



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **Psychology 6181**

## *Specification A*

### **Unit 5 (PYA5)**

### **Individual Differences and Perspectives**

# **Mark Scheme**

*2007 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

---

**QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION  
(QoWC)**

|               |   |                      |
|---------------|---|----------------------|
| <b>Band 3</b> | The work is characterised by some or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• clear expression of ideas</li><li>• use of a good range of specialist terms</li><li>• few errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li></ul> | <b>4-3<br/>marks</b> |
| <b>Band 2</b> | The work is characterised by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• reasonable expression of ideas</li><li>• the use of some specialist terms</li><li>• reasonable grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li></ul>                                   | <b>2-1<br/>marks</b> |
| <b>Band 1</b> | The work is characterised by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• poor expression of ideas</li><li>• the use of a limited range of specialist terms</li><li>• poor grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li></ul>                                 | <b>0 marks</b>       |

### **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 for 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 (questions 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**

- (a) Describe the major characteristics of **two** culture-bound syndromes (eg Koro, Dhat).  
(5 marks + 5 marks)
- (b) Briefly outline arguments **for** the existence of such culture-bound syndromes and evaluate the strength of these arguments. (20 marks)

**Marking Criteria**

**Part (a)** ‘Describe’ is an AO1 term which requires the candidate to offer a descriptive account of two culture-bound syndromes.

**Part (b)** ‘Outline’ is an AO1 term which requires the candidate to present a brief, summary description of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes. ‘Evaluate’ is an AO2 term which requires the candidate to present evidence of AO2 relating to the strength of arguments in favour of culture-bound syndromes.

**Part (a) AO1**

There are several culture-bound syndromes that have been described eg amok, latah, piblokto, windigo, and outlines of any one of these conditions would be acceptable here. However, since Koro and Dhat are mentioned on the specification, these are the most likely ones to be offered. Characteristics can include:

- *the signs and symptoms of the disorder* eg in Koro, the fear that the penis will withdraw into the abdomen causing death or, in women, the fear that shrinkage of the vulva or breast will lead to death
- *the additional complications caused by the disorder* eg in Koro, the physical damage that can arise from panic attempts to stop the genitalia from shrinking
- *the country/culture associated with the disorder* eg in Koro, China and south-east Asia, and, in rare cases, in western cultures
- possible explanations for the disorder, eg in Koro, its association with culturally-elaborated fears of sexual overindulgence.

Candidates would not be expected to outline all the above characteristics for full marks and examiners should be mindful that candidates only have a few minutes to answer this part of the question.

NB: There is a case to be made for considering the eating disorders, anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa as culture-bound syndromes.

**Part (b): AO1**

Candidates are required here to outline the arguments for the existence of such disorders. Such arguments include the views that:

- certain syndromes exist which cannot be found in the established diagnosis and classification systems
- these syndromes are closely associated with particular populations in specific cultural areas.

Candidates could also legitimately outline the positions described by Berry *et al* (1992) that support the existence of culture-bound syndromes (CBS), ie the culturally relative and, to a lesser extent, the universal positions.

**NB: there are only 5 marks available for AO1 material in this part of the question.**

**Part (b) AO2**

Candidates are required here to evaluate the strength of the arguments for the existence of CBS. They could gain AO2 credit, for example, by challenging the idea that culture-bound syndromes are significantly different from syndromes classified by DSM and/or ICD; by evaluating the universal, absolutist and culturally-relativist positions; by looking at specific disorders and offering commentary on how well they fit the criteria for culture-bound syndromes.

**Part (a) AO1: Outline of one culture-bound syndrome (2 x 5 marks)**

**Mark allocations**

**Part (a) AO1: Outline of one culture-bound syndrome.**

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>  | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| <b>Band 3</b> | Outline of one culture-bound syndrome is <b>reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.          | <b>5-4</b>   |
| <b>Band 2</b> | Outline of one culture-bound syndrome is <b>limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS. | <b>3-2</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | Outline of one culture-bound syndrome is <b>weak and muddled</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.                                    | <b>1-0</b>   |

**Part (b) AO1: Outline of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes.**

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>  | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| <b>Band 3</b> | Outline of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is <b>reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.          | <b>5-4</b>   |
| <b>Band 2</b> | Outline of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is <b>limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS. | <b>3-2</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | Outline of arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is <b>weak and muddled</b> . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.                                    | <b>1-0</b>   |

**Part (b) AO2:** *Evaluation of the strength of the arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes.*

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>   | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|--|--------------|
| <b>Band 4</b> | <p><b>Thorough</b></p> <p>Evaluation of the strength of the arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is <b>thorough</b>. The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b>. There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.</p> | <b>15-12</b> |
| <b>Band 3</b> | <p><b>Reasonable</b></p> <p>Evaluation of the strength of the arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is <b>limited</b>. The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration</b>. There is <b>evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.</p>      | <b>11-8</b>  |
| <b>Band 2</b> | <p><b>Basic</b></p> <p>Evaluation of the strength of the arguments for culture-bound syndromes is <b>basic</b>. The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner and shows <b>some evidence of elaboration</b>. There is <b>some evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.</p>   | <b>7-4</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | <p><b>Rudimentary</b></p> <p>Evaluation of the strength of the arguments for the existence of culture-bound syndromes is <b>rudimentary</b>. It is <b>weak, muddled and incomplete</b>. The material is <b>not used effectively</b> and may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b>. There is <b>little or no evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.</p>    | <b>3-0</b>   |

‘Psychological research has shown that people are much more likely to experience depression now than a hundred years ago. One explanation is that modern life involves high levels of stress and psychological pressures.’

Discuss the view that depression can be explained primarily by psychological factors.

(30 marks)

### Marking Criteria

‘Discuss’ is an AO1 and AO2 term which requires the candidate to describe and evaluate the arguments that depression can be explained primarily by psychological factors.

#### AO1

The requirement here is to describe various psychological explanations of depression. Candidates are most likely to describe the psychoanalytic, behavioural and cognitive theories of depression. It would also be legitimate to describe the diathesis-stress model including the ‘lock and key’ hypothesis. The question does not specifically ask for more than one psychological explanation of depression, so candidates could access the top mark band by describing only one, eg the behavioural account. There is a depth/breadth trade-off here so that candidates describing only one theory would need to include more detailed description than candidates offering more than one.

The question only requires a description of *psychological* explanations. One pitfall for candidates is that they describe biological explanations rather than, or in addition to, psychological theories. These explanations cannot gain AO1 credit.

#### AO2

It is likely that candidates will offer an evaluation/analysis of the explanations described for AO1. However, they could legitimately consider the appropriateness/effectiveness of other psychological explanations not explicitly described in their answer. There is no requirement in this question to refer to the quotation, but candidates could gain AO2 credit by discussing evidence relating to the effects of stressful life-events on vulnerability to depression eg Brown and Harris (1978). Candidates can also access AO2 marks by referring to the word ‘primarily’ in the question and discussing the problems associated with trying to identify a single cause of such a complex disorder.

The point made in AO1 above about the pitfall of including irrelevant material applies here as well. Candidates can use biological explanations to evaluate psychological theories, but they must use the material as sustained critical commentary. To gain credit, answers must consistently relate biological theories to the issue raised in the question, ie the validity of the psychological perspective. Candidates who simply describe biological theories and then evaluate them on their own merits without reference to the question cannot gain marks.

**AO1: Description of psychological explanations of depression.**

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>  | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| <b>Band 4</b> | <b>Substantial</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of psychological explanations of depression is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.       | <b>15-12</b> |
| <b>Band 3</b> | <b>Reasonable</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of psychological explanations of depression is <b>reasonable</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure are <b>reasonably coherent</b> . There is <b>evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.        | <b>11-8</b>  |
| <b>Band 2</b> | <b>Basic</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of psychological explanations of depression is <b>basic</b> and <b>not well detailed</b> . There is <b>some focus on the question</b> . There is <b>little</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.   | <b>7-4</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | <b>Rudimentary</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of psychological explanations of depression is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities. | <b>3-0</b>   |

**AO2: Evaluation of psychological explanations of depression.**

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>  | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| <b>Band 4</b> | <b>Thorough</b><br>Evaluation of psychological explanations of depression is <b>thorough</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities. | <b>15-12</b> |
| <b>Band 3</b> | <b>Reasonable</b><br>Evaluation of psychological explanations of depression is <b>limited</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . There is <b>evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.      | <b>11-8</b>  |
| <b>Band 2</b> | <b>Basic</b><br>Evaluation of psychological explanations of depression is <b>basic</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner and shows <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.  | <b>7-4</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | <b>Rudimentary</b><br>Evaluation of psychological explanations of depression is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak, muddled and incomplete</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> and may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> . There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.   | <b>3-0</b>   |

---

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

Describe and evaluate therapies derived from **either** the psychodynamic **or** the cognitive-behavioural models of abnormality. *(30 marks)*

### Marking Criteria

‘Describe’ is an AO1 term which requires the candidate to present a descriptive account of *either* psychodynamic *or* cognitive-behavioural therapies.

‘Evaluate’ is an AO2 term which requires the candidate to give evidence of AO2 in relation to the therapy/ies described for AO1.

#### AO1

Candidates are required to choose **either** psychodynamic **or** cognitive-behavioural therapies. Candidates who describe both types of therapy should gain credit for the one they describe more effectively. Candidates are most likely to describe the therapies given as examples on the specification, ie psychoanalysis and psychodrama or rational-emotive therapy and stress inoculation therapy. However, other therapies derived from the two models are perfectly acceptable, eg transactional analysis or Beck’s restructuring cognitive therapy.

Cognitive-behavioural therapies are not the same as traditional behavioural therapies (ie those based on classical and operant conditioning) and they occur in different sub-sections of the specification. Candidates who describe therapies such as flooding and token economies can gain no credit.

It is unlikely that candidates will describe only one therapy, but the wording of the question does not preclude this interpretation and so partial performance does not apply. Examiners should, however, be mindful of the depth-breadth trade-off here.

#### AO2

Candidates are required to evaluate the therapy/ies described for AO1. Candidates who discuss other types of therapy can only gain marks if this material is used explicitly to evaluate the psychodynamic or cognitive-behavioural therapy. The material must be used as sustained critical commentary. Free-standing accounts and evaluations of other types of therapy can gain no credit.

Examiners should remember that the evaluation has to relate to the therapy and not to the underlying approach/model. Candidates can only gain credit for evaluation of the model where this is made explicitly relevant to the therapy.

It is likely that candidates will evaluate therapies with regard to their appropriateness and effectiveness as suggested on the specification. However, it is perfectly acceptable for them to consider other issues such as ethical considerations.

**AO1:** Description of therapies derived from either the psychodynamic or the cognitive-behavioural models of abnormality.

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

**AO2:** Evaluation of therapies derived from either the psychodynamic or cognitive-behavioural models of abnormality.

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

---

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

|  |
|--|
| Discuss <b>two or more</b> examples of gender bias in psychological studies. |
|--|

|                   |
|-------------------|
| <i>(30 marks)</i> |
|-------------------|

**Marking Criteria**

‘Discuss’ is an AO1 and AO2 term which requires the candidate to describe and evaluate two or more examples of gender bias in psychological studies.

**AO1**

The candidate is required to describe two or more examples of gender bias in psychological studies. Examiners should be mindful of the depth/breadth trade-off here, depending on whether the candidate offers the minimum number of examples or not.

The requirement here is for examples in psychological studies so material on bias in theories cannot gain AO1 credit.

The focus of this question is on gender bias – detailed descriptions of psychological studies with no reference to their inherent bias will gain little credit.

It is acceptable for candidates to describe types of gender bias, eg alpha/beta bias and androcentrism for AO1 marks, provided that they place their descriptions in the context of psychological studies. Candidates can gain credit for describing the same type of bias, eg beta bias, providing they refer to two or more studies. However, partial performance applies to answers where, for example, only one type of bias is described in only one study.

Candidates can also gain credit where they refer to examples of gender bias in psychological studies without making explicit reference to specific studies.

Examiners should be mindful that the focus of this question is on examples of gender bias and **not** gender differences. No credit should be awarded for the latter unless the material is made explicitly relevant. Maximum of 9 marks if only one example is described.

**AO2**

Candidates are required to offer commentary/evaluation on examples of gender bias in psychological studies. They are not being asked to evaluate the studies per se and methodological/ethical criticisms will only gain credit if they are relevant to the issue of gender bias. Possible ways of gaining AO2 credit include discussion of factors such as research design, experimenter effects, selection of participants, drawing erroneous conclusions, publication bias, political/social consequences etc. Candidates could also gain AO2 marks by considering how gender bias could be prevented or lessened in future research.

**AO1: Description of two or more examples of gender bias psychological studies.**

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>  | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| <b>Band 4</b> | <b>Substantial</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological studies is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.   | <b>15-12</b> |
| <b>Band 3</b> | <b>Reasonable</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological studies is <b>reasonable</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure are <b>reasonably coherent</b> . There is <b>evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.<br><i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well detailed (NB maximum 9 marks).</i> | <b>11-8</b>  |
| <b>Band 2</b> | <b>Basic</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological studies is <b>basic</b> and <b>not well detailed</b> . There is <b>some focus on the question</b> . There is <b>little</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.<br><i>Partial performance is reasonable, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>  | <b>7-4</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | <b>Rudimentary</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more examples of gender bias in psychological studies is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.<br><i>Partial performance is basic and not well detailed.</i>                           | <b>3-0</b>   |

**AO2: Commentary on two or more examples of gender bias in psychological studies.**

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>  | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| <b>Band 4</b> | <b>Thorough</b><br>Commentary on two or more examples of gender bias in psychological studies is <b>thorough</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.   | <b>15-12</b> |
| <b>Band 3</b> | <b>Reasonable</b><br>Commentary on two or more examples of gender bias in psychological studies is <b>limited</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . There is <b>evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.<br><i>Partial performance is thorough, highly effective and shows appropriate selection and coherent elaboration (NB maximum 9 marks).</i> | <b>11-8</b>  |
| <b>Band 2</b> | <b>Basic</b><br>Commentary on two or more examples of gender bias in psychological studies is <b>basic</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner and shows <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.<br><i>Partial performance is limited. The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonable selection and elaboration.</i>                            | <b>7-4</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | <b>Rudimentary</b><br>Commentary on two or more examples of gender bias in psychological studies is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak, muddled and incomplete</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> and may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> . There is <b>little or no evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.<br><i>Partial performance is basic. The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration.</i>             | <b>3-0</b>   |

- (a) Describe constraints on the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations. (15 marks)
- (b) Evaluate arguments **against** the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations. (15 marks)

### Marking Criteria

**Part (a)** ‘Describe’ is an AO1 term that requires the candidate to provide a descriptive account of some of the constraints on the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations.

**Part (b)** ‘Evaluate’ is an AO2 term that requires the candidate to present evidence of AO2 in relation to arguments against the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations.

#### Part (a) AO1

There are several constraints on the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations. These fall into the following broad categories:

- legislation eg the Animals Scientific Procedures Act
- codes of conduct eg the BPS code
- systems for determining research criteria, eg Bateson’s decision cube
- scientific.

It would also be acceptable for candidates to outline factors such as popular opinion and the pressure exerted by animal rights activists. However, they need to explain this in the context of psychological investigations. For example, descriptions of public opposition to the use of animals in cosmetics research would not gain any marks.

Candidates are not required in this part of the question to give descriptions of psychological investigations that have involved non-human animals and it is unlikely that straight descriptions of studies could gain any AO1 credit.

#### Part (b) AO2

This part of the question requires evaluation of the arguments against the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations. There are no AO1 marks available for this part of the question so, although candidates will need to identify arguments against animal use, they will not be rewarded for long descriptive accounts. The focus should be on weighing up the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments against the use of animals.

Examiners should be mindful of the requirement to discuss the arguments in the context of psychological investigations. General answers on the arguments against the use of non-human animals which make no reference to psychological investigations will be restricted to Band 2.

Candidates do not need to refer explicitly to psychological studies/theories to illustrate their answer, but they must make their arguments relevant ie examples from cosmetic research would not be creditworthy.

**Part (a) AO1:** *Description of constraints on the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations.*

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>   | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|--|--------------|
| <b>Band 4</b> | <b>Substantial</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of constraints on the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.       | <b>15-12</b> |
| <b>Band 3</b> | <b>Reasonable</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of constraints on the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>reasonable</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure is <b>reasonably coherent</b> . There is <b>evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.         | <b>11-8</b>  |
| <b>Band 2</b> | <b>Basic</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of constraints on the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>basic</b> and <b>not well detailed</b> . There is <b>some focus on the question</b> . There is <b>little</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.   | <b>7-4</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | <b>Rudimentary</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of constraints on the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities. | <b>3-0</b>   |

**Part (b) AO2:** *Evaluation of the arguments against the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations.*

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>  | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| <b>Band 4</b> | <b>Thorough</b><br>Evaluation of the arguments against the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>thorough</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities. | <b>15-12</b> |
| <b>Band 3</b> | <b>Reasonable</b><br>Evaluation of the arguments against the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>limited</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . There is <b>evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.      | <b>11-8</b>  |
| <b>Band 2</b> | <b>Basic</b><br>Evaluation of arguments against the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>basic</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner and shows <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.  | <b>7-4</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | <b>Rudimentary</b><br>Evaluation of arguments against the use of non-human animals in psychological investigations is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak, muddled and incomplete</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> and may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> . There is <b>little or no evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.       | <b>3-0</b>   |

6

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

- (a) Explain what is meant by the terms *free will* and *determinism*. (5 marks)
- (b) ‘Free will is simply an illusion. All our behaviour is determined by factors outside our direct control.’  
Discuss the view that human behaviour can be explained purely in terms of determinism.  
Use examples from psychological research in your answer. (25 marks)

**Marking Criteria**

‘Explain’ is an AO1 term which requires candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of what is meant by the terms *free will* and *determinism*.

‘Discuss’ is an AO1 and AO2 term which requires the candidate to describe and evaluate the view that behaviour is determined.

**Part (a) AO1**

The requirement here is for an explanation of what is meant by the terms free will and determinism. Candidates need to explain both in order to gain full marks, although they do not have to give equal weight to each. Examiners should bear in mind that the allocation of marks is only 5, so it is unreasonable to expect particularly detailed answers.

**Part (b) AO1**

Candidates are required to describe determinism in psychological research. They can use psychological theories and/or studies to illustrate their accounts. However, descriptions of research will only gain credit if they make the link to determinism explicit. It is perfectly acceptable for candidates to offer descriptions of different types of determinism, eg psychic determinism, environmental determinism, or to make the distinction between hard and soft determinism. They could mention the increasing evidence that supports the genetic influence on human behaviour (eg the human genome project); the basis of science on the belief that events have a cause and effect; the idea that free will is simply an aspect of behaviour that is controlled by the brain, etc.

**Examiners should remember that there is a maximum of 10 marks for the AO1 in part (b).**

**Part (b) AO2**

Candidates are required to evaluate the arguments for determinism. They could, for example, question the assumption that genetic causes will be found for all behaviour; challenge the view that psychology needs to embrace scientific values; discuss the over-simplification of human behaviour that underlies deterministic explanations, etc.

**Part (a) AO1: Explanation of the free will/determinism debate.**

| Band   | Mark Allocation  | Marks |
|--------|--|-------|
| Band 3 | Explanation of the free will/determinism debate is <b>reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent</b> .<br>AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.          | 5-4   |
| Band 2 | Explanation of the free will/determinism debate is <b>limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent</b> .<br>AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS. | 3-2   |
| Band 1 | Explanation of the free will/determinism debate is <b>weak and muddled</b> .<br>AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS.                                    | 1-0   |

**Part (b) AO1: Description of the view that behaviour is determined.**

| Band   | Mark Allocation  | Marks |
|--------|--|-------|
| Band 4 | <b>Substantial</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the view that behaviour is determined is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial</b> evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.<br>AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.           | 10-9  |
| Band 3 | <b>Reasonable</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the view that behaviour is determined is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>reasonably</b> constructed. There is some evidence of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.<br>AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS. | 8-6   |
| Band 2 | <b>Basic</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the view that behaviour is determined is <b>basic and not well detailed</b> . There is <b>some focus</b> on the question. There is <b>little</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.<br>AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.   | 5-3   |
| Band 1 | <b>Rudimentary</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the view that behaviour is determined is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled understanding</b> . The answer may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.<br>AS APPROPRIATE FOR 10 MARKS.    | 2-0   |

**Part (b): AO2: Evaluation of the view that behaviour is determined.**

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

Discuss assumptions made about nature and nurture in psychological research. (30 marks)

### Marking Criteria

'Discuss' is an AO1 and AO2 term which requires the candidate to describe and evaluate assumptions made about nature and nurture in psychological research.

#### AO1

The candidate is required to describe the assumptions made about nature and nurture. These include (nature):

- any particular characteristic have evolved because of its survival value
- we are born with certain characteristics which determine our behaviour
- people are similar/different because of their genetic inheritance.

(nurture):

- we learn our behaviour through a process of conditioning and social learning
- we are able to change our behaviour depending on our reinforcement schedules
- people are similar/different because of their experiences.

(interaction):

- genes and environment interact
- the relationship between genes and environment can be passive, evocative or active
- the same genotype can determine different phenotypes depending on environmental influences.

Candidates can use appropriate psychological studies/theories to illustrate these points. However, straight descriptions of studies/theories with no reference to assumptions about nature and nurture cannot gain credit.

#### AO2

Candidates are required to evaluate the assumptions made about nature and nurture in *psychological research* and, in order to gain marks in the higher bands, they need to embed their evaluation in a psychological context. Candidates can gain AO2 credit by challenging some of the assumptions, for example, Skinner's belief that the acquisition of language in humans is solely attributable to learning or Gibson's views on direct perception. They could also discuss the relationship between nature and nurture, for example by exploring the diathesis-stress model of abnormal behaviour.

Note: Partial performance criteria do not apply to this question.

**AO1: Description of assumptions made about nature and nurture in psychological research.**

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>   | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|--|--------------|
| <b>Band 4</b> | <b>Substantial</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of assumptions made about nature and nurture is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer are <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.       | <b>15-12</b> |
| <b>Band 3</b> | <b>Reasonable</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of assumptions made about nature and nurture is <b>reasonable</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure are <b>reasonably coherent</b> . There is <b>evidence</b> of breadth/depth and synoptic possibilities.        | <b>11-8</b>  |
| <b>Band 2</b> | <b>Basic</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of assumptions made about nature and nurture is <b>basic</b> and <b>not well detailed</b> . There is <b>some focus on the question</b> . There is <b>little</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities.   | <b>7-4</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | <b>Rudimentary</b><br>Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of assumptions made about nature and nurture is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. There is <b>little or no</b> evidence of synoptic possibilities. | <b>3-0</b>   |

**AO2: Evaluation of some of the assumptions made about nature and nurture in psychological research.**

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>   | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|--|--------------|
| <b>Band 4</b> | <b>Thorough</b><br>Evaluation of assumptions made about nature and nurture is <b>thorough</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities. | <b>15-12</b> |
| <b>Band 3</b> | <b>Reasonable</b><br>Evaluation of assumptions made about nature and nurture is <b>limited</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . There is <b>evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.      | <b>11-8</b>  |
| <b>Band 2</b> | <b>Basic</b><br>Evaluation of assumptions made about nature and nurture is <b>basic</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner and shows <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.  | <b>7-4</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | <b>Rudimentary</b><br>Evaluation of assumptions made about nature and nurture is <b>rudimentary</b> . It is <b>weak, muddled and incomplete</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> and may be <b>mainly irrelevant</b> . There is <b>little or no evidence</b> of synoptic possibilities.   | <b>3-0</b>   |

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

Some young people enjoy smoking cigarettes in spite of the expense and the health warnings printed on the packets. They also seem to ignore government advertising campaigns which try to highlight the dangers of smoking.

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

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

People have shown a lot of interest in home and garden make-overs, and there are many television programmes and magazines devoted to this topic. Some people spend significant amounts of money every year on buying items to improve their homes and gardens.

- (a) Describe how the interest in home and garden improvement might be explained by **two** different approaches. *(6 marks + 6 marks)*
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations of the interest in garden and home improvement in terms of its strengths and limitations. *(6 marks)*
- (c) How might the interest in home and garden improvement be investigated by **one** of these approaches? *(6 marks)*
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating the interest in home and garden improvement. *(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 for Question 8

*Psychodynamic approach:* smoking could be explained in terms of an orally dependent personality – a child might have been fixated at the oral stage of development either because of over-gratification or frustration. Either way, the adolescent seeks a symbolic substitute for the pleasure derived from sucking, and smoking fulfils that role. Smoking, therefore, becomes a means of prolonging the oral stage of development either to make up for lost opportunities in the case of people deprived of oral gratification or, for those who have been overindulged, to maintain the experience of pleasurable stimulation. The pleasure associated with smoking could be offset by the anxiety caused by adverse health warnings. Smokers, however, derive such enjoyment and comfort from smoking that they are reluctant to give it up and so use the defence mechanism of denial to protect themselves from acknowledging the health risks. There is some evidence that orally-fixated people favour defence mechanisms such as denial and projection whereby they try to change reality.

*Biological approach:* according to this approach, smoking could be explained in terms of physiological needs. Adolescence is a time of stress and anxiety brought about by the physical and emotional changes that occur in puberty. Young people might begin to smoke as it helps them to relax and unwind. Nicotine results in increased transmission of neurotransmitters such as dopamine, serotonin, noradrenaline and endorphins and these effects could bring about temporary relief from anxiety symptoms. Once the habit of smoking has started, there can be changes in biochemical functioning, eg in the endogenous opioid system, that lead to an increased likelihood of developing nicotine dependence. This explains why the habit might be maintained in spite of adverse publicity. There is also some evidence for a genetic vulnerability to nicotine dependence.

It is also possible to explain this behaviour in terms of, for example, behavioural and cognitive approaches.

### Possible approaches for Question 9

*Behavioural approach:* it might be that people improve their homes/gardens because of the positive reinforcement they gain from doing so. The positive reinforcement could take the form of increased self-esteem as a result of having a beautiful home and/or garden; or it could be the compliments/envy of neighbours and friends. People who do the work themselves instead of paying others to do it might be rewarded by a sense of achievement, or even pleasure in having saved themselves money. The home improvements could also add significant value to the house and so increase its selling price, which would act as a tangible reward. It is highly unlikely that this behaviour could be explained by classical conditioning.

Social learning theory could be offered as an extension of behavioural theory or as a free-standing explanation. The question refers to the popularity of television and magazine features on house and garden make-overs and this could be used by candidates as a basis for explaining the behaviour in terms of imitation. There are also numerous magazines, newspapers etc that have features showing the homes of celebrities and these could also act as aspirational models.

*Evolutionary approach:* this behaviour could be explained in adaptive terms. People who enhance their homes and gardens are striving to produce the best possible environments for raising their families. Men who are good at practical tasks such as gardening and building would be seen as attractive mates because they can provide protection for their families. Women who are good home-makers would be seen as attractive mates because they are likely to be strong, nurturing mothers and wives.

It is also possible to explain this behaviour in terms of, for example, psychoanalytic, humanist or cognitive approaches.

**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 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.

Candidates 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 are 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 smoking per se, but the enjoyment of smoking by young people.

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, certain aspects of personality or aptitude (eg practicality), but not for ‘carrying out DIY projects’. 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 part (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 identifiable 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 ‘enjoying smoking’, 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 smoke because we are rewarded or by copying our friends.’ This is simply a rehash of the explanation – the candidate will need to explain 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 part (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 who are interested in DIY, although, in some circumstances, it would be legitimate to use questionnaires within the behavioural approach.

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 gardening.

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 part (c).

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 part (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 why (Qu.8) young people enjoy smoking or (Qu.9) people want to improve their homes/gardens. 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.

---

**Mark allocations for Questions 8 and 9**
**Question 8 and 9 Part (a) AO1:** *For description of each approach.*

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

**Question 8 and 9 Part (b) AO2:** *For assessment of strengths and limitations of one approach.*

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>  | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| <b>Band 3</b> | There is <b>reasonably thorough</b> commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). Strengths <b>and</b> limitations must be considered, although not necessarily given the same weight. Material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner. The approach is <b>evaluated</b> in the context of its appropriateness in explaining the stimulus material.   | <b>6-5</b>   |
| <b>Band 2</b> | There is <b>limited</b> commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). There is <b>some attempt</b> to evaluate the explanation in the context of its appropriateness to the stimulus material.<br><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>   | <b>4-3</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | There is <b>basic</b> commentary and evaluation of one of the approaches given in (a). The material has been used in a <b>restricted</b> manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>muddled or minimal, or the commentary/evaluation is sound but there is no engagement with the stimulus material</b> .<br><i>If there is partial performance (either strengths or limitations), commentary and evaluation are 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> | <b>2-0</b>   |

**Question 8 and 9 Part (c) AO2: For one approach investigating the phenomenon.**

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>   | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|--|--------------|
| <b>Band 3</b> | There is <b>reasonably thorough</b> commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. There is a <b>clear indication</b> of the intentions of the investigation and a reasonably detailed account of how this could be implemented. The method described is <b>plausible</b> as a way of investigating the behaviour in the stimulus material. It is also <b>appropriate</b> to the approach chosen and this approach is identifiable. The method is <b>practicable</b> and if ethical concerns arise, they are minor. There is <b>sustained and coherent</b> engagement with the stimulus material. | <b>6-5</b>   |
| <b>Band 2</b> | There is <b>limited</b> commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. There is <b>some indication</b> of the intentions of the investigation and a limited account of how these could be effected. The method described is <b>reasonably plausible</b> 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 <b>reasonably practicable</b> and, if ethical concerns arise, they are minor. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>reasonably coherent</b> .                | <b>4-3</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | There is <b>basic</b> commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is <b>substantially</b> inappropriate. Engagement with the material is <b>muddled, minimal or commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in part (a) might investigate the topic is sound but there is no engagement</b> .   | <b>2-0</b>   |

**Question 8 and 9 Part (d) AO2: For evaluation of this investigative method.**

| <b>Band</b>   | <b>Mark Allocation</b>  | <b>Marks</b> |
|---------------|---|--------------|
| <b>Band 3</b> | There is <b>reasonably thorough</b> commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. There is <b>explicit reference</b> to the intentions offered in (c) and an <b>evaluation</b> of its effectiveness. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>coherent</b> . | <b>6-5</b>   |
| <b>Band 2</b> | There is <b>limited</b> commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. There is <b>some attempt</b> to refer to the intention offered in (c) and an evaluation of its effectiveness. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>reasonable</b> .                | <b>4-3</b>   |
| <b>Band 1</b> | There is <b>basic</b> commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>muddled, minimal or the commentary/evaluation is sound but there is no engagement with the stimulus material</b> .                              | <b>2-0</b>   |

---

**Assessment Grid**

| <b>Question</b>                    | <b>AO1</b> | <b>AO2</b> |
|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1 (a)                              | 10         | 0          |
| 1 (b)                              | 5          | 15         |
| 2                                  | 15         | 15         |
| 3                                  | 15         | 15         |
| 4                                  | 15         | 15         |
| 5 (a)                              | 15         |            |
| 5 (b)                              |            | 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          |            |
|                                    |            |            |
| <b>Total marks for 3 questions</b> | <b>42</b>  | <b>48</b>  |
| <b>Total marks for paper</b>       | <b>46</b>  | <b>48</b>  |