



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme

# June 2003

---

## GCE

## Psychology A

### Unit PYA5

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**Mark Allocations for Assessment Objective 1**

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

**Mark Allocations for Assessment Objective 2**

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

**Mark Allocations for Approaches Questions**

## Approaches part (a)

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

## Approaches part (b) &amp; (d)

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

## Approaches part (c)

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

## Approaches part (d)

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

Marking allocation as for part (b).

**QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION**

<b>Band 3</b>	The work is characterised by a <b>CLEAR</b> expression of ideas, the use of a <b>GOOD</b> range of specialist terms, and <b>FEW</b> errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling.	<b>4-3 marks</b>
<b>Band 2</b>	The work is characterised by a <b>REASONABLE</b> expression of ideas, the use of <b>SOME</b> specialist terms, and <b>REASONABLE</b> grammar, punctuation and spelling.	<b>2-1 marks</b>
<b>Band 1</b>	The work is characterised by a <b>POOR</b> expression of ideas, the use of a <b>LIMITED</b> range of specialist terms, and <b>POOR</b> grammar, punctuation and spelling.	<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 (e.g. iatrogenesis).

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

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

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

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

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

**SECTION A: INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES****1****Total for this question: 30 marks**

“Research into Multiple Personality Disorder, such as the case study of Eve by Thigpen and Cleckley, suggests that this is a spontaneous rather than iatrogenic phenomenon.”

Critically consider whether Multiple Personality Disorder (Dissociative Identity Disorder) is an iatrogenic or spontaneous phenomenon. (30 marks)

*Critically consider* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate whether Multiple Personality Disorder (MPD) is iatrogenic or spontaneous.

**Indicative AO1**

One would expect better answers to offer a clear differentiation between the iatrogenic and spontaneous explanations for MPD (i.e. the later seeing it as being ‘natural’ or emergent, the former ‘imposed’ or the result of patient reactivity to perceived demands of the clinical situation and/or the therapist). Examiners should be mindful of the definition of research we use (*Terms Used in Examination Questions* document) so candidates may legitimately address the quotation via studies, which almost certainly will be case studies such as those of Eve, Sybil and/or Ken Bianchi, or theoretical expositions. Theoretical expositions tend to be behaviourist and/or psychoanalytic.

An alternative approach could be to consider the case for/against one of the positions in relation to MPD. In this instance the case for would be credited under **AO1** and the case against **AO2**. Eysenck & Flanagan (2000) give the following arguments for the iatrogenic position, based on Spanos et al (1985): Since the syndrome has become well known, for example through film accounts, imitation is a possibility. Certain therapeutic techniques, such as hypnosis, lend themselves to suggestion. Therapists may become very attentive to MPD patients. The patient can come to believe in the existence of the personalities once they have ‘emerged’.

Band 1 max. if no explicit reference to iatrogenic/spontaneous debate.

Note that describing a case study of MPD is one of the ways in which **AO1** credit can be earned.

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

The question has the synoptic feature of participant reactivity/demand characteristics but the following are some additional possibilities:

- Ethics, e.g. patient trust and dependence
- Nature/nurture, e.g. whether or not the MPD (or at least a proclivity towards it) is inherited
- The nature of abnormality (links across the specification) e.g. whether the aetiology of MPD is biological or psychological

**Indicative AO2**

Evaluation may be delivered via empirical corroboration (although evidence is problematic here as it is in most clinical situations) or an analysis of the strength of the theoretical explanations, for example in terms of their coherence or their 'fit' to DSM/ICD criteria and practices.

Other possibilities are an exploration of the case for MPD as a Culture Bound Syndrome, given its high prevalence in the USA and the increase in incidence rates (79 to 6000 between 1970 and 1986 and now to tens of thousands according to Cocks, 2000) suggesting an MPD epidemic and an iatrogenic phenomenon.

Evaluating a case study of MPD is one of the ways **AO2** can be credited.

Band 1 max. if there is no explicit reference to iatrogenic/spontaneous debate.

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

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

There is no penalty for not engaging explicitly with the quotation.

**Question 1 Assessment Objective 1**

Description of whether Multiple Personality Disorder is spontaneous or iatrogenic.

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

**Question 1 Assessment Objective 2**

Evaluation of whether Multiple Personality Disorder is spontaneous or iatrogenic

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



2

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

Compare and contrast <b>two or more</b> explanations of <b>one</b> anxiety disorder.	(30 marks)
--	------------

*Compare and contrast* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the demonstration of knowledge and understanding of explanations of an anxiety disorder and consideration of similarities and/or differences between the explanations.

There are **two strategies** which examiners may use to mark answers to compare and contrast questions. The **first strategy** is for 'free-standing' description of two or more explanations of one anxiety disorder to be credited under the **AO1** allocation of marks. Such content should be descriptive but evaluative material *may* receive credit if it constitutes an elaboration of this description. The **AO2** allocation of marks is then awarded for explicit comparing and contrasting of the two or more explanations and may be descriptive and/or evaluative.

The **second strategy** is to credit *description* of similarities and differences as **AO1** and *evaluation* of similarities and differences as **AO2**.

These strategies are reflected in the marking allocations which follow.

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

### **STRATEGY 1:**

#### **AO1**

Explanations are likely to be linked to theoretical positions, for example biological explanations (such as those focusing on the influence of genetic factors and neurophysiology); behaviourism (both classical/operant conditioning; and modelling), cognitive approaches; and explanations in terms of social factors/life events.

Explanations may be more eclectic and/or loosely categorised but the emphasis must be upon explanations (or theories) rather than empirical research. Candidates writing about specific studies should earn marks if the material is serendipitously relevant to explanations.

Answers which focus upon the clinical characteristics of an anxiety disorder (e.g. phobias) should receive credit only insofar as they might also serendipitously make points relevant to theoretical explanations. The same is true of methodology.

If a candidate offers more than one anxiety disorder then both should be marked but only the better credited.

#### **AO2**

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

<b>Additional synoptic possibilities</b>
--

The synoptic requirement of this question is a plurality of theoretical explanations of anxiety disorders. Candidates may also make useful reference to issues and debates such as psychology as science, nature/nurture and free-will/determinism. Methodological factors may also be given at a descriptive ( <b>AO1</b> ) level. Links to other areas of the specification (e.g. biological and psychological explanations of psychological abnormality).
--

**STRATEGY 2****AO1: Similarities/differences**

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

Examples which candidates may explore include the following although it is impossible to be prescriptive since much will depend on which explanations are selected by the candidate. It is quite legitimate for candidates to offer examples from within the biological ‘group’ or from within the psychological ‘group’, or examples from both.

Similarities:

- The explanations lead to treatment of mental illnesses/psychological abnormalities
- The majority are reductionist
- All except cultural relativist explanations focus on the individual

Differences:

- Assumptions of the aetiology of mental disorders (e.g., somatic versus learned)
- Level and nature of reductionism (e.g., molecular versus behavioural)
- Different explanations will give rise to different treatments.
- Although all except cultural relativism focus on the individual they differ in which aspects of the individual they focus upon (e.g., behaviour versus biology; the role of social factors)

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

Issues relating to broad synoptic possibilities such as:

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

**AO2: Similarities & differences**

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

- How well do they help open up or extend debate?
- How well have they helped the way psychologists look at a particular issue or area?
- Do they employ concepts/definitions that can be criticised?
- Do they reflect the values of a perspective or the psychologist?
- Are they outdated?
- Are they supported by empirical evidence?
- What are the advantages/disadvantages of the method(s) used?
- Are they objective?
- What sampling procedures are normally used (e.g. use of non-human animals)
- Can assertions or findings be generalised?
- How well do they satisfy the requirements of reliability/validity?
- Are there biases? (e.g. ethnocentricity, androcentricity, heterosexism)
- Are there alternative explanations/interpretations?
- Have they helped clarify the meaning of any concepts in psychology?
- Have they added to our understanding in the relevant area of psychology?
- Are they likely to be of any use to psychologists in the future?
- Are they useful to society in general?

The question requires the candidates to address two or more explanations therefore those offering only one will be deemed to be partially performing (see mark allocations for both **AO1** and **AO2**).

**Partial Performance**

In **Strategy 1** if only one explanation is given then marks will be restricted to a maximum of top of Band 3 (9 marks) in **AO1** and 0 for **AO2**.

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

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

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

**STRATEGY 1****Question 2 Assessment Objective 1**

Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of two or more explanations of one anxiety disorder.

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

**Assessment Objective 2**

Consideration of similarities and differences between two or more explanations of one anxiety disorder

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

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

Description of similarities and differences between two or more explanations of one anxiety disorder.

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

**Assessment Objective 2**

Evaluation of similarities and differences between two or more explanations of one anxiety disorder

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

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

- (a) Describe **one** therapy derived from **either** a psychodynamic **or** a cognitive-behavioural model of abnormality. (15 marks)
- (b) Assess the therapy you described in part (a) in terms of **two or more** issues (e.g. appropriateness and effectiveness) surrounding its use. (15 marks)

*Describe* is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to present **AO1** with relation to one therapy derived from either a psychodynamic or a cognitive-behavioural model of abnormality.

*Assess* is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to give evidence at **AO2** of two or more issues surrounding their use of the therapy described in part (a).

**(a) Indicative AO1**

The relevant therapies given in the specification are psychoanalysis and psychodrama for psychodynamic and rational-emotive therapy and stress inoculation training for cognitive-behavioural. Candidates consequently are most likely to offer a descriptive account of one of these, although others are of course acceptable, e.g. Kleinian therapies.

Examiners should be particularly mindful of not crediting description of behavioural therapies, such as flooding and the use of token economies.

Description is likely to focus upon the theoretical underpinnings (e.g. the role of the unconscious mind, the role and veracity [or otherwise] of perceptions) or how the therapy is used in practice (e.g. treating phobias by psychodynamic therapy). If candidates offer both cognitive-behavioural and psychodynamic therapies, both should be marked and the better of the two credited.

If two therapies from either category are given, both should be marked and the best one credited.

There should be no penalty if a candidate describes several *techniques* from within one *therapy*.

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

Candidates may infuse synopticity focus by describing different applications of the therapy (e.g. to different disorders; focusing upon issues such as the scientific status of psychology, gender bias, ethical issues and free-will/determinism; and making links to other areas of the specification (e.g. the nature of abnormality and eating disorders on AS).

**(b) Indicative AO2**

The issues given in the question are only ‘e.g.s’ therefore candidates are able to choose whichever ones they like. Given their inclusion on the specification (albeit as examples) it is likely however that the majority of candidates will offer these. Typical focus points are likely to be the difficulty in assessing ‘cure’, long-term/short-term scrutiny, dependency, patient-therapist relationship, comparisons with other therapies.

If candidates assess two therapies both should be marked but only the better of the two credited.

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

The wording of the question requires the candidate to address a plurality of issues. If only one is given (e.g. effectiveness) there is partial performance (see mark allocation). If a candidate includes material that is clearly relevant and would earn marks in one part of a question, it should remain (when determining marks) regardless of whether it might earn more marks elsewhere. If the material is only peripherally relevant or irrelevant to one part of the question and would earn marks in the other part, then it should be 'exported' (when determining marks) to that part.

Candidates who simply describe alternative research evidence without using this material as part of a sustained critical commentary will receive a maximum of Band 1 for **AO2**.

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

Synoptic possibilities here include gender bias, ethical issues, psychology as a science and free-will/determinism offered at an **AO2** (evaluative/analytical) level.

**3(a): Assessment Objective AO1**

Description of one therapy derived from either a psychodynamic or cognitive-behavioural model of abnormality.

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

**3(b): Assessment Objective AO2**

Assessment of therapy in terms of two or more issues surrounding its use

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



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

“There have been many instances of psychological research that have shown gender biases (such as alpha bias, beta bias and androcentrism). These biases may distort the value of such research.”

With reference to issues such as those raised by the quotation above, discuss gender bias in psychology.  
(30 marks)

*Discuss* in an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate. The **AO1** component requires the candidate to present his or her knowledge of issues relating to gender bias in psychology. The **AO2** component of the question requires the candidate to make reference to different, if not contrasting points of view about gender bias in psychology.

**Indicative AO1**

It should be noted that it is legitimate for candidates to focus on either particular instances of gender bias in psychology (for example in terms of particular studies or theories) or (perhaps wider) a consideration of the different types or forms of bias. In terms of particular instances, likely favourites will include Freud, Kohlberg and Erikson. Bem (1974) would be relevant as an example of ‘good practice’ as would feminist psychologists such as Kitzinger and Ussher.

Issues raised in the quotation which may gain credit as **AO1**:

- That there have been many instances of gender bias in psychology (e.g. they are not isolated instances or so rare that they need not trouble us).
- There are different types or forms of gender bias (e.g. alpha bias, beta bias, androcentrism).
- Our understanding of human behaviour being consequently distorted.
- The biases may distort the value of this research.

The question stipulates ‘issues such as those raised in the quotation’ therefore it is quite legitimate for candidates to choose others relevant to gender bias in psychology.

Descriptive accounts of gender bias(es) *and/or* studies/theories which illustrate these should be credited as **AO1**. Commentary/evaluation/analysis of these in terms of gender bias should be credited under **AO2**.

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

The question has the synoptic feature of gender bias but the following are some additional possibilities:

- Psychology as science, e.g. bias in research such that experiments may be carried out differently on men and women.
- Ethics, e.g. women being regarded as inferior to men or ‘other’ (Sampson 1993).
- Nature/nurture, e.g. an implication that psychological differences between men and women are biological and inevitable.

**Indicative AO2**

It is likely that the last ‘clause’ of the quotation is the one which will most readily trigger **AO2**. For example, a case could be made that gender bias has resulted in a view which may, ironically both exaggerate and deny differences between the psychological functioning of men and women. It could support prejudice and discrimination against a particular sex/gender and it could influence the nature and topics of future psychological research. A counter argument could be a view of universal ‘man’, which contends participant specificity is not an important issue in psychological research.

Two possible strategies that could be usefully employed here are specific critiques of particular psychological research. A well-known example would be Gilligan (1982) on Kohlberg, and the most astute of candidates may be able to critique her critique! Another strategy is to apply general evaluative criteria to particular research. Gross (2001) lists the following as some major feminist criticisms of psychology:

- Much psychological research is conducted on all-male samples;
- Some of the most influential theories are based on the above but subsequently applied equally to women;
- Male behaviour is taken as ‘standard’ and female – if different – as ‘other’;
- Psychological theories and explanations often emphasise biological rather than social causes.

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

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

There is no penalty for candidates who do not make explicit reference to the quotation.

Note it is not intended that this part of the question requires a plurality performance: the number of issues offered will constitute the breadth of response.

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

**Question 4 Assessment Objective 1**

Description of gender bias in psychology

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

**Assessment Objective 2** Evaluation of gender bias in psychology

Evaluation of gender bias in psychology

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 5	Evaluation of gender bias in psychology 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> of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of gender bias in psychology is <b>slightly limited</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of gender bias in psychology is <b>limited</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner and shows <b>reasonable elaboration</b> of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of gender bias in psychology is <b>basic</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner and shows <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> of synoptic possibilities (p.6)	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of gender bias in psychology is <b>weak, muddled and incomplete</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> and may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

5

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

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

*Discuss* in an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate. The **AO1** component requires the candidate to present his or her knowledge of issues relating to ethical issues in psychological research with human participants. The **AO2** component of the question requires the candidate to make reference to different, if not contrasting points of view about ethical issues in psychological research with human participants.

**Indicative AO1**

It should be noted that the focus of the description of ethical issues relates to two or more psychological investigations, consequently discussion of theories is not acceptable.

Ethical issues are not the same as ethical guidelines (which are one way of addressing ethical concerns and issues in psychology) but it is likely that many candidates will ‘work backwards’ and identify ethical issues via the guidelines which have been developed to help deal with them. Whilst this approach is legitimate it should not detract from the candidate who takes the more logical step of reversing this order.

Likely ethical issues are those addressed by the BPS ethical guidelines (1993):

- Consent
- Deception
- Absence of debriefing
- Withdrawal
- Confidentiality
- Protection
- Giving advice

There is overlap with issues relating to socially sensitive research studies, which are also relevant. Sieber & Stanley (1988) offer:

- Privacy
- Confidentiality
- Sound & valid methodology
- Deception
- Informed consent
- Justice & equitable treatment
- Scientific freedom
- Ownership of data
- Values & epistemology of social scientists
- Risk/benefit ratio

Note that ethical issues relating only to studies carried out on non-human animals (e.g. Harlow) are not acceptable although this may be used as evaluation (but note paragraph on ‘sustained critical commentary’ below). When marking those answers which largely focus on social influence experiments examiners should be mindful of the A2 standard. It is reasonable to expect greater sophistication, knowledge and analytical ability than that demonstrated at AS.

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

The focus of the question is itself synoptic because it is concerned with an issue in psychology but other synoptic possibilities may be relevantly raised. These include methodologies (e.g. covert observation and ethics issues). Other issues/debates such as culture bias and psychology as science. Links may also be made to other parts of the specification, e.g. the social influence work in AS (but see comments above).

**Indicative AO2**

The focus here is on evaluation/analysis of the ethical issues. This might be in terms of whether ethical controversy in specified studies can be justified (e.g. cost-benefit analysis) or how effective ethical guidelines have been in influencing how the studies have been carried out. For example, if a candidate focused on Milgram's obedience to authority studies he or she could legitimately focus upon issues such as de-briefing, counselling versus, on the debit side, suffering and misleading participants.

Answers dealing with ethics and therapies are acceptable as the therapies will almost inevitably have been the focus of published studies.

An alternative approach to those above would be to evaluate ethical issues in psychological research in a moral or theoretical context such as 'is it right that psychological research should be constrained by x or y'?

Candidates who simply evaluate research studies without reference to ethical issues they raise should receive no credit.

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

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

Note it is not intended that this part of the question requires a plurality performance: the number of issues offered will constitute the breadth of response.

**Question 5 Assessment Objective 1**

Description of ethical issues relating to two or more psychological investigations involving human participants

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

**Assessment Objective 2**

Evaluation of ethical issues relating to two or more psychological investigations involving human participants.

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

6

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

Critically consider whether psychology is a science.

(30 marks)

*Critically consider* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe **and** evaluate whether psychology is a science.

The key is that arguments or points (either for or against) should be both described and evaluated. If a candidate adopts a 'shopping list' approach (listing of arguments for and against with a minimum of elaboration) this will not show effective use of material and thus be limited to a maximum mark at the top of Band 3 (9 marks).

### **Indicative AO1**

The 'is psychology a science' debate is given extensive coverage in the major textbooks both in terms of what constitutes a science and how different branches of the discipline do or do not satisfy the key criteria. The account given by candidates can address any aspect of psychology in order to explore its scientific status. Examples would include specific empirical research/studies (e.g. Skinner's operant conditioning studies; Freud's clinical case studies) or theory (e.g. Freud and Popperian falsifiability). 'Broader' issues such as scientific funding could also be legitimately raised. It is acceptable for candidates to focus upon issues relating to the philosophy of science (e.g. issues relating to positivism) or to focus upon particular research methods (e.g. the laboratory experiment versus self-report items such as questionnaires).

Several characteristics of science are typically offered by the widely-used textbooks. These include:

- Objectivity
- Replicability
- Falsifiability
- Generation of theory
- Generation of predictions
- Usage of certain preferred methodologies (e.g., laboratory experiments)

It is acceptable for arguments *for* to be counted as **AO1** and those *against* as **AO2** if the candidate uses this structure in his/her answer (see point at end of **AO2** section), provided they are clearly related (i.e., not separate, unrelated points).

### **Additional synoptic possibilities**

The focus of the question is itself 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 also be made to other parts of the specification, e.g. bio-psychology versus social psychology.

### **Indicative AO2**

This part of the essay is an evaluative/analytical consideration of issues described for **AO1**. An example would be Kuhn's notion of paradigms where the candidate could display **AO2** by considering whether behaviourism, for example, ever satisfied the criterion for a paradigm in psychology. Candidates could also legitimately cover 'broader' issues such as whether psychology should actually aim to be a science at all. Although the majority of candidates will probably attempt to deliver a balanced response (e.g. the case for and against) it should be noted that a 50/50 balance is not required and examiners should award marks according to how well the quality of the arguments is delivered (determined by the criteria specified in the marking bands, of course).

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

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

Candidates discussing criteria for science or the arguments relating to the status of psychology could deliver these as either **AO1 or AO2**.

If candidates offer ‘for and against’ essays it is acceptable to credit one as **AO1** and the other as **AO2** provided they are clearly related (i.e., not separate, unrelated points).



**Question 6 Assessment Objective 1**

Descriptive account of whether psychology is a science

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

**Assessment Objective 2**

Evaluation of claim that psychology is a science

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

7

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Explain what is meant by reductionism.	(5 marks)
(b) Describe and evaluate the case <b>for</b> reductionist explanations in psychology.	(25 marks)

- (a) *Explain* is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to demonstrate his or her knowledge of what is meant by reductionism.
- (b) *Describe* is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO1** with relation to the case for reductionist explanations in psychology. *Evaluate* is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO2** with relation to this.

**Part (a) Indicative AO1**

Reductionism is the attempt to reduce phenomena to simpler or lower-order ones.

Rose (1997) identifies three forms of reductionism;

- Methodological reductionism;
- Philosophical reductionism (the attempt or desire to establish language of all sciences);
- Ideological reductionism (reducing the number of different ideological accounts or explanations of a particular phenomenon).

Examiners should bear in mind that the allocation of marks for this question is only 5, this means that it has a notional time allocation of around 6 minutes so it's unreasonable to expect particularly detailed or lengthy answers. Note that the explanation does not have to be in a context of psychology. Candidates might make good use of examples to enhance the quality of their explanation.

**Part (b) Indicative AO1**

It should be noted that the question requires candidates to describe the case **for** reductionist explanations in psychology. Consequently in the unlikely event of an answer being given which only forwarded the case against no credit will be awarded. Candidates may, of course, use arguments **against** as an **AO2** to the arguments for **AO1**. Candidates may answer the question at a micro or a macro level. An example of the former would be (for **AO1**) a description of key features of specific theories or methodologies; the latter would be broad approaches such as behaviourism or psychoanalysis. There may also be descriptive account of the different aspects of reductionism (e.g. from macro to micro level, canon of parsimony, reduction of number of theories).

Advantages of reductionism include enhanced scientific status and possible greater unification with other sciences; and simplicity/parsimony.

There are two potential pitfalls for candidates in answering this question. One is to focus too heavily on reductionism per se and the other is to get drawn into inappropriately detailed accounts of particular psychological theories and/or studies and fail to relate them sufficiently to reductionism.

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

The focus of the question is itself synoptic because it is concerned with a debate in psychology but other synoptic possibilities may be relevantly raised. These include theoretical perspectives (e.g. behaviourism versus humanistic psychology or Gestalt psychology), methodologies (e.g. psychometric tests versus open-ended interviews), other issues/debates such as the use of non-human animals in psychology, free-will/determinism and psychology as a science. Links may also be made to other parts of the specification, e.g. biopsychology and AS coverage of biological versus psychological explanations (of psychological abnormality).

**Indicative AO2**

This part of the answer is an evaluative/analytical appraisal of reductionist explanations in psychology. It is likely that it is achieved by examining the extent to which different branches of psychology are characterised by the features and/or goals of reductionism and whether these are appropriate for psychology.

Advantages of reductionism include enhanced scientific status and possible greater unification with other sciences; and simplicity/parsimony. Disadvantages include a failure to appreciate holistic principles such as those expounded by Gestalt and Humanistic psychologists and the argument that some psychological phenomena such as human consciousness are not easily amenable to reductionism.

Candidates may be credited for arguments **against** reductionism insofar as they represent evaluation of arguments **for** reductionism, provided they are clearly related (i.e., not separate, unrelated points)

**Additional synoptic possibilities**

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

**Question 7(a). Assessment AO1.**

Explanation of what is meant by reductionism

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

**7(b). Assessment Objective 1**

Description of case for reductionist explanations in psychology

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

**7(b). Assessment Objective 2.**

Evaluation of case for reductionist explanations in psychology

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Band 5	Evaluation of case for reductionist explanations in psychology 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> of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	15-13
Band 4	Evaluation of case for reductionist explanations in psychology is <b>slightly limited</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	12-10
Band 3	Evaluation of case for reductionist explanations in psychology is <b>limited</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner and shows <b>reasonable elaboration</b> of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	9-7
Band 2	Evaluation of case for reductionist explanations in psychology is <b>basic</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner and shows <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	6-4
Band 1	Evaluation of case for reductionist explanations in psychology is <b>weak, muddled and incomplete</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> and may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> in terms of synoptic possibilities (p.6).	3-0

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

It has been claimed by some people that there is a growing trend for “body decoration” in young people in Britain today. Many young men and young women now display a wide range of tattoos and have almost every conceivable part of their bodies pierced and adorned with jewellery. How might this be explained?

- (a) Describe how **two** approaches might try to explain the desire for body decoration. (6 marks + 6 marks)
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations of the desire for body decoration in terms of its strengths and limitations. (6 marks)
- (c) How would **one** of these approaches investigate the desire for body decoration? (6 marks)
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating the desire for body decoration. (6 marks)

It must be clearly appreciated that the Approaches questions are concerned with epistemology rather than ontology, thus the candidate is rewarded for demonstrating knowledge of how a particular approach would endeavour to explore the topic area in question. Answers which focus on particular studies or published accounts should receive credit only insofar as these illustrate an understanding and critical appreciation of the theoretical and methodological orientations of the general approach to the hypothetical example given in the question.

**Two possible approaches here are:**

- **Behaviourism:** It may be that tattoos would earn admiration from peers. Perhaps the more ‘extreme’ the tattoo, or the greater area of body surface covered the greater the reinforcement. It is also worth noting that it would be reinforcing if it does not meet with the approval of all groups of people who the ‘wearers’ disassociated with. Approval might also be due to a body ‘aesthetic’.
- **Anthropology:** Many cultures and historical tribes use body painting and piercing as forms of identification and to celebrate special occasions or to evoke certain spiritual phenomena. Much of the cultural history is maintained through such ceremonies and rituals.

The method described should clearly be one associated with or appropriate to the approach chosen.

**Examples here would be:**

- For behaviourism, an experiment could look at a volunteer sample of young people, none of whom had any body decoration. All of these could then be given ‘henna (temporary) tattoo’. Half would then be rewarded by confederates placed in the group, the other half would not. Later participants would be asked to assess their satisfaction with the tattoos.
- Anthropologists tend to use ethnographic methods which involve observations and interviewing which are non-invasive as possible. An anthropologist could compare interviews taken in this culture and another one.

In all parts of the Approaches question candidates are required to engage with the stimulus material, as distinct from presenting pre-prepared material on Approaches. Some candidates may simply add a few appropriate words (such as ‘body decoration’). This tactic is unlikely to raise a candidate’s mark above Band 1 (Basic). On the other hand, some candidates may *shape* their responses in order to address

issues in the stimulus material. Such responses could gain full marks depending on the degree of shaping for purpose. The extent to which candidates have used their knowledge to effectively answer the four parts of the question constitutes the merit of their response.

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

### Question 8(a) Assessment Objective 1

AO1: For description of each approach

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	Psychological content is <b>reasonably thorough</b> and <b>accurate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>coherent</b> .	6-5
Band 2	Psychological content is <b>limited</b> and <b>generally accurate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>reasonable</b> .	4-3
Band 1	Psychological content is <b>basic, sometimes flawed</b> and <b>inaccurate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>muddled</b> or there is <b>no meaningful attempt</b> to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0

### Question 8 (b) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For assessment of strengths and weaknesses of one approach

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

**Question 8 (c) Assessment Objective 2**

AO2: For one approach investigating the phenomenon

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is <b>reasonably thorough</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>appropriate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>coherent</b> .	6-5
Band 2	There is <b>limited commentary</b> in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is <b>reasonably appropriate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>reasonable</b> .	4-3
Band 1	There is <b>basic commentary</b> in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is <b>largely inappropriate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>muddled</b> or there is <b>no meaningful attempt</b> to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0
	If the method is not appropriate to either of the approaches identified in (a) = 0 marks.	

Even if (c) is not appropriate, examiners must read part (d) as it might contain information, which can be exported. Examiners should not rule out therapeutic techniques as ways of investigating in part (c). The marks awarded must depend on plausibility/how candidates have used the material.

**Question 8 (d) Assessment Objective 2**

AO2: For evaluation of the investigative approach given in (c).

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is <b>reasonably thorough</b> commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in an <b>effective</b> manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>coherent</b> .	6-5
Band 2	There is <b>limited commentary</b> and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>reasonable</b> .	4-3
Band 1	There is <b>basic commentary</b> and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. The material in which material has been used is <b>restricted</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>muddled</b> or there is <b>no meaningful attempt</b> to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0
	If the evaluation is of a method which is not appropriate to either of the approaches in (a) = 0 marks.	



9

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

Henry is a man who often finds it difficult to distinguish between reality and fantasy. For example, he believes that he is better than anyone else at the job that he does, and that rapid promotion will inevitably follow when other people realise this too. However, few of his colleagues believe this and they feel that Henry is not really facing up to the realities of his everyday life. How might this be explained?

- (a) Describe how **two** approaches might try to explain a difficulty in distinguishing reality from fantasy. *(6 marks + 6 marks)*
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations of a difficulty in distinguishing reality from fantasy in terms of its strengths and limitations. *(6 marks)*
- (c) How would **one** of these approaches investigate a difficulty in distinguishing reality from fantasy? *(6 marks)*
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating a difficulty in distinguishing reality from fantasy. *(6 marks)*

It must be clearly appreciated that the Approaches questions are concerned with epistemology rather than ontology, thus the candidate is rewarded for demonstrating knowledge of how a particular approach would endeavour to explore the topic area in question. Answers which focus on particular studies or published accounts should receive credit only insofar as these illustrate an understanding and critical appreciation of the theoretical and methodological orientations of the general approach to the hypothetical example given in the question.

Nomothetic answers which make no reference to Henry are quite acceptable provided they engage with the difficulty in distinguishing reality from fantasy.

**Possible approaches are:**

- **A psychodynamic approach:** Freud made much of the distinction between reality and fantasy. There may be many reasons why Henry has difficulty with the distinction including the relationship between the id, ego and superego. It may also be that he finds 'reality' threatening, perhaps through insecurity or a feeling of inadequacy and takes recourse in a fantasy world.
- **Cognitive approach:** A comparison which will be familiar to students is how many people suffering from eating disorders have wholly inaccurate perceptions about themselves. In this case it may be because Henry lacks the necessary skills and insight to interpret the feedback that others give him.

The method described should clearly be one associated with, or appropriate to the approach chosen.

**Examples here would be:**

- A psychoanalyst would employ clinical methodology to investigate the cause of an inability to distinguish between reality and fantasy. As the cause is likely to reside in unconsciousness the investigation could use methods such as dream analysis and projective techniques.
- Cognitive psychologists may use the experimental method and ask Henry to watch short video clips of people operating in a work environment, some obviously 'successfully', others obviously unsuccessfully. Henry could be required to indicate how successful each was and how much each one of the behaviours was similar to his own. (N.B. emphasis should be on investigating the phenomenon not curing the person in the case study).

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

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

**Question 9(a) Assessment Objective 1****AO1:** For description of each approach

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	Psychological content is <b>reasonably thorough</b> and <b>accurate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>coherent</b> .	6-5
Band 2	Psychological content is <b>limited</b> and <b>generally accurate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>reasonable</b> .	4-3
Band 1	Psychological content is <b>basic, sometimes flawed and inaccurate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>muddled</b> or there is <b>no meaningful attempt</b> to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0

**Question 9 (b) Assessment Objective 2****AO2:** For assessment of strengths and weaknesses of one approach

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

**Question 9 (c) Assessment Objective 2**

**AO2:** For one approach investigating the phenomenon

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is <b>reasonably thorough</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>appropriate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>coherent</b> .	6-5
Band 2	There is <b>limited</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>reasonably appropriate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>reasonable</b> .	4-3
Band 1	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>largely inappropriate</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>muddled</b> or there is <b>no meaningful attempt</b> to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0
	If the method is not appropriate to either of the approaches identified in (a) = 0 marks.	

Even if (c) is not appropriate, examiners must read part (d) as it might contain information, which can be exported. Examiners should not rule out therapeutic techniques as ways of investigating in part (c). The marks awarded must depend on plausibility/how candidates have used the material.

**Question 9 (d) Assessment Objective 2**

**AO2:** For evaluation of the investigative approach given in (c).

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is <b>reasonably thorough</b> commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent.	6-5
Band 2	There is <b>limited</b> commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>reasonable</b> .	4-3
Band 1	There is <b>basic</b> commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. The material in which material has been used is <b>restricted</b> . Engagement with the stimulus material is <b>muddled</b> or there is <b>no meaningful attempt</b> to engage with the stimulus material.	2-0
	If the evaluation is of a method which is not appropriate to either of the approaches in (a) = 0 marks.	

## Assessment Grid

<b>Question</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>
1	15	15
2	15	15
3 (a)	15	
3 (b)		15
4	15	15
5	15	15
6	15	15
7(a)	5	
7 (b)	10	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>