



General Certificate of Education

Psychology 5181/6181 *Specification A*

PYA5 Individual Differences and Perspectives

Mark Scheme

2006 examination – January series

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

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

UNIT 5 (PYA5)

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AND PERSPECTIVES

**QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION
(QoWC)**

Band 1	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 (eg iatrogenesis).

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

It is quite acceptable (ie 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 constructionism, humanistic psychology, evolutionary psychology.
- Approaches deriving from other, related disciplines such as sociology, biology and philosophy.

SECTION A: INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

1

Total for this question: 30 marks

‘The same psychological disorders are found in all cultures. These disorders have the same causes and the same symptoms, wherever they occur. Culture has no influence on mental disorder, so there can be no such things as culture-bound syndromes.’

Discuss culture-bound syndromes with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation above.
(30 marks)

Marking Criteria

Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to describe and evaluate culture-bound syndromes.

Indicative AO1:

It is highly likely that candidates will illustrate their answers by using descriptions of syndromes apparently bound by culture and this is perfectly acceptable AO1.

- The issues raised in the quotation are:
- the same psychological disorders exist in every culture
- the causes of the disorders are the same wherever they occur
- these disorders can be recognised wherever they occur because they have the same symptoms
- if cultural factors have no effect on psychological disorders, there is no need to have a diagnostic category of culture-bound syndromes.

The wording of the question does not restrict the candidate to a discussion of the issues specifically raised in the quotation. For example, a candidate could legitimately explore issues of reliability and validity in psychiatric diagnosis provided the material is clearly related to culture-bound syndromes.

Berry et al. (1992) have identified three main positions which can be taken on the relationship between culture and psychological disorders:

- According to the *absolutist view* (which is embodied in the quotation), the same psychological disorders exist across all cultures and they have the same incidence, origins and symptoms regardless of where they occur.
- The *universalistic view* is similar in that it sees the same psychological disorders occurring in every culture. However, it acknowledges that the causes and outward expressions of these disorders are affected by cultural factors. Culture-bound syndromes, according to this view, are simply variations of standard universal psychological disorders.
- The position taken by *cultural relativists* is that certain psychological disorders are present only in specific cultures and that these are sufficiently distinct from other disorders to form discrete, diagnostic categories in their own right. In other words, they are not simply variations on universal disorders.

The first two of these positions support the arguments against culture-bound syndromes, while the last one supports the argument for their existence.

Indicative AO2:

One route for AO2 is an evaluation of how well particular culture-bound syndromes fit the criteria for other mental illnesses classified within DSM and/or ICD. For example, universalists believe that so-called culture-bound syndromes such as amok can be accommodated within existing Western classifications, whereas cultural relativists would assert that this can only be done by severely distorting the criteria.

Other opportunities for evaluation could include criteria such as the quality/coherence of the argument; empirical evidence; and the issue of the possible ethnocentricity of the ICD/DSM.

Examples of synopticity:

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

- psychology as a science, eg, the seeking of universal phenomena (in this case, explanations of mental illnesses)
- reductionism, eg, the reduction of mental illnesses to specific syndromes or groups 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).

Mark Allocations

AO1: Description of culture-bound syndromes.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of culture-bound syndromes and/or description of issues such as those raised in the quotation 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).	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of culture-bound syndromes and/or description of issues such as those raised in the quotation is reasonable . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities. (p.6).	11-8
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of culture-bound syndromes and/or description of issues such as those raised in the quotation is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities. (p.6).	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of culture-bound syndromes and/or description of issues such as those raised in the quotation is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities. (p.6).	3-0

AO2: Evaluation of culture-bound syndromes.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of culture-bound syndromes with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of culture-bound syndromes with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation of culture-bound syndromes with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of culture-bound syndromes with reference to issues such as those raised in the quotation is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

2

Total for this question: 30 marks

(a) Outline clinical characteristics of depression.	(5 marks)
(b) Discuss one biological and one psychological explanation of depression.	(25 marks)

Marking Criteria

Outline is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to give a brief descriptive account of clinical characteristics of depression. *Discuss* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate both to describe and evaluate **one** biological and **one** psychological theory of depression.

Part (a)**Indicative AO1:**

It is likely that candidates will outline the characteristics of unipolar disorder and/or bipolar disorder, although it is possible, and perfectly acceptable, for them to describe the characteristics of, for example, reactive and endogenous depression. The major symptoms of depression tend to fall into 4 categories: cognitive, behavioural, emotional and physical. Clinical characteristics of depression could also legitimately include factors such as the prevalence, course and outcome of the disorder. However, causal explanations and evaluative comments, for example, on the difficulty of diagnosis, are not creditworthy in this part of the question.

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

Part (b)**Indicative AO1:**

Candidates are required to offer a descriptive account of *one* biological and *one* psychological explanation of depression. Candidates who offer only one or other of these explanations are partially performing (see mark allocations for AO1). If candidates offer more than one explanation of each type, the best answer should be credited. However, it is possible that other explanations could be used evaluatively and, therefore, credited as AO2. To achieve top band marks, there should be a reasonable balance between the two explanations.

Biological explanations are most likely to fall into two categories: genetic and biochemical. Given the wording of the question, candidates could either take a broad approach eg, describe the role of either biochemistry or genetics in the origins of depression, or they could take a narrower approach eg, only describe the role of serotonin. Markers should bear in mind the depth/breadth trade-off here. A list alone demonstrates knowledge but not understanding.

Psychological explanations are most likely to include psychodynamic, behavioural and cognitive-behavioural approaches. (NB markers must remember that there are only 10 marks available for AO1 in this part of the question.)

Indicative AO2:

Candidates are required to evaluate each of their chosen explanations. If they evaluate only one, they are partially performing (see mark allocations for AO2). They could legitimately introduce other perspectives here provided that they are used explicitly to evaluate the explanations outlined in part (a). The nature of the evaluations will vary depending on the explanations chosen, but are likely to include: testability, quality of empirical evidence, and difficulties of disentangling cause and effect. Evaluations could also include broader issues such as reductionism and the nature/nurture debate.

Examples of synopticity

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

- reductionism, eg the reduction of depression to, for example, hormonal explanations.
- nature-nurture debate, eg, the issue of innate versus environmental factors in the origins of depression
- cultural relativity, eg, the role of cultural factors in explaining depression.

Mark Allocations**Part (a) AO1: Outline of clinical characteristics of depression.**

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 3	Outline of clinical characteristics of depression is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	5-4
Band 2	Outline of clinical characteristics of depression is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	3-2
Band 1	Outline of clinical characteristics of depression is weak and muddled . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	1-0

Part (b) AO1: Description of *one* biological and *one* psychological explanation of depression.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of one biological and one psychological explanation of depression is substantial . It is accurate and well-detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is coherent . There is substantial evidence of breadth/depth with a reasonable balance between the two explanations and synoptic possibilities (p.6). AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	10-9
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of one biological and one psychological explanation of depression 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). AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	8-6
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of one biological and one psychological explanation of depression is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS. <i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed (N.B. maximum 5 marks)</i>	5-3
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of one biological and one psychological explanation of depression is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding . The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS. <i>Partial performance is basic and not well-detailed.</i>	2-0

Part (b) AO2: Evaluation of one biological and one psychological explanation of depression.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	<p>Thorough Evaluation of one biological and one psychological explanation of depression is thorough. The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration. There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).</p>	15-12
Band 3	<p>Reasonable Evaluation of one biological and one psychological explanation of depression is limited. The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration. There is evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well detailed. (N.B. maximum 9 marks)</i></p>	11-8
Band 2	<p>Basic Evaluation of one biological and one psychological explanation of depression is basic. The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration. There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i></p>	7-4
Band 1	<p>Rudimentary Evaluation of one biological and one psychological explanation of depression is rudimentary. It is weak, muddled and incomplete. The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6) <i>Partial performance is basic and not well detailed.</i></p>	3-0

3

Total for this question: 30 marks

‘Psychological treatments for mental disorders should be appropriate and effective.’

With reference to the quotation above, discuss the treatment of mental disorders by **either** psychodynamic **or** cognitive-behavioural therapies. (30 marks)

Marking Criteria

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

Indicative AO1:

Candidates are required to choose *either* psychodynamic *or* cognitive-behavioural therapies. If they describe both, they should be credited for the account for which they would gain the highest marks. Given the wording of the question, it is acceptable for candidates to choose *one or more* psychodynamic therapies or *one or more* cognitive-behavioural therapies. Markers should bear in mind the depth/breadth trade-off here.

Psychodynamic therapies: it is likely that candidates will choose to focus on classical psychoanalysis, but other therapies within the psychodynamic perspective are just as acceptable eg, psychodrama, ego analysis, Kleinian therapy etc.

Cognitive-behavioural therapies: there is some disagreement in the text books, most widely available to candidates as to what constitutes a cognitive-behavioural therapy. Some make a distinction between cognitive-behavioural and cognitive, but, for this question, therapies such as Beck’s cognitive therapy will be perfectly acceptable. Other likely choices will be rational-emotive therapy and stress inoculation therapy since these are given as examples on the specification. However, behavioural therapies such as systematic desensitisation will not be acceptable.

Although the question requires a discussion of issues surrounding the use of the chosen therapies, it is acceptable to offer descriptions of the mode of operation of the therapies as **AO1**.

Indicative AO2:

Candidates are likely to focus on the issues given in the quotation. Issues of *appropriateness* could include: the nature of the psychological disorder for which the therapy is being used (eg is the therapy more likely to be successful with people suffering from an anxiety disorder than from schizophrenia?); factors that affect choice of treatment (eg financial constraints or the availability of an appropriate therapist); ethical issues (eg the emotional harm that might arise if a client is forced to confront hidden conflicts).

Issues of *effectiveness* could include: problems of measuring effectiveness (eg when to measure, how to define what is meant by successful treatment, etc.); placebo effects (eg is the change in behaviour brought about simply because of increased attention?).

Examiners should remember that candidates need to provide sustained critical commentary when awarding **AO2** marks. The focus of the question is on one type of therapy and material on alternatives should only receive credit insofar as it is explicitly and consistently used to evaluate the chosen therapy.

Examples of synopticity:

- ethics, eg the danger of emotional harm arising from certain therapies
- psychology as science, eg the standing of psychodynamic therapies as opposed to, for example, somatic therapies
- links across the specification, eg, the nature of abnormality (AS)
- different perspectives, eg using other approaches in evaluation
- different methods, eg methods used to assess effectiveness.

Mark Allocations**AO1: Description of the treatment of mental disorders.**

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the treatment of mental disorders by either psychodynamic or cognitive-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).	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of treatment of mental disorders by either psychodynamic or cognitive-behavioural therapies is reasonable . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	11-8
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of treatment of mental disorders by either psychodynamic or cognitive-behavioural therapies is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of treatment of mental disorders by either psychodynamic or cognitive-behavioural therapies is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

AO2: Evaluation of the treatment of mental disorders.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of the treatment of mental disorders by either psychodynamic or cognitive-behavioural therapies is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of the treatment of mental disorders by either psychodynamic or cognitive-behavioural therapies is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation of the treatment of mental disorders by either psychodynamic or cognitive-behavioural therapies is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of the treatment of mental disorders by either psychodynamic or cognitive-behavioural therapies is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

SECTION B: PERSPECTIVES: ISSUES AND DEBATES

4

Total for this question: 30 marks

Discuss gender bias in psychological theories **and/or** studies (eg androcentrism and alpha-beta bias).
(30 marks)

Marking Criteria

Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to describe and evaluate research (theories and/or studies) in terms of gender bias.

Indicative AO1:

Candidates can use theories and/or specific studies to illustrate examples of gender bias. However, detailed descriptions of studies/theories, which do not explicitly focus on the way in which they show gender bias, cannot gain much credit. Candidates can also gain **AO1** credit by describing particular kinds of gender bias (eg alpha and beta biases and androcentrism as suggested in the question).

Indicative AO2:

This part of the answer is an evaluation or assessment of gender bias in psychological research. The critique could be of the various types of bias (eg the consequences of alpha and/or beta bias and/or how these could be addressed). It could also be of specific examples given in the **AO1** description.

Examples of synopticity:

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

- different theoretical perspectives eg gender bias can occur in many different theories
- different methodologies eg, the argument that women perform better in interviews than men because of their better verbal skills
- ethics eg, giving legitimacy to beliefs which may result in prejudice and/or discrimination
- nature-nurture eg, concerning the permanence of gender differences.

Mark Allocations*AO1: Description of gender bias in psychological theories and/or studies.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of gender bias in 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).	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of gender bias in psychological theories and/or studies is reasonable . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	11-8
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of gender bias in psychological theories and/or studies is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of gender bias in psychological theories and/or studies is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

AO2: Evaluation of gender bias in psychological theories and/or studies.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of gender bias in 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 . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of gender bias in psychological theories and/or studies is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation of gender bias in psychological theories and/or studies is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of gender bias in psychological theories and/or studies is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

Discuss **two or more** ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants.
(30 marks)

Marking Criteria

Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate both to describe and evaluate two or more ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants.

Indicative AO1:

There are several ethical issues which could be described: deception, informed consent, privacy, protection from psychological and physical harm, and confidentiality are probably the most likely ones to be offered. There is a requirement to discuss such issues in the context of psychological investigations involving human participants. Material relating to psychological investigations with non-human animals is not acceptable. Candidates sometimes simply describe the main BPS ethical guidelines in a question like this – this is not likely to gain much credit unless it is clearly related to psychological investigations. Candidates who only refer to one ethical issue are partially performing (see mark allocations for AO1). The focus for candidates should be on ethical issues in psychological investigations. Candidates who offer lengthy descriptions of studies will only gain credit insofar as the descriptions engage with the requirements of the question.

Indicative AO2:

The **AO2** here is to evaluate/analyse the ethical issues identified for **AO1** in the context of psychological investigations. The candidate could consider, for example, whether attempts were made by the original researchers to resolve potential ethical issues and how successful such attempts were. They might also consider the viability and contribution of certain studies if ethical guidelines had not been compromised. It would also be acceptable to include an evaluation of the issues specific to socially sensitive research.

Examples of synopticity:

The question has the synoptic feature of ethical issues in psychological research but the following are some additional possibilities.

- links to other parts of the specification eg to social influence studies (AS)
- different perspectives eg examples can be drawn from different areas of psychology
- different methodologies eg the issue of whether ethical issues are more difficult to resolve in certain types of investigation more than others.

Mark Allocations

AO1: *Description of two or more ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants 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).	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants is reasonable . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well detailed (N.B. maximum 9 marks).</i>	11-8
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and not well detailed.</i>	3-0

AO2: *Evaluation of ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation of ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of ethical issues relating to psychological investigations involving human participants is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

6

Total for this question: 30 marks

- (a) Outline what is meant by the terms free will and determinism. (5 marks)
- (b) Discuss free will and determinism in relation to **two or more** psychological theories. (25 marks)

Marking Criteria

(a) *Outline* is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to demonstrate his/her knowledge of what is meant by free will and determinism.

(b) *Discuss* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to describe and evaluate how free will and determinism relate to two or more psychological theories.

Part (a) Indicative AO1:

Determinism according to the Concise Oxford Dictionary is ‘the doctrine that all events, including human actions, are determined by causes external to the will.’ Nothing happens without a cause and everything that happens is a direct and necessary outcome of previous events or conditions. The triggering event might come from the external environment, eg a compliment from a friend or from internal physiological mechanisms, eg the overactivity of a particular neurotransmitter. The key point is that the causes of human actions are *outside the will* of the individual.

An act of free will, on the other hand, is one that is independent of external or internal causes. Advocates of this view believe that humans are capable of self-determination and they do not react in response to external or biological pressures. The assumption is that an individual’s behaviour in a given situation could have been different if the individual had willed it. A determinist would say that the individual’s behaviour could have been predicted by the antecedent events and was, therefore, pre-determined and unchangeable.

Candidates have to give accounts of both terms for full marks.

Part (b) Indicative AO1:

Candidates should describe free will and determinism in relation to two theories for AO1. The question requires a consideration of theories so studies can only be credited where they are used to illustrate assumptions embedded in the theory.

The main pitfall for candidates in answering this question is that they simply describe two psychological theories without relating them to the question. It is also possible that candidates will discuss the free will/determinism debate generally without relating it to psychological theories. In both cases, material can only be credited when it fulfils the requirements of the question.

(NB markers must remember that there are only 10 marks available for AO1 in this part of the question)

Indicative AO2:

This will be an analysis/evaluation of the **AO1** points made. Possibilities include the appropriateness or usefulness of a free will and determinism analysis and what it tells us about human behaviour.

The question requires consideration of at least two psychological theories. If only one is offered, partial performance penalties apply. If more than two are discussed, markers should be aware of the depth/breadth trade-off. Issues of free will and determinism are intertwined and it is highly unlikely that candidates will offer a discussion of one in the absence of the other. Partial performance will, therefore, apply only to the number of theories offered.

Additional synoptic possibilities

The focus of the question is itself synoptic but other synoptic possibilities may be relevantly raised. These include other issues/debates such as psychology as a science and nature-nurture. Links may also be made to other parts of the specification, eg topics within the field of developmental psychology or individual differences.

Mark Allocations**Part (a) AO1: Outline of the terms free will and determinism.**

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 3	Outline of the terms free will and determinism is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	5-4
Band 2	Outline of the terms free will and determinism is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	3-2
Band 1	Outline of the terms free will and determinism is weak and muddled . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.	1-0

Part (b) AO1: Description of free will and determinism in relation to two or more psychological theories.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of free will and determinism 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 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of free will and determinism 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). AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.	8-6
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of free will and determinism in relation to two or more psychological theories is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question. There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS. <i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed (N.B. maximum mark 5 marks).</i>	5-3
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of free will and determinism in relation to two or more psychological theories is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding . The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities. AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS. <i>Partial performance is basic and not well detailed.</i>	2-0

Part (b) AO2: Evaluation of free will and determinism in relation to two or more psychological theories.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	<p>Thorough Evaluation of free will and determinism 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. There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).</p>	15-12
Band 3	<p>Reasonable Evaluation of free will and determinism in relation to two or more psychological theories is limited. The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration. There is evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well detailed. (N.B. maximum 9 marks)</i></p>	11-8
Band 2	<p>Basic Evaluation of free will and determinism in relation to two or more psychological theories is basic. The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration. There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i></p>	7-4
Band 1	<p>Rudimentary Evaluation of free will and determinism in relation to two or more psychological theories is rudimentary. It is weak, muddled and incomplete. The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6). <i>Partial performance is basic and not well detailed.</i></p>	3-0

Discuss the claim that psychology is a science.

(30 marks)

Marking Criteria

Discuss is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires candidates to describe and evaluate the claim that psychology is a science.

AO1:

AO1 marks will be gained by presenting the claim that psychology **is** a science. It can be argued that science is difficult to define because it embraces such a broad range of disciplines and because it is a flexible and changing concept. However, there are certain characteristics which sciences seem to share. These include:

- objectivity
- replicability
- falsifiability
- generation of theory
- generation of predictions
- usage of certain preferred methodologies (eg laboratory experiments).

A description of such criteria is acceptable as **AO1**. Candidates can address any aspect of psychology in order to explore its scientific status. Examples could include specific empirical research or theory. Broader issues such as scientific funding could also be legitimately raised. It is also acceptable for candidates to focus on issues relating to the philosophy of science or to focus on particular research methods.

AO2:

This part of the essay is an evaluative/analytical consideration of the claim described in **AO1**. It is acceptable for arguments **against** the claim that psychology is a science to be counted as **AO2**, provided that the candidate has used the arguments effectively. If arguments against are simply listed/outlined, marks will be limited to Band 3.

Candidates can also earn **AO2** credit by covering broader issues such as whether psychology should aim to be a science at all.

Examples of synopticity

The focus of the question itself is synoptic because it is concerned with a debate in psychology but other synoptic possibilities may be relevantly raised. These include methodologies experimentation, qualitative versus quantitative research and data generation), other issues/debates such as culture bias and the use of non-human animals in psychology. Links may be made to other parts of the specification, eg bio-psychology versus social psychology or humanistic psychology.

Mark Allocations

AO1: *Description of the claim that psychology is a science.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Substantial Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the claim that psychology is a science 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).	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the claim that psychology is a science is reasonable . It is generally accurate and reasonably detailed . The organisation and structure of the answer is reasonably coherent . There is evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities (p.6).	11-8
Band 2	Basic Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the claim that psychology is a science is basic and not well detailed . There is some focus on the question . There is little evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the claim that psychology is a science is rudimentary . It is weak and shows muddled understanding. The answer may be mainly irrelevant to the question's requirement. There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

AO2: *Evaluation of the claim that psychology is a science.*

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of the claim that psychology is a science is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of the claim that psychology is a science is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation of the claim that psychology is a science is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of the claim that psychology is a science is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

SECTION C: PERSPECTIVES; APPROACHES**8****Total for this question: 30 marks**

Television soap operas such as ‘EastEnders’, ‘Hollyoaks’ and ‘Coronation Street’ are long-running programmes about the everyday lives and conflicts of fictional characters and have been popular for a long time. Many people watch them on a regular basis and record episodes on video if they have to miss one for any reason.

- (a) Describe how the popularity of television soap operas might be explained by **two** different approaches. (6 marks + 6 marks)
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations of the popularity of television soap operas in terms of its strengths **and** limitations. (6 marks)
- (c) How might the popularity of television soap operas be investigated by **one** of these approaches? (6 marks)
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating the popularity of television soap operas. (6 marks)

Marking Criteria

The Approaches question requires candidates to show knowledge of two approaches, but, more importantly, to use this knowledge effectively to explain the behaviour outlined in the question.

Possible approaches here are:

Behaviourism: It might be that soap operas are watched because of the positive reinforcement they provide. Given the widespread popularity of many soaps and the broad range of people to whom they appeal, it is likely that the reinforcers will be different for different people. For example, positive reinforcers might include relaxation (they are often scheduled at the time people return home from work or sit down for their evening meal); validation of their own norms and values; for people living alone and/or feeling lonely, it might act as a predictable and comforting companion. Regular programmes such as soaps may also act as behavioural regulators – ie they provide some structure to the day/evening and might act as rewards after unappealing household chores such as washing up or ironing. Negative reinforcement might also play a role – watching programmes in a regular slot on frequent occasions may divert the family from engaging in conflict. Social Learning Theory (SLT) could be offered as an elaboration of the behavioural approach or as a separate explanation. For example, in the absence of extended families, soaps might offer modern families’ role models for behaviour – ie how to deal with conflict with neighbours, difficult teenagers, elderly parents etc.

A psychodynamic approach: The liking for soaps might be explained in terms of defence mechanisms such as displacement and projection. There might be an element of wish fulfilment – watching dramatic events in soaps allows people to act out their fantasies vicariously in a safe environment. Watching soaps may act as a form of catharsis that helps some individuals to release emotions and frustrations.

A biological approach: Some people watch every episode and even video them when they go out or on holiday so that they do not miss a single episode. They also often avidly read newspapers and magazines that include features on the soaps. This could be explained in terms of addictive personality.

Part (a): Candidates must clearly identify 2 approaches. They can take a broad view eg identify the behavioural approach and include a variety of explanations within this such as classical conditioning, operant conditioning and SLT; or, equally, acceptably, they could take a narrower focus and offer traditional learning theory as one approach and SLT as a second. There is obviously a depth/breadth trade-off here.

They must explicitly link the theoretical explanation to the behaviour outlined in the stimulus material. General answers on eg psychodynamic theory without any clear engagement with the stimulus material will be limited to a maximum of 2 marks (**NB** such an account does not automatically attract 2 marks – for that it must be detailed and accurate). For *top band marks*, the answers must engage very specifically with the stimulus material. For example, in this question, it is not watching television per se, but watching a particular kind of programme that needs to be addressed.

The accounts must be plausible. For example, in behavioural theory, classical conditioning can only account for a relatively small range of behaviours and should not attract marks where it is implausible. Similarly, genetic susceptibility is a legitimate way of explaining, for example, an addictive personality, but not for being a fan of ‘Coronation Street’. Where candidates offer more than two explanations, all should be marked and, usually, the best two should be credited. However, the examiner needs to look at parts (b) and (c) as well before deciding what to credit in (a).

Part (b): Candidates can use either of the 2 approaches identified in part (a). They will gain no marks if they assess a completely different approach. Marks will be restricted to Band 1 if the strengths and limitations are not specific to a clearly identified approach.

Candidates must include strengths **and** weaknesses, although not necessarily with equal weight. Where candidates offer only strengths or only limitations, partial performance will apply. Marks are awarded for the extent to which the candidates engage with the material. Where there is no meaningful attempt to engage with the material, a maximum of 2 marks can be awarded. Some candidates may simply add a few words such as ‘watching TV’, but this tactic is not likely to raise a candidate’s mark above Band 1.

Candidates often repeat in part (b) what they have already described in part (a). For example, they might write that ‘The behaviourist explanation is good because it shows that we learn to watch TV soaps through being rewarded or by copying our friends.’ This is simply a rehash of the explanation – the candidate will need to explain exactly why this is ‘good’ to earn credit in part (b).

Part (c): Candidates can choose either of the Approaches offered in part (a), but will gain no marks if they introduce a completely new approach here. The method must be one that could be plausibly used by one of the approaches described in (a). The investigation must embrace the principles of the approach chosen. It is unlikely, for example, that behaviourists would use questionnaires to explore the ‘feelings’ of people watching soap operas on TV.

Candidates sometimes offer descriptions of therapeutic techniques in part (c). Candidates should not describe a treatment or therapy unless it is specifically presented as a way of investigating the behaviour in the stimulus material. It must also be a plausible way of investigating the behaviour. It is inappropriate, for example, to suggest that people require psychoanalytic therapy or systematic desensitisation to ‘cure’ them of watching ‘EastEnders’.

The candidate is not meeting the requirement ‘to demonstrate psychological knowledge’ if the method of investigation is implausible, impractical or completely unethical. No marks can be awarded to answers which describe completely implausible methods. Answers which are substantially implausible can earn up to 2 marks provided there is some part of the method which is appropriate.

To gain Band 3 marks, the answer should be explicitly engaged with the stimulus material, plausible and well detailed in terms of sampling, design, methods etc. The purpose of the investigation should be identifiable.

Part (d): This answer must be related to the method outlined in part (c). There must be consistency between the two parts. For example, candidates who describe random sampling in part (c) should not be credited for evaluating a matched pairs design in part (d).

If the answer to part (c) has gained no marks, examiners should still read part (d) as it may be appropriate to export material to (c). However, if there is nothing that is appropriate to export, no marks can be awarded to part (d).

General evaluations of the underlying *approach* rather than of the *method* will not gain marks. Such evaluation is more appropriate to part (b). However, it cannot be exported from (d) to (b) – exporting can only occur between parts (a) and (b) and parts (c) and (d).

In order to gain Band 3 marks, candidates must explicitly evaluate the use of the method as a way of investigating the popularity of soap opera. Candidates who have described *wholly* implausible or *grossly* unethical methods in (c) cannot gain marks for criticising those aspects of the methods in part (d). The wording of this part of the question does not require a consideration of strengths and limitations so partial performance does not apply.

Question 8 (a)

AO1: For description of each approach.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 3	Psychological content is reasonably thorough and is accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is sustained, coherent and plausible . Appropriate aspects of the approach have been selected.	6-5
Band 2	Psychological content is limited and generally accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable and substantially plausible .	4-3
Band 1	Psychological content is basic and flawed/inaccurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled and/or minimal . If there is no attempt at engagement, marks up to 2 can only be awarded if the psychological content is accurate and thorough.	2-0

Question 8(b)

AO2: For assessment of strengths and limitations of one approach.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Strengths and limitations must be considered, although not necessarily given the same weight. Material has been used in an effective manner. The approach is evaluated in the context of its appropriateness in explaining the stimulus material.	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). There is some attempt to evaluate the explanation in the context of its appropriateness to the stimulus material. <i>If there is partial performance (either strengths or limitations), commentary and evaluation are reasonably thorough. The approach is evaluated in the context of its appropriateness in explaining the stimulus material. Material has been used in an effective manner.</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 (either strengths or limitations), commentary and evaluation is limited. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. There is some attempt to evaluate the explanation in the context of its appropriateness to the stimulus material. No marks can be awarded for an answer which considers only strengths or weaknesses and makes no attempt to engage with the stimulus material.</i>	2-0

Question 8 (c)

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. There is a clear indication of the intentions of the investigation and a reasonably detailed account of how this could be implemented. The method described is plausible as a way of investigating the behaviour in the stimulus material. It is also appropriate to the approach chosen and this approach is identifiable. The method is practicable and if ethical concerns arise, they are minor. There is sustained and coherent engagement with the stimulus material.	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. There is some indication of the intentions of the investigation and a limited account of how these could be effected. The method described is reasonably plausible as a way of investigating the behaviour in the stimulus material. It is reasonably appropriate to the approach chosen and this approach is identifiable. The method is reasonably practicable and, if ethical concerns arise, they are minor. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonably coherent .	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 substantially inappropriate . Engagement with the material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement .	2-0

Question 8 (d)

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. There is explicit reference to the intentions of the investigation offered in (c) and an evaluation of its effectiveness. 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. There is some attempt to refer to the intentions of the investigation offered in (c) and an evaluation of its effectiveness. 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. Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement .	2-0

Cosmetic surgery can be expensive and carries the same risks as any other kind of surgery. In spite of this, it has become increasingly popular in recent years amongst both men and women. People who are dissatisfied with the way they look are often prepared to spend large amounts of money and undergo painful procedures in order to change their appearance (eg change the shape of their nose, remove wrinkles, increase the size of their lips).

- (a) Describe how the popularity of cosmetic surgery might be explained by **two** different approaches. (6 marks + 6 marks)
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations of the popularity of cosmetic surgery in terms of its strengths **and** limitations. (6 marks)
- (c) How might the popularity of cosmetic surgery be investigated by **one** of these approaches? (6 marks)
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating the popularity of cosmetic surgery. (6 marks)

Marking Criteria

Possible approaches here are:

Evolutionary approach: the desire to be attractive and, by inference, younger-looking might be explained in terms of mate selection. The stimulus material refers to the desire for cosmetic surgery in both males and females. Research has shown that males tend to value youth and physical attractiveness highly in females and this could explain why women seek to make themselves look younger and more appealing. Women, on the other hand, have been found to put more of a premium on signs of wealth and status. It could, therefore, be the case that males who have undergone cosmetic surgery, are demonstrating that they have the means to pay for expensive treatments.

Behaviourism: the behaviour could be explained in terms of positive reinforcement, eg compliments from other people, better social or even career opportunities, greater feelings of self-worth. Social Learning Theories (SLT) could explain the behaviour in terms of media role models where the emphasis is on youth and beauty.

Part (a): Candidates must clearly identify two approaches. They can take a broad view eg identify the behavioural approach and include a variety of explanations within this such as operant conditioning and SLT; or, equally, acceptably, they could take a narrower focus and offer traditional learning theory as one approach and SLT as a second. There is obviously a depth/breadth trade-off here.

They must explicitly link the theoretical explanation to the behaviour outlined in the stimulus material. General answers on eg evolutionary theory without any clear engagement with the stimulus material will be limited to a maximum of 2 marks (**NB** such an account does not automatically attract 2 marks – for that it must be detailed and accurate). For *top band marks*, the answers must engage very specifically with the stimulus material.

The accounts must be plausible. For example, in behavioural theory, classical conditioning can only account for a relatively small range of behaviours and should not attract marks where it is implausible. Where candidates offer more than two explanations, all should be marked and, usually, the best two should be credited. However, the examiner needs to look at parts (b) and (c) as well before deciding what to credit in (a).

Part (b): Candidates can use either of the two approaches identified in part (a). They will gain no marks if they assess a completely different approach. Marks will be restricted to Band 1 if the strengths and limitations are not specific to a clearly identified approach.

Candidates must include strengths and limitations, although not necessarily with equal weight. Where candidates offer only strengths or only limitations, partial performance will apply. Marks are awarded for the extent to which the candidates engage with the material. Where there is no meaningful attempt to engage with the material, a maximum of 2 marks can be awarded. Some candidates may simply add a few words such as ‘having cosmetic surgery’, but this tactic is not likely to raise a candidate’s mark above Band 1.

Candidates often repeat in part (b) what they have already described in part (a). For example, they might write that ‘The behaviourist explanation is good because it shows that we learn to want younger looking bodies through being rewarded or by copying media figures.’ This is simply a rehash of the explanation – the candidate will need to explain exactly why this is ‘good’ to earn credit in part (b).

Part (c): Candidates can choose either of the Approaches offered in part (a), but will gain no marks if they introduce a completely new approach here. The method must be one that could plausibly be used by one of the Approaches described in (a).

The investigation must embrace the principles of the approach chosen. It is unlikely, for example, that behaviourists would use questionnaires to explore the ‘feelings’ of people undergoing cosmetic surgery. Candidates sometimes offer descriptions of therapeutic techniques in part (c). Candidates should not describe a treatment or therapy unless it is specifically related to investigating the behaviour in the stimulus material. It must also be a plausible way of investigating the behaviour. It is inappropriate, for example, to suggest that people require psychoanalytic therapy or systematic desensitisation to ‘cure’ them of having cosmetic surgery, unless, perhaps, it has been explained in terms of unhealthy obsessive behaviour.

The candidate is not meeting the requirement ‘to demonstrate psychological knowledge’ if the method of investigation is implausible, impractical or completely unethical. No marks can be awarded to answers which describe completely implausible methods. Answers which are substantially implausible can earn up to 2 marks provided there is some part of the method which is appropriate.

To gain Band 3 marks, the answer should be explicitly engaged with the stimulus material, plausible and well detailed in terms of sampling, design, methods etc. The purpose of the investigation should be identifiable.

Part (d): This answer must be related to the method outlined in part (c). There must be consistency between the two parts. For example, candidates who describe random sampling in part (c) should not be credited for evaluating a matched pairs design in part (d).

If the answer to part (c) has gained no marks, examiners should still read part (d) as it may be appropriate to export material to (c). However, if there is nothing that is appropriate to export, no marks can be awarded to part (d). General evaluations of the underlying *approach* rather than of the *method* will not gain marks. Such evaluation is more appropriate to part (b). However, it cannot be exported from (d) to (b) – exporting can only occur between parts (a) and (b) and parts (c) and (d)

In order to gain Band 3 marks, candidates must explicitly evaluate the use of the method as a way of investigating the desire for cosmetic surgery. Candidates who have described *wholly* implausible or *grossly* unethical methods in (c) cannot gain marks for criticising these aspects of the methods in part (d). The wording of this part of the question does not require a consideration of strengths and limitations so partial performance does not apply.

Question 9 (a)

AO1: For description of each approach.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 3	Psychological content is reasonably thorough and is accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is sustained, coherent and plausible . Appropriate aspects of the approach have been selected.	6-5
Band 2	Psychological content is limited and generally accurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable and substantially plausible .	4-3
Band 1	Psychological content is basic/ flawed and inaccurate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled and/or minimal . If there is no attempt at engagement, marks up to 2 can only be awarded if the psychological content is accurate and thorough.	2-0

Question 9 (b)

AO2: For assessment of strengths and limitations of one approach.

Band	Mark Allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Strengths and limitations must be considered, although not necessarily given the same weight. Material has been used in an effective manner. The approach is evaluated in the context of its appropriateness in explaining the stimulus material.	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). There is some attempt to evaluate the explanation in the context of its appropriateness to the stimulus material. <i>If there is partial performance (either strengths or limitations), commentary and evaluation are reasonably thorough. The approach is evaluated in the context of its appropriateness in explaining the stimulus material. Material has been used in an effective manner.</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 (either strengths or limitations), commentary and evaluation is limited. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. There is some attempt to evaluate the explanation in the context of its appropriateness to the stimulus material. No marks can be awarded for an answer which considers only strengths or weaknesses and makes no attempt to engage with the stimulus material.</i>	2-0

Question 9 (c)

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. There is a clear indication of the intentions of the investigation and a reasonably detailed account of how this could be implemented. The method described is plausible as a way of investigating the behaviour in the stimulus material. It is also appropriate to the approach chosen and this approach is identifiable. The method is practicable and if ethical concerns arise, they are minor. There is sustained and coherent engagement with the stimulus material.	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. There is some indication of the intention of the investigation and a limited account of how these could be effected. The method described is reasonably plausible as a way of investigating the behaviour in the stimulus material. It is reasonably appropriate to the approach chosen and this approach is identifiable. The method is reasonably practicable and, if ethical concerns arise, they are minor. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonably coherent .	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 substantially inappropriate . Engagement with the material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement .	2-0

Question 9 (d)

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. There is explicit reference to the intentions of the investigation offered in (c) and an evaluation of its effectiveness. 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. There is some attempt to refer to the intentions of the investigation offered in (c) and an evaluation of its effectiveness. 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. Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled, minimal or there is no engagement .	2-0

Assessment Grid

Question	AO1	AO2
1	15	15
2(a)	5	
2(b)	10	15
3	15	15
4	15	15
5	15	15
6 (a)	5	
6(b)	10	15
7	15	15
8 (a)	12	
8 (b)		6
8 (c)		6
8 (d)		6
9 (a)	12	
9 (b)		6
9 (c)		6
9 (d)		6
QoWC	4	
Total marks for 3 questions	42	48
Total marks for paper	46	48