	Thorough	Appropriate selection and coherent	Highly effective
12-10	Slightly limited	Appropriate selection and elaboration	Effective
9-7	Limited	Reasonable elaboration	Reasonably effective
6-4	Basic	Some evidence of elaboration	Restricted
3-0	Weak, muddled and incomplete	Wholly/mainly irrelevant	Not effective

Mark Allocations for Approaches Questions

Approaches part (a)

Mark bands	Content	Accuracy	Engagement
6-5	Reasonably thorough	Accurate	Coherent
4-3	Limited	Generally accurate	Reasonable
2-0	Basic	Sometimes flawed or inaccurate	Muddled or minimal or no engagement

Approaches part (b) & (d)

Mark bands	Commentary	Use of material	Engagement
6-5	Reasonably thorough	Effective	Coherent
4-3	Limited	Reasonably effective	Reasonable
2-0	Basic	Restricted	Muddled or minimal or no engagement

Approaches part (c)

Mark bands	Commentary	Plausibility	Engagement
6-5	Reasonably thorough	Appropriate	Coherent
4-3	Limited	Reasonably appropriate	Reasonable
2-0	Basic	Largely inappropriate	Muddled or minimal or no engagement

Approaches part (d)

Should engage with method in (c) and with the stimulus material.

Marking allocation as for part (b).

**QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION
(QoWC)**

Band 3	The work is characterised by a CLEAR expression of ideas, the use of a GOOD range of specialist terms, and FEW errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.	4-3 marks
Band 2	The work is characterised by a REASONABLE expression of ideas, the use of SOME specialist terms, and REASONABLE grammar, punctuation and spelling.	2-1 marks
Band 1	The work is characterised by a POOR expression of ideas, the use of a LIMITED range of specialist terms, and POOR grammar, punctuation and spelling.	0 marks

Synoptic Possibilities

Unit 5 rewards the demonstration of synopticity.

Synopticity can be defined as 'affording a general view of the whole'.

It is the addressing of psychology-wide matters and concerns.

Possible routes identified in the specification are:

- Demonstrating different explanations or perspectives.
- Demonstrating different methods used.
- Relating overarching issues and debates.
- Links with other areas of the specification.
- Psychology-wide concerns and issues such as reliability and validity, cultural variation and demand characteristics/participant reactivity (e.g. iatrogenesis).

Each question is synoptic. The above list identifies additional avenues for gaining credit of synopticity.

It is quite acceptable (i.e. will permit access to the full range of marks) for candidates to offer just one of these categories, or to offer several of them.

Synopticity may be demonstrated either within a particular area or across a number of different areas. The former can be thought of as 'vertical' synopticity, the latter as 'horizontal' synopticity.

For the approaches questions (question 8 and 9) the possibilities for demonstration of synopticity given above are supplemented with the following:

- Biological/medical, behavioural, psychodynamic and cognitive approaches.
- Other psychological approaches, not named in the specification, such as social construction, humanistic psychology, evolutionary psychology.
- Those approaches deriving from other, related disciplines such as sociology, biology and philosophy.

SECTION A: INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES.**1****Total for this question: 30 marks****Describe and evaluate arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes. (30 marks)**

Describe is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes. *Evaluate* requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO2** with relation to these arguments.

Indicative AO1:

Given the reference in the specification to case studies of culture-bound syndromes it is likely that candidates focus their answer on examples of these (e.g., amok; koro; dhat). In order to earn credit such accounts must clearly be made relevant to the question set. The descriptive part (**AO1**) could be an account which identifies the key features or symptoms of the CBS which could then be explored for cultural exclusivity for **AO2** (see below).

Berry et al. (1992) point out three different positions which can be taken on the relationship between culture and mental illnesses:

- Absolute: the same psychological disorders occur in every culture and with the same incidence. Same symptoms, same origins.
- Universal: the same disorders but with different incidences. Yapp (1974) takes this position stating that CBSs are variations on standard universal disorders.
- Culturally relative: some disorders are unique to particular cultures. This is the position taken by Pfeiffer (1982).

Only this last position supports the argument for culture bound syndromes. The first two can be given as counter arguments against and credited under **AO2**.

Note that arguments must be **for** the existence of culture-bound syndromes (although those against their existence can be used as a counterpoint of those for and credited as **AO2**).

Ideas for additional synopticity:

The question has the synoptic feature of cultural variability but the following are some additional possibilities

- psychology as a science, e.g., the seeking of universal phenomena (in this case explanations of mental illnesses)
- reductionism, e.g., the 'reduction' of mental illnesses to specific constellations of symptoms
- nature of abnormality and cultural relativism (from the AS specification)
- the possibility of eating disorders such as anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa being culture bound syndromes (link back to AS specification).

Indicative AO2:

One route for **AO2** is an evaluation of how well particular CBSs fit the criteria for other (universal) mental illnesses identified within the DSM and/or ICD and an evaluative analysis arguments for culture bound syndromes existing. These are associated with the positions taken by Yap and Pfeiffer (see above). The former argues that CBSs are merely exotic variations of the DSM/ICD mental illnesses (e.g., latah being a local cultural expression of primary fear reaction, amok being a rage reaction and windigo a possession state) whereas the latter argues that they can only be accommodated by severe distortion and that they are indeed location/culture specific.

Evaluations could include criteria such as the quality/coherence of the argument; empirical evidence; and contended ethnocentricity of the ICD/DSM. Evaluations may also be arguments *against* the existence of CBSs as long as they are explicit counter-points to arguments made *for* and not free-standing.

Additional synoptic possibilities

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** additional synoptic are also relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis. They should related to an evaluation of the argument for the existence of culture bound syndromes.

The question requires the candidate to address a plurality of arguments therefore those offering only one are partially performing (see mark allocations for both **AO1** and **AO2**).

Examiners should be mindful of the depth/breadth trade-off when marking the work of candidates who offer two arguments and those offering more than this.

Question 1 Assessment Objective 1

Description of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Description of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Description of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Description of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Description of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding . The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6) <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking detail with little focus on the question.</i>	3-0

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and coherent (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited and reasonably effective with reasonable elaboration.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of arguments for the existence of culture bound syndromes is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and restricted with some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

2

Total for this question: 30 marks

Compare and contrast biological **and** psychological explanations of anxiety disorders.
(30 marks)

Compare and contrast is an **AO1** and **AO2** injunction which requires the candidate to demonstrate his or her knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders and to consider similarities and differences between these two.

There are **two strategies** which examiners may use to mark answers to compare and contrast questions.

The **first strategy** is for 'free-standing' description of biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders to be credited under the **AO1** allocation of marks. Such content should be descriptive but evaluative material may receive credit insofar as it constitutes an elaboration of the description. The **AO2** allocation of marks is then awarded for explicit comparing and contrasting of biological and psychological explanations and may be descriptive and/or evaluative. The **second strategy** is to credit description of similarities and differences as **AO1** and evaluation of similarities and differences as **AO2**.

These strategies are reflected in the marking allocations which follow.

Examiners should award marks according to whichever of the two strategies will earn more credit for the candidate. In almost all instances this will be determined by whether the essay comprises predominantly free-standing accounts of the explanations or whether it is predominantly comparing and contrasting.

Strategy 1:**AO1:**

The examples of anxiety disorders given in the specification are post-traumatic stress disorder, phobic disorders and obsessive-compulsive disorder and it is thus likely that the majority of candidates will select examples from this list. However there are many other possibilities including panic disorders, generalised anxiety disorder and adjustment disorder. Biological explanations tend to focus on genes (making use of twin and family studies in particular), neurophysiology and evolutionary perspectives. The psychological explanations are likely to be drawn from the psychodynamic, behavioural and/or cognitive models.

In this strategy evaluation of the explanation is credited under **AO1** insofar as it elaborates the description of the explanation.

Note that material relating to treatments should not be credited unless this is serendipitously relevant.

AO2:

See description of similarities and differences and evaluation of these below.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The question has the synoptic feature of different explanations (biological and psychological) but the following are some additional possibilities:

- psychology as a science;
- reductionism (both may be reductionist but in different ways [e.g., biological reductionism versus environmental reductionism]);
- nature-nurture.

Strategy 2 AO1:**Similarities/differences:**

It must be remembered that these must be described/evaluated explicitly.

Examples which candidates may explore include the following, although it is impossible to be prescriptive since much will depend on which biological and, particularly, which psychological explanations are selected by the candidate.

Similarities:

- They are both used to treat used to treat mental illnesses/psychological abnormalities
- The majority are reductionist
- All except cultural relativist explanations focus on the individual

Differences:

- Assumptions of the aetiology of mental disorders (e.g., somatic versus learned)
- Level and nature of reductionism
- Modal illnesses for treatment tend to differ between the models
- Although both focus on the individual they differ in which aspects of the individual they focus upon (e.g., behaviour versus biology; the role of social factors)

Issues relating to broad synoptic possibilities such as:

- Gender bias;
- Culture bias;
- Nature-nurture (e.g., biological explanation favouring the former);
- Psychology as science (e.g., biological explanations being regarded as more scientific);
- Free will/determinism (most are determinist but the focus is often on different determining factors).

AO2:**Similarities & differences: evaluation.**

Rather than evaluating specific theories or studies candidates will be evaluating similarities and differences between theories/studies. The following list of evaluative criteria given by Starbuck (1998) may be useful when comparing the two (or more) theories/studies:

- How well do they help open up or extend debate?
- How well have they helped the way psychologists look at a particular issue or area?
- Do they employ concepts/definitions that can be criticised?
- Do they reflect the values of a perspective or the psychologist?
- Are they outdated?
- Are they well supported by empirical evidence
- What are the advantages/disadvantages of the method(s) used?
- Are they objective?
- What sampling procedures are normally used (e.g., use of non-human animals)
- Can assertions or findings be generalised?

- How well do they satisfy the requirements of reliability/validity?
- Are there biases? (e.g., ethnocentricity, androcentricity, heterosexism)
- Are there alternative explanations/interpretations?
- Have they helped clarify the meaning of any concepts in psychology?
- Have they added to our understanding in the relevant area of psychology?
- Are they likely to be of any use to psychologists in the future?
- Are they useful to society in general?

In **Strategy 1**, if only biological **or** psychological explanations are given then marks will be restricted to a maximum of top of Band 3 (9 marks) in **AO1** and 0 for **AO2**.

In **Strategy 1**, if only similarities or differences are given in the comparing and contrasting marks will be restricted to a maximum of top of Band 3 (9 marks) in **AO2**.

In **Strategy 2**, if only similarities or differences are given marks will be restricted to maximum of Band 3 (9 marks) in both **AO1 and AO2**.

Examiners should be mindful of the breadth/depth trade-off when marking the work of candidates who offer two explanations and those offering more than this.

QUESTION 2: STRATEGY 1**Assessment Objective 1**

Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations of an anxiety disorder.

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of biological and psychological explanations is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding . The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking detail with little focus on the question.</i>	3-0

Assessment Objective 2

Consideration of anxiety disorders in terms of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Explicit comparing and contrasting of similarities and differences is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Explicit comparing and contrasting of similarities and differences is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Explicit comparing and contrasting of similarities and differences is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and coherent (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Explicit comparing and contrasting of similarities and differences is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6) <i>Partial performance is limited and reasonably effective with reasonable elaboration.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Explicit comparing and contrasting is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and restricted with some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

OR**Question 2: STRATEGY 2****Assessment Objective 1**

Description of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders

Band	Mark allocation	M
Band 5	Description of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Description of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Description of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Description of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Description of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking detail with little focus on the question.</i>	3-0

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.000).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and coherent (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6) <i>Partial performance is limited and reasonably effective with reasonable elaboration.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of similarities and differences between biological and psychological explanations of anxiety disorders is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and restricted with some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

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

“Behavioural therapies have been very successful in treating mental disorders and are superior in all respects to alternative forms of therapy”.

Discuss the treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies, with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation above. (30 marks)

Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate the treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies.

Indicative AO1:

Candidates may focus upon therapies deriving from classical conditioning (e.g. flooding, systematic desensitisation and aversion therapy); operant conditioning (e.g. token economy treatment) and SLT (e.g. modelling therapy). Given their treatment in the major textbooks it is likely that candidates can offer full and well- detailed descriptions of the mode of operation and implementation of such treatments.

Notice that is not necessary for candidates to link the treatments back to their theoretical underpinnings.

The issues raised in the quotation include:

- that behavioural treatments are successful (e.g. in what respect? how measured? by whom?)
- in all respects (e.g., success rates, ethical considerations; patient dependency; relapse rates).

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The question has the synoptic feature of behavioural therapies (plural). The following are some additional possibilities:

- ethics, e.g., the relative ‘reversibility’ of behavioural therapies (as opposed to somatic treatments)
- reductionism, i.e., behavioural reductionism.
- psychology as a science, e.g., the standing of behavioural therapies as opposed to, say, somatic treatments of psychoanalytic interventions.
- links across the specification, e.g., nature of abnormality (AS)

Indicative AO2:

Given the wording in the specification candidates are likely to focus on effectiveness of treatment. A key factor here is the nature of the illness or psychological disorder it is being used with (e.g. phobias versus schizophrenia). Another key issue is whether it is successful – when it is – because of the nature of the treatment of other co-occurring factors such as attention, expectations and therapist variables.

Other likely issues include the accusation that it mechanistic (and does not give insight such as humanistic treatments do, for example); that it only deals with symptoms rather than underlying causes; symptom substitution; lack of generalisation; and the exclusive focus upon behaviour.

Examiners should be particularly mindful of the need for candidates to provide sustained critical commentary when awarding AO2 marks. The focus of the question is on behavioural therapies and material on alternatives (e.g., bio-therapies; psychoanalysis) should only receive AO2 credit insofar as they are explicitly and consistently used to evaluate the behavioural therapies.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

All of the points made above with reference to AO1 additional synopticity are also relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis.

There is no penalty if the candidate does not refer to the quotation. The wording of the question means that the candidate does not have to engage with these particular issues but may chose his or her own.

Note, it is not intended that this question requires a plurality performance but the number of factors offered will constitute the breadth of the response.

Question 3 Assessment Objective 1

Description of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Description of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Description of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	9-7
Band 2	Description of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	6-4
Band 1	Description of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of treatment of mental disorders by behavioural therapies is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

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

Discuss **two or more** examples of gender bias in psychological research (theories **and/or** studies). (30 marks)

Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate research (theories and/or studies) into two or more examples of gender bias.

Indicative AO1:

It should be remembered that research is both theoretical and empirical (candidates are reminded of this in the wording of the question). It is therefore acceptable for candidates to offer either or both. Furthermore candidates can focus on types of bias (e.g. alpha & beta biases) or specific examples (e.g. Marcia's theory of identity formation; Freud's theories). In the past the case has been made for gender to be a form of cultural bias (insofar as males and females are treated differently in very many cultures merely because of their sex/gender).

Examiners should be mindful of candidates not fully engaging with the requirements of the question when describing psychological research. A common failing is for a candidate to spend an unjustifiable amount of time describing the fine details of a particular study (say, Kohlberg's work on moral development) without focusing on its gender bias.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

The question has the synoptic feature of the issue of gender or cultural bias in psychological research but the following are some additional possibilities:

- different theoretical perspectives (for example psychoanalysis)
- different methodologies (for example the argument that women 'perform' better in interviews than men because of their allegedly superior verbal skills)
- ethics (for example giving legitimacy to beliefs which may result in prejudice and/or discrimination)
- nature-nurture issues (for example, concerning the 'permanence' of gender differences)

Indicative AO2:

This part of the answer is an evaluation or assessment of gender bias in psychological research. This could be, for example, in terms of universalist arguments such as those used by some bio-psychologists amongst others. At the other extreme there could be arguments which are culturally and/or historically specific (e.g. Freud's alleged sexism being a product of the times).

Once again the focus may legitimately be a critique of the types of bias (for example the consequences of alpha and/or beta bias or how these may be addressed/resolved) and/or specific examples (such as studies showing gender bias in diagnosis of certain mental disorders).

Additional synoptic possibilities:

All the points made above with reference to **AO1** above are relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis.

The question requires the candidate to address a plurality of examples therefore those offering just one example are partially performing (see mark allocation for both **AO1** and **AO2**).

Examiners should be mindful of the depth/breadth trade-off when marking the work of candidates who offer two examples and those offering more than this.

TURN OVER FOR THE MARK BANDS

Question 4: Assessment Objective 1

Description of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Description of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Description of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Description of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Description of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding . The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking detail with little focus on the question.</i>	3-0

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and coherent (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6) <i>Partial performance is limited and reasonably effective with reasonable elaboration.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological research is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and restricted with some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

5

Total for this question: 30 marks

“We have learned a great deal in psychology by studying non-human animals. This would seem to outweigh any scientific and ethical arguments against the use of non-human animals in psychological research.”

Critically consider the use of non-human animals in psychology, with reference to issues raised in the quotation above. (30 marks)

Critically consider is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate the use of non-human animals in psychology.

The key is that arguments or points (either for or against) should be both described and evaluated. If a candidate adopts a ‘shopping list’ approach (listing of arguments for and against with a minimum of elaboration) it will be likely that evaluation will not show effective use of material and will thus be limited to a maximum mark at the top of band 3 (9 marks in **AO2**), see below.

Indicative AO1:

The issues raised in the quotation are:

- We have learned a great deal in psychology from studying non-human animals. This could be considered in the context of general areas of psychology associated with non-human animal research such as classical and operant conditioning and comparative psychology, or specific studies using non-human animals (e.g., Harlow, Brady; Seyle)
- Scientific arguments against non-human animals research in psychology. Examples include lack of generalisability (e.g., ratomorphism); discontinuities between species; reductionism.
- Ethical arguments against non-human animals research in psychology. Examples include effectiveness of legal regulation (Animals [Scientific Procedures] Act 1986 and BPS guidelines [recently revised in 2000]; suffering; cost-benefit judgement of research).
- Gains derived and whether such gains are greater than scientific and ethical arguments against.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The question has the synoptic feature of the issues of the use of non-human animals in psychology but the following are some additional possibilities:

- different theoretical perspectives (e.g. learning theory)
- psychology as a science (e.g. species generalisation)
- examples of non-human animal research from different parts of the specification

Indicative AO2:

The **AO2** is clear to identify here given the wording of the question. It will be an evaluation/analysis of the arguments and points described for **AO1**. These may result in the case for the use of non-human animals in psychology being supported or refuted. Again the focus may legitimately be upon areas of psychology (for instance how much have we really learned from conditioning studies) or specific studies such as those carried out by Harlow and his colleagues. There must be *shaping of purpose* for material to count as being used effectively.

It is possible evaluation could be delivered by arguments against as the evaluation of the arguments for but in this case there must be genuine juxtaposition and analysis rather than a mere description of two free-standing/independent arguments (one for and one against). The maximum here would be top of band 3 (9 marks).

Additional synoptic possibilities:

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** are relevant here but can be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis.

Candidates who make no explicit reference to the quotation should be limited to a maximum at the top of Band 4 (12 marks) for **AO2** insofar as they have failed to make highly effective use of their material.

The question requires the candidate to address a plurality of the issues raised in the quotation therefore those offering only one are partially performing (see mark allocation for both **AO1** and **AO2**).

Question 5: Assessment Objective 1

Description of the use of non-human animals in psychology

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of the use of non-human animals in psychology substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Description of the use of non-human animals in psychology is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Description of the use of non-human animals in psychology limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Description of the use of non-human animals in psychology is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Description of the use of non-human animals in psychology just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding . The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking detail with little focus on the question.</i>	3-0

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of the use of non-human animals in psychology

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of the use of non-human animals in psychology is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of the use of non-human animals in psychology is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of the use of non-human animals in psychology is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and coherent (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of the use of non-human animals in psychology is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6) <i>Partial performance is limited and reasonably effective with reasonable elaboration.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of the use of non-human animals in psychology is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and restricted with some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

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

- (a) Explain what is meant by reductionism. (5marks)
- (b) Discuss reductionism in relation to **two or more** psychological theories. (25 marks)

Explain is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to demonstrate his or her knowledge of what is meant by reductionism. *Discuss* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories.

Part (a)**Indicative AO1:**

Markers should bear in mind that the allocation of marks for this question is only 5, this means that it has a notional time allocation of around 6 minutes so it unreasonable to expect particularly detailed or lengthy answers.

Reductionism is the attempt to reduce phenomena to simpler or lower-order ones. Better candidates may offer classifications such as given by Rose (1997) who identifies three forms of reductionism:

- methodological reductionism
- philosophical reductionism (the attempt or desire to establish a single language of all sciences)
- ideological reductionism (reducing the number of different ideological accounts or explanations of a particular phenomenon)

Note that the explanation does not have to be in a context of psychology.

Candidates might make good use of examples to enhance the quality of explanation.

Part (b)**Indicative AO1:**

Candidates may answer the question at a macro or a micro level. An example of the former would be (for **AO1**) a description of specific 'broad' theories or methodologies, for instance behaviourism, psychoanalysis, and/or the laboratory experiment. An example of the latter would be specific theories (such as Seyle's GAS model of stress).

There are two potential pitfalls for candidates in answering this question. One is to focus too heavily on reductionism per se and the other is to get drawn into unjustifiably detailed accounts of particular theories without focusing on how they are relevant to reductionism debates.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The question has the synoptic feature of reductionism in psychological theories but the following are some additional possibilities:

- use of non-human animal research to inform theory development (e.g., Seligman's work or that of Harlow)
- psychology as a science (e.g., establishing common goals with other sciences)
- examples drawn from different parts of the specification

Part (b)**Indicative AO2:**

It should be clearly noted that general evaluation or analysis of theories will earn little or no credit. Such an approach should receive marks only to the extent that it may serendipitously be relevant to the 'reductionism in psychology' debate.

Candidates may demonstrate **AO2** by assessing the appropriateness of reductionism in the chosen examples and the implications/consequences of such reductionism (to the discipline of psychology and in terms of the quality of the research itself).

Candidates may focus upon advantages and disadvantages of reductionism (in their chosen examples and in psychology in general). This is acceptable insofar as such discussion is clearly related to specific examples of theories and not a general discussion of the merits and problems of reductionism.

Candidates may also discuss what we have gained/lost from reductionism in psychology and the general usefulness and appropriateness of reductionism in psychology. Again this would need to be focused on specific examples of theory/research.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** synopticity are also relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number of different means of evaluation or analysis.

The question requires the candidate to address a plurality of examples of reductionism in psychological theory and/or research therefore those offering one are partially performing (see mark allocation for both **AO1** and **AO2**).

Examiners should be mindful of the depth/breadth trade-off when marking the work of candidates who offer two examples and those offering more than this.

TURN OVER FOR THE MARK BANDS

Question 6: Assessment AO1

(a) Explanation of what is meant by reductionism

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	Explanation of reductionism is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	5-4
Band 2	Explanation of reductionism is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	3-2
Band 1	Explanation of reductionism is weak and muddled . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	1-0

Assessment Objective 1

(b) Description of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	10-9
Band 4	Description of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	8-7
Band 3	Description of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and well-detailed (bottom of band).</i> AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	6-5
Band 2	Description of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i> AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	4-3
Band 1	Description of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding . The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and lacking detail.</i> AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	2-0

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories.

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and coherent (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited and reasonably effective with reasonable elaboration.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of reductionism in relation to two or more psychological theories is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and restricted with some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

7

Total for this question: 30 marks

With reference to psychological theories **and/or** studies, discuss the nature-nurture debate.
(30 marks)

Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate the nature-nurture debate with reference to psychological research and/or studies. In the *Terms Used in Examinations* document, the term ‘research’ is defined as ‘the process of gaining knowledge and understanding via either theory construction, examination, or empirical data collection.

Indicative AO1:

There are two potential pitfalls for candidates in answering this question. One is to focus too heavily on the nature-nurture debate per se and the other is to get drawn into unjustifiably detailed accounts of particular theories and/or studies without focusing on how they are relevant to the nature-nurture debate. Given the wording of the specification it is likely that candidates will focus on assumptions, which we can define for convenience as ‘beliefs which are held to be true without any actual proof or at least evidence of contradiction’.

Candidates can write a competent answer which focuses at a relatively macro level of the discipline, for example describing some theories which contend that behaviour is explained by genes that are inherited, but such description does need to be located in a particular area of research and/or theory such as IQ testing. Alternatively candidates may focus on different types of studies which exemplify the nature/nurture debate. A more productive approach would probably be through specific theories such as biological determinism with nature as the driving force as an assumption of Piaget’s theory and ‘blank-slateism’ as an assumption of behaviourism.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

The question has the synoptic feature of the nature-nurture debate in psychology but the following are some additional possibilities:

- cultural variation (e.g., in relationships)
- ethics (for example that relating to IQ testing)
- psychology as a science (e.g., establishing genetic causes of mental disorders which can then be treated by a somatic approach)

Indicative AO2:

A likely legitimate approach here is for candidates to question whether the assumptions underpinning particular theories can be regarded as reasonable or having been supported (e.g., by empirical work). An example could be regarded as the ‘Was Piaget right?’ question, i.e. this is a ‘direct’ appraisal of a particular psychology (for example Donaldson on Piaget). Other favourites are likely to be an analytical appraisal of the Skinner/Chomsky debate on language acquisition or whether the findings of research studies genuinely inform the nature/nurture debate.

As with **AO1** above it should be noted that it is legitimate for candidates to address theories and/or empirical studies.

Additional synoptic possibilities:

All of the points made above with reference to **AO1** additional synopticity are also relevant here but must be made at analytical and/or evaluative levels. In addition, credit may be earned by employing a number or different means of evaluation or analysis.

Question 7: Assessment Objective 1

Description of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies.

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Description of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Description of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies is slightly limited . It is accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Description of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies is limited . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably constructed . There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Description of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies is basic and lacking detail . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Description of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies is just discernible . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic, lacking detail with little focus on the question.</i>	3-0

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies is slightly limited . The material is used in an effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows reasonable elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and coherent (top of band) or slightly limited and effective (bottom of band).</i>	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration of synoptic possibilities (p.6) <i>Partial performance is limited and reasonably effective with reasonable elaboration.</i>	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of the nature/nurture debate with reference to psychological theories and/or studies is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be wholly or mainly irrelevant in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and restricted with some evidence of elaboration.</i>	3-0

SECTION C: Approaches.**8****Total for this question: 30 marks**

A pop band called Here&Now created mass hysteria in millions of young girls in the country. All of their concerts sold-out within minutes of tickets going on sale, and at the concerts girls were seen to swoon and faint when the band were on stage. Girls traded posters and magazine stories about their pop idols and constantly talked to each other about their undying love for the boys in the band.

- (a) Describe how **two** approaches might try to explain mass hysteria for pop stars. (6 marks + 6 marks)
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations of mass hysteria for pop stars in terms of its strengths and limitations. (6 marks)
- (c) How might mass hysteria for pop stars be investigated by **one** of these approaches? (6 marks)
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating mass hysteria for pop stars. (6 marks)

It must be clearly appreciated that the Approaches questions are concerned with epistemology rather than ontology, thus the candidate is rewarded for demonstrating knowledge of how a particular approach would endeavour to explore the topic area in question.

Answers which focus on particular studies or published accounts should receive credit only insofar as these illustrate an understanding and critical appreciation of the theoretical and methodological orientations of the general approach of the hypothetical example given in the question.

An illustration of the approaches here is:

Biological: During the concerts the experience of mass hysteria would produce many biological reactions of arousal in those involved. These may be perceived as exhilarating and pleasurable. For example there would be neural and hormonal changes associated with the experience.

Social constructionism: The fact that this is described as a 'mass' phenomenon indicates that it has a social component. Social constructionists would argue that it could be part of a 'sense-making' process for the girls by which they come to understand the social world in which they live.

Investigative methods should be appropriate to the approaches given. In the case of the above examples the biological approach could involve measurement of internal biological changes, e.g. hormonal and neurological. Social constructionists are exclusively qualitative in their methodological orientation so interviews and discourse analysis would probably be likely methods employed.

In all parts of the Approaches question candidates are required to engage with the stimulus material, as distinct from presenting pre-prepared material on Approaches. Some candidates may simply add a few appropriate words (such as ‘Here&Now’ or ‘mass hysteria for pop stars’). This tactic is unlikely to raise a candidate’s mark above Band 1 (Basic). On the other hand, some candidates may *shape* their responses in order to address issues in the stimulus material. Such responses could gain full marks depending on the degree of shaping for purpose. The extent to which candidates have used their knowledge to effectively answer the four parts of the question constitutes the merit of their response.

Some candidates may describe a way of investigating the phenomenon which is clearly appropriate to one approach identified in (a) but operationalises the variables without explicit reference to the stimulus. Such responses may gain credit insofar as they accurately portray methodology and assumptions of the chosen approach.

Question 8(a) Assessment Objective 1

AO1: For description of each approach

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	Psychological content is reasonably thorough and accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent .	6-5
Band 2	Psychological content is limited and generally accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable .	4-3
Band 1	Psychological content is basic, sometimes flawed and inaccurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement .	2-0

Question 8(b) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For assessment of strengths and weaknesses of one approach

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent .	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable . <i>If there is partial performance strengths or limitations is reasonably thorough and engagement with the stimulus material is coherent. Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with material is coherent.</i>	4-3
Band 1	There is basic commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). The material has been used in a restricted manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement . <i>If there is partial performance strengths or limitations is limited. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonably.</i>	2-0

Question 8(c) Assessment Objective 2**AO2:** For one approach investigating the phenomenon

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is reasonably thorough commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent .	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is reasonably appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable .	4-3
Band 1	There is basic commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is largely inappropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement .	2-0

Question 8(d) Assessment Objective 2**AO2:** For evaluation of this investigative approach.

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent.	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable .	4-3
Band 1	There is basic commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. The material in which material has been used is restricted . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement .	2-0

9

Total for this question: 30 marks

Jenny loves cooking meals for other people such as her family and friends. She rarely bothers to cook for herself but regularly invites people to her house to eat and spends a lot of time planning meals that please her friends. She is a good cook and people looked forward to being invited round.

- (a) Describe how **two** approaches might try to explain an enjoyment of cooking for others. (6 marks + 6 marks)
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations for an enjoyment of cooking for others in terms of its strengths and limitations. (6 marks)
- (c) How might an enjoyment of cooking for others be investigated by **one** of these approaches? (6 marks)
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating an enjoyment of cooking for others. (6 marks)

It must be clearly appreciated that the Approaches questions are concerned with epistemology rather than ontology, thus the candidate is rewarded for demonstrating knowledge of how a particular approach would endeavour to explore the topic area in question.

Answers which focus on particular studies or published accounts should receive credit only insofar as these illustrate an understanding and critical appreciation of the theoretical and methodological orientations of the general approach of the hypothetical example given in the study.

An illustration of the approaches here is:

Behaviourism: Both operant conditioning and classical conditioning are clearly relevant here, although it may be that accounts of the former are more plausibly made. It is legitimate for candidates to use each as separate approaches or to write generally about Learning theory. Social Learning theory is also relevant and may be used in either of these ways too.

Evolutionary psychology: Although a good deal which is written in evolutionary psychology concerns male behaviour this scenario is an example of female evolved behaviour, i.e. nurturing. It should be noted that such accounts may be supportive of gender stereotypes and this material could be usefully employed in part (b). Gender stereotypes keys yet another approach, cognitive psychology.

Investigative methods should be appropriate to the approaches given. In the case of the above examples the behavioural approach might well use an experimental methodology. A field experiment is a credible possibility here in which one group of participants could be invited to cook for friends who are appreciative and another group of participants would be asked to cook for experimental confederates. The DV could be self-reports of satisfaction gained from the experience by the participants.

In the case of evolutionary psychology comparative studies could be made with nurturing behaviour of other, non-human species particularly those near to us on the phylogenetic scale. So for example, a trip could be made to a zoo or similar institution and observations made of nurturing behaviours. Issues surrounding classification of behaviours would be relevant as would those relating to observational reliability.

In all parts of the Approaches question candidates are required to engage with the stimulus material, as distinct from presenting pre-prepared material on Approaches. Some candidates may simply add a few appropriate words (such as ‘Jenny’ or ‘enjoyment of cooking for others’). This tactic is unlikely to raise a candidate’s mark above Band 1 (Basic). On the other hand, some candidates may *shape* their responses in order to address issues in the stimulus material. Such responses could gain full marks depending on the degree of shaping for purpose. The extent to which candidates have used their knowledge to effectively answer the four parts of the question constitutes the merit of their response.

Some candidates may describe a way of **investigating** the phenomenon which is clearly appropriate to one approach identified in (a) but operationalise the variable without explicit reference to the stimulus. Such responses may gain credit insofar as they accurately portray methodology and assumptions of the chosen approach.

Question 9(a) Assessment Objective 1

AO1: For description of each approach

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	Psychological content is reasonably thorough and accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent .	6-5
Band 2	Psychological content is limited and generally accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable .	4-3
Band 1	Psychological content is basic, sometimes flawed and inaccurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement .	2-0

Question 9(b) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For assessment of strengths and weaknesses of one approach

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent .	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable . <i>If there is partial performance strengths or limitations is reasonably thorough and engagement with the stimulus material is coherent. Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with material is coherent.</i>	4-3
Band 1	There is basic commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). The material has been used in a restricted manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement . <i>If there is partial performance strengths or limitations is limited. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonably.</i>	2-0

Question 9(c) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For one approach investigating the phenomenon

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is reasonably thorough commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent .	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is reasonably appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable .	4-3
Band 1	There is basic commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is largely inappropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement .	2-0

Question 9(d) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For evaluation of this investigative approach.

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent .	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable .	4-3
Band 1	There is basic commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. The material in which material has been used is restricted . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement .	2-0

A LEVEL/A2 UNIT 5: ASSESSMENT GRID

Question number	AO1	AO2
1	15	15
2	15	15
3	15	15
4	15	15
5	15	15
6(a)	5	0
(b)	10	15
7	15	15
8(a)	12	0
(b)	0	6
(c)	0	6
(d)	0	6
9(a)	12	0
(b)	0	6
(c)	0	6
(d)	0	6

Marks	AO1	AO2
Total marks for 3 questions	42	48
QoWC	4	0
Total for paper	46	48
A-level total weighting (20%)	9.6%	10.4%