



General Certificate of Education

Psychology 5181/6181 *Specification A*

Unit 5 PYA5

Mark Scheme

2005 examination – June 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.

PYA5

Mark Allocations for Assessment Objective 1

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

Mark Allocations for Assessment Objective 2

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

Mark Allocations for Approaches Questions

Approaches part (a)

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

Approaches part (b) & (d)

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

Approaches part (c)

Mark bands	Commentary	Plausibility	Engagement
6-5	Reasonably thorough	Appropriate	Coherent
4-3	Limited	Reasonably appropriate	Reasonable
2-0	Basic	Largely inappropriate	Muddled/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
(QoWC)**

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

Synoptic Possibilities

Unit 5 rewards the demonstration of synopticity.

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

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

Possible routes identified in the specification are:

- demonstrating different explanations or perspectives
- demonstrating different methods used
- relating overarching issues and debates
- links with other areas of the specification
- psychology-wide concerns and issues such as reliability and validity, cultural variation and demand characteristics/participant reactivity (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 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

Critically consider the DSM **and** the ICD as classification systems for psychological abnormality.
(30 marks)

Critically consider is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to show evidence of their knowledge and understanding (**AO1**) and of their analysis and evaluation (**AO2**) of the DSM and ICD as classification systems for psychological abnormality.

Indicative AO1

There are a number of possible legitimate approaches to answering this question. Given the treatment of DSM and ICD in the popular Abnormal Psychology textbooks, one likely possibility is a 'nuts and bolts' approach in which a candidate considers how the DSM and ICD are operated in practice. These are likely to focus on a listing of categories given below. Candidates who only list the categories may earn full marks (the complete list is not necessary for full marks).

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) was developed by the APA and is classificatory and diagnostic. The current version is the DSM-IV-TR. It is organised into five axes with *Axis I* comprising the following disorders:

- Disorders in infancy (e.g., autism); (2) delirium and dementia; (3) mental disorder due to a medical condition; (4) Substance abuse; (5) schizophrenia; (6) mood disorders; (7) anxiety disorders; (8) somatoform disorders; (9) factitious disorders; (10) dissociative disorders; (11) eating disorders; (12) sexual disorders; (13) sleep disorders; (14) impulse control disorders; (15) adjustment disorders; (16) other conditions.

Diagnosticians then decide whether a client is displaying *Axis II* disorders, i.e., mental retardation and personality disorders. The diagnostician then looks for *Axis III* information, such as general medical conditions. *Axis IV* information includes psycho-social or environmental problems. Finally, *Axis V* information is a rating of the overall level of functioning.

The International Classification of Diseases and Health Related Problems (ICD) was developed by the WHO and is now in its tenth edition (1993). It has eleven major categories:

- Organic, including symptomatic, mental disorders (e.g., Alzheimer's disease); (2) mental and behaviour disorders due to psychoactive substance abuse (e.g., alcohol, cocaine); (3) schizophrenia; (4) mood disorders (e.g., depression); (5) neurotic and stress related disorders (e.g., phobias); (6) behavioural syndromes associated with physiological disturbances (e.g., eating disorders); (8) mental retardation; (9) Disorders of psychological development (e.g., dyslexia); (10) behavioural and emotional disorders in childhood; (11) unspecified conditions.

Candidates can legitimately choose to focus upon a description of several of these categorisations (breadth versus depth being a trade-off issue here in determining what credit to give the answer) or a more general account of the ICD as a 'global' instrument for categorisation. For example, a historical account of how the ICD developed as a strategy for classifying mental illness in the same way that there are taxonomies of physical illness could be given.

A broader approach could be in terms of the *nature* of diagnostic/classificatory systems such as DSM and ICD. Key points here could be the location in the medical model of abnormality and psychiatry and the issues of reliability and validity (these being named in the specification). Whether such material is credited as **AO1** or **AO2** will be determined by the manner in which it is used. For example, description of reliability and validity issues arising from studies (e.g. Rosenhan, 1973) would be **AO1** and an analysis of the implications of the studies would be **AO2**.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

- reductionism (e.g. ‘reduction of patients to constellations of symptoms)
- gender bias in diagnosis/classification (e.g. Self-defeating personality disorder [SDPD])
- cultural bias in diagnosis/classification (e.g. schizophrenia)
- links across the specification (e.g. to defining psychological abnormality on AS).

Indicative AO2

Two possible approaches here would be for the candidate to focus upon an evaluation/analysis of (1) research and (2) reliability and validity, given the wording of the specification.

Evaluation relevant to reliability/validity would be studies such as that carried out by Cooper et.al. (1972) on schizophrenia. The *critical* writings of Laing, Szasz and Heather are highly relevant here. The study most likely to be *critically* considered will almost certainly be that of Rosenhan (1973). Other likely research which can be evaluated/analysed includes that carried out on bias in diagnosis/classification, for example, that on gender, race, culture (including culture-bound syndromes) and class. Fernando (1988), Humphreys (1997) and Ussher (1992) have all written about the alleged ethnocentricity and androcentricity of the classification systems.

Further possibilities include evidence which suggests that reliability and validity have increased in recent years and that classification and diagnosis biases may have been merely indicative of broader biases/failings in psychological research until recently. Candidates may also focus on the difficulties of operationalising reliability and validity in research and practice.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

theoretical underpinnings (in the somatic model)
 psychology as science (the status of psychiatry as opposed to other approaches to mental illness such as psychoanalysis).

The question requires the candidate to address both DSM and ICD but not necessarily in equal measure therefore those offering only one are partially performing (see mark allocations for both **AO1** and **AO2**).

Question 1 Assessment Objective 1

Description of DSM and ICD as classification systems for psychological abnormality.

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

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of DSM and ICD as classification systems for psychological abnormality.

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

2

Total for this question: 30 marks

(a) Outline clinical characteristics of one anxiety disorder.	(5 marks)
(b) Outline and evaluate two or more explanations of one anxiety disorder.	(25 marks)

Outline is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to offer a summary description of clinical characteristics of one anxiety disorder.

Outline is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to offer a summary description of two or more explanations of one anxiety disorder and *evaluate* is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO2** for two or more explanations of one anxiety disorder.

(a) Indicative AO1:

The examples of anxiety disorders given in the specification are post-traumatic stress disorder, phobic disorders and obsessive-compulsive disorder and it is thus likely that the majority of candidates will select examples from this list. However there are many other possibilities including panic disorders, generalised anxiety disorder and adjustment disorder. Abnormal psychology textbooks (e.g. Comer, 2003) discuss Generalised Anxiety Disorder and phobias, such as agoraphobia, social phobias and specific phobias (e.g. spiders, flying and thunderstorms). Candidates may address clinical characteristics by outlining symptoms. These include dizziness, diarrhoea, palpitations and nausea for agoraphobia; shaking and nausea, fear of social performance, avoidance of social situations for social phobias; fear of the specific situation resulting in dizziness, vomiting, fear and panic attacks for specific phobias. Alternatively candidates may outline demographic factors, such as those associated with ethnicity, or aspects of dysfunctionality (e.g. a perception that the world is more threatening than it actually is).

(b) Indicative AO1:

The specification names three examples of anxiety disorders: post-traumatic stress disorder, phobias and obsessive-compulsive disorders. Clearly the explanations will share common features consistent with each model (e.g. bio-psychology, behaviourism) but there will be peculiarities relating to each anxiety disorder and candidates may illustrate their answers with different studies. For example, behaviourist explanations would be in terms of classical and operant conditioning (note that this can be counted as two explanations for the purpose of this question) and/or modeling. The concept of dysfunctional learning is important here. Psychoanalysts would argue that defence mechanisms break down under stress and are then overrun by neurotic anxiety. Cognitive psychologists would argue for the importance of maladaptive assumptions. If candidates give descriptions which are non-specific to one anxiety disorder (i.e. generic to an explanation) marks should be awarded insofar as such material is serendipitously relevant.

Detailed accounts of explanations of different anxiety disorders are given in the textbooks. Space does not permit a reproduction of these here. The following two examples are given merely as illustration.

Phobias: *Biological explanations* tend to focus on genes (making use of twin and family studies in particular), neurophysiology and evolutionary perspectives (e.g. biological preparedness). Candidates are likely to illustrate their explanations of gene theories, for example, of an anxiety disorder by referring to specific studies. These include studies on blood relatives (e.g. Kendler et. al, 1992) which tend to show an incidence of 15% of those with relatives classified as having an anxiety disorder as opposed to 4% in the general population. Many of the studies (e.g. Marks 1986) have focused on twins.

Obsessive-compulsive disorders: According to *psychoanalytic theory*, obsessions are defence mechanisms which serve the purpose of 'occupying' the mind and consequently preventing the entertainment of more threatening or disturbing thoughts. Laughlin (1967), for example, sees the intrusion of obsessive thoughts as preventing the arousal of anxiety, by acting as a more tolerable substitute for a subjectively less acceptable thought or impulse (taken from Gross, 2001).

Candidates may describe the diathesis-stress model which focuses on the interaction between biological and environmental factors or they may use this as an evaluation of the adequacy of either biological or psychological explanations should they select these as their explanations.

Note that AO1 maximum mark is 10, not 15 here.

Ideas for further synopticity;

The question has the synoptic feature of a description of two or more explanations of an anxiety disorder but the following are some additional possibilities:

- nature/nurture with biological explanations seeing anxiety disorders as substantially inherited whereas many of the psychological explanations (e.g. behaviourism) see it as learned
- psychology as science with biological explanations generally being regarded as more scientific than the majority of psychological ones
- links across the specification such as the nature of psychological abnormality and biological and psychological explanations of mental illness on AS.

Indicative AO2:

Evaluation is likely to be in terms of empirical corroboration or other factors such as ethical implications (for example, of studies validating or challenging the explanations). There may also be methodological criticisms of the studies used to evidence the explanations, for example those relating to twin studies or participant sampling.

Note that *descriptions* of empirical evidence may count as part of an explanation. The extent to which such material is *used* constitutes its effectiveness and thus the **AO2** credit to be awarded. Falsifiability is a relevant issue related to psychodynamic models. Comer says "Researchers have looked for ways to test the psychodynamic explanations of...anxiety disorders". Behaviourist explanations can be criticised for concentrating on symptoms and behaviours rather than underlying causes. Cognitive explanations have been supported by some empirical research (e.g. Rimm & Litvak, 1969; Ellis, 1995) but they tend to concentrate on the individual rather than the cultural/social level.

Answers which evaluate one theory by saying that it is inadequate in terms of the alternative explanations (e.g. biological explanations do not take cognitions into account) will earn credit only when there is appropriate use of such material, otherwise such commentary lacks effectiveness and there is a maximum of 6 marks.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

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.

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

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

2(a) Assessment Objective 1*Outline of clinical characteristics of one anxiety disorder.*

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

2(b) Assessment Objective 1*Outline of two or more explanations of one anxiety disorder.*

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

2(b) Assessment Objective 2.

Evaluation of two or more explanations of one anxiety disorder.

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

3

Total for this question: 30 marks

Describe and evaluate **two or more** biological (somatic) therapies.

(30 marks)

Describe is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of their knowledge and understanding (**AO1**) of two or more biological therapies. *Evaluate* is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of analysis and evaluation (**AO2**) with relation to two or more biological therapies.

Indicative AO1:

The focus of the question is on biological *therapies* therefore any material on the *theoretical* principles underpinning these should only receive credit insofar as it is serendipitally relevant. Examples of biological therapies which are most likely to be given by candidates are chemotherapy/drug therapy, ECT and psychosurgery (e.g. lobotomies) although the last two are rarely used these days. Accounts of these are given in all the textbooks used by A level students. These therapies can be described at a general level, for example what happens in ECT, or with relation to specific disorders. Examples here would be the following for drug therapy:

- Phenothiazines as dopamine blockers for treating schizophrenia
- Monoamine oxidase inhibitors and tricyclics for depression
- Benzodiazepines (e.g. Valium and Librium) for anxiety disorders.

One or more drugs would be credited as **one** therapy.

Candidates should be rewarded to the extent that their answers give accurate and detailed accounts of these. The phrase ‘mode of action’ included in the specification is often taken by candidates to mean the *principles* of the therapy. This focus is clearly highly appropriate for answering this question. An alternative approach, which would be equally acceptable, would be for the candidate to describe the use of biological therapies in terms of ‘real-world’ applications (e.g. treating schizophrenia or depression).

Ideas for additional synopticity:

The question has the synoptic feature of the use of behavioural therapies but the following are some additional possibilities:

- a descriptive account of ethical issues for example those relating to reversibility and consent.
- psychology as science with biological therapies being viewed as more scientific than others (e.g. psychoanalysis) and less scientific than others.
- use of non-human animals in psychology with several biological therapies deriving from such research.
- reductionism with biological therapies operating at a molecular level (in contrast to psychoanalysis or behaviourism, for example).

Indicative AO2:

Evaluation could be in terms of appropriateness and effectiveness, as given in the specification, or other issues such as an evaluation of ethical considerations. Candidates may make reference to specific studies of effectiveness such as Fisher & Greenberg (1995) on antidepressants, Sackeim (1989) on ECT and Gelder et.al. (1989) on psychosurgery.

Evaluations may be absolute or relative (for example, in comparison to other therapies such as those based on behaviourism or psychoanalysis). If a candidate offers the latter strategy examiners should be mindful of the need for sustained critical commentary, if candidates choose to evaluate biological therapies by comparing them to alternative therapies or treatments.

Evaluation may be in more general terms such as those relating to methodological issues (e.g. the difficulty of doing blind and placebo studies), the problems of defining cure and isolating causal factors. Appropriateness, mentioned in the specification and hence a likely favourite, may be related to ethical/moral issues such as consent or to conceptions of mental illness (e.g. the presumption of organic causes and hence treatment).

Ideas for additional synopticity:

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.

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

Even if different drugs are discussed this would still constitute one therapy.

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

Note that this is a relatively open-ended question so the candidate has a free choice of the context(s) in which to describe and evaluation two or more biological therapies.

Question 3 Assessment Objective 1*Description of two or more biological therapies.*

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

Assessment Objective 2*Evaluation of two or more biological therapies.*

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

SECTION B: PERSPECIVES; ISSUES AND DEBATES

4

Total for this question: 30 marks

Discuss the ethics of socially sensitive research.

(30 marks)

Discuss is 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 the ethics of socially sensitive research. The **AO2** component of the question requires the candidate to make reference to different, if not contrasting points of view about the ethics of socially sensitive research.

Indicative AO1:

The question is concerned with the ethics of socially sensitive research but general answers on ethics or ethical guidelines may receive credit insofar as such material is applicable to SSR. Relevant studies (e.g. Hamer’s gay-gene work) may also receive credit for **AO1**. It is, however, unlikely that purely descriptive accounts of social influence which candidates are familiar with from AS (e.g. Milgram’s studies of obedience to authority) could be made relevant to SSR.

Sieber & Stanley (1988) suggest the following ethical issues relate to SSR:

- privacy
- confidentiality
- sound and valid methodology
- deception
- informed consent
- just and equitable treatment
- scientific freedom
- ownership of data
- values and epistemology of social scientists
- risk/benefit ratio.

Given the wide coverage of Sieber & Stanley’s analysis in the mainstream textbooks it is likely that many candidates will base their answers on at least some of these points. It is highly likely that they will address the issues by reference to particular studies or areas of psychology. Favourites are likely to be the gay gene research mentioned above, IQ nature/nurture research; consequences of gender research which has shown alpha bias and research which has shown cultural bias (e.g. the diagnosis of schizophrenia in different ethnic groups).

Given that many candidates seem to regard the terms ethics and Milgram synonymously it is likely that some will offer Milgram answers here. Such answers could conceivably be relevant (for example, by discussing how women – as a particular group – could have been even more intimidated by the laboratory setting than men) but the case must be made in order for credit to be awarded.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

The question has the synoptic feature of a description of ethics of socially sensitive research but the following are some additional possibilities:

- cultural bias as some ‘minority’ ethnic groups may have values which are not incorporated into mainstream psychological research which could be deemed socially sensitive
- nature/nurture debate with the implications which arise when it is claimed that some socially sensitive behaviours (e.g. homosexuality) are inherited
- methodologies (e.g. how psychologists carry out their work).

Indicative AO2:

This component of the answer is likely to focus on an analysis/evaluation of the specific issues raised in **AO1**. Examples include whether deception and lack of informed consent can be justified in SSR and the ‘publish or be damned’ argument (which contends that psychologists have a moral obligation to publish their research findings even if they are ‘contentious’).

Candidates may also consider whether the benefits which have arisen from SSR may be judged to be ethically acceptable. An example, would be a greater sensitivity to relationship factors in ‘minority’ relationships such as those between people with disabilities.

Another acceptable way for candidates to offer evaluation/analysis here would be a consideration of the consequences of bias (for example, towards certain minority groups) arising from a failure to adequately take into account ethical considerations. Stenner (2002) raises the following critical points relevant to ethics and SSR:

- the need for innovation when researching sensitive and threatening topics (for example the use of participant observation)
- the importance of trust and the consequences of this being broken
- the need to block negative repercussions that might follow SSR research
- addressing power dynamics (e.g. when working with marginalized groups).

Ideas for additional synopticity:

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.

Question 4 Assessment Objective 1

Description of the ethics of socially sensitive research.

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

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of the ethics of socially sensitive research.

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

Discuss the use of non-human animals in psychological research.	(30 marks)
---	------------

Discuss is 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 the use of non-human animals in psychological research. The **AO2** component of the question requires the candidate to make reference to different, if not contrasting points of view about the use of non-human animals in psychological research.

Indicative AO1:

The requirement of the question is to describe the use of non-human animals in psychological research, thus making this a broad, relatively open-ended question. Candidates may legitimately approach it by focusing upon particular studies or upon *general issues* surrounding the use of non-human animals in psychological research. The only illegitimate approach which candidates are likely to offer is a focus on the use of non-human animals in research areas which are not connected to psychology, for example medical research (although even here relevance could have been achieved e.g. if such research influenced psychiatry).

Legitimate approaches might include:

- Description of (a) study/studies. Studies using non-human animals may, of course, be drawn from any area of psychology, so it is impossible to be prescriptive here. Brady, Selye, Harlow, Zimmerman, Lorenz and Skinner may be particularly frequently chosen researchers. This approach focuses on descriptions of the particular studies but as with other questions in the Issues and Debates section of Unit 5 there must be selection and shaping for purpose (for example, upon how non-human animals have been used in building learning theory rather than upon the features of learning theory itself).
- Arguments for or against or for and against the use of non-human animals in psychology. Presentation of arguments for and/or against should be credited as AO1 unless they are offered as explicit counterpoints of juxtapositions in which case they should be credited as AO2.

Some of the main arguments *for* the use of non-human animals in psychology are:

- There are universals between all animals.
- Non-human animals are sometimes easier to study than humans.
- Certain studies can be carried out on non-human animals which would not be permitted with humans.
- Animals develop and reproduce quicker than humans thus facilitating a shorter time period for longitudinal studies.
- Animals are interesting to study in their own right.
- Such research can bring about breakthroughs in our understanding of human problems.
- Animal research is regulated by the Home Office, legislation (the Animals [Scientific Procedures] Act of 1986) and ethical guidelines.
- Using non-human animals to benefit the lives of humans (but beware the medical angle here).

Some of the main arguments *against* the use of non-human animals in psychology are:

- Dissimilarities between humans and other species.
- Speciesism (the indefensibility of the use of non-human animals by humans ‘for their own ends’).
- Ethical and moral concerns (e.g. those relating to animal rights; distress/suffering and exploitation).
- That studying non-human animals arguably tells us little about ‘higher’ aspects the human condition (e.g. the concerns of humanistic psychology).
- Ethical issues raised by animal research. In 1985 the BPS and the EPS (Experimental Psychology Society) jointly published guidelines on the use of animals in psychological research. There were fourteen ‘check-points’, relating to:
 - The law.

- Ethical considerations.
- Species (researchers carefully considering what the most appropriate species to work with is).
- Number of animals; (smallest number possible).
- Endangered species.
- Animal suppliers (e.g. keeping full records).
- Caging and social environment.
- Fieldwork (preferred).
- Aggression and predation including infanticide (avoiding 'staging' whenever possible).
- Motivation (e.g. in studies of deprivation).
- Aversive stimulation and stressful procedures.
- Surgical and pharmacological procedures.
- Anesthesia, analgesia and euthanasia.
- Independent advice.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

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

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

Indicative AO2:

Popular evaluations are likely to be in terms of general ethical issues, methodological issues, applications or cost/benefit analysis of certain studies. Better answers will show an awareness of the difficulties involved in this (for example, that it is often difficult to predict what benefits may emerge from a particular piece of research and that individual judgements, which are subjective, are likely to be involved).

Where AO1 consists of arguments for and/or against the use of animals, AO2 will entail presentation of evaluation/commentary on these arguments.

Evaluation of ethical issues could be delivered at a general or a specific level, either in terms of individual points raised or generally. This is likely to be considered on a case-by-case basis. For example, could the studies by Selye have been carried out any other way? Are they rendered redundant/unnecessary by work on SRRS and Hassles & Uplifts?

Ideas for additional synopticity:

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.

Question 5 Assessment Objective 1*Description of use of non-human animals in psychological research.*

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

Assessment Objective 2*Evaluation of the use of non-human animals in psychological research.*

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

Discuss the free will and determinism debate in psychological research.

(30 marks)

Discuss is 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 the free will and determinism debate in psychological research. The **AO2** component of the question requires the candidate to make reference to different, if not contrasting points of view about the free will and determinism debate in psychological research.

Indicative AO1:

Examiners should note that the word ‘debate’ does not carry any implications for the awarding of marks. Free-will and determinism and free-will and determinism debate can be treated interchangeably. It should be noted that free-will and determinism is regarded as a unitary debate therefore in the unlikely event of a candidate referring only to free will or determinism this can earn full marks. Likely examples for discussion include behaviourism and bio-psychology at a ‘molar’ level and specific examples of behaviourist and bio-psychology studies/particular theories at a ‘molecular’ level. Examples of psychoanalysis are also likely to be popular. Once again the focus may be upon studies and/or theories. Humanistic psychology is likely to be the favourite vehicle used to explore free-will in psychology. Many students are taught about humanistic psychology (which is not named on the specification) for the sole purpose of servicing this debate. More astute candidates will be aware that Rogers was less of an exponent of free-will in his later writings.

Two possible pitfalls are that candidates may write generally about free will and determinism without relating it to psychological research and/or they may focus on the research but insufficiently relate it to the free will and determinism debate. In both instances material should receive credit only to the extent that it fulfils the requirements of the question.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

The question has the synoptic feature of free will and determinism (see p.6) but the following are some additional possibilities:

- ethical issues (such as responsibility for one’s actions)
- psychology as a science (given that science is often seen as deterministic)
- examples drawn from other areas of the specification (e.g., models of abnormality from AS).

Indicative AO2:

This is likely to be an analysis/evaluation of the **AO1** points made. Possibilities include the appropriateness or usefulness of a free will and determinism analysis and what it tells us about the human condition (for example in terms of determinants of our behaviour and experiences).

One strength of determinism is that it enables experiments to be carried out which could then be applied to determinist theories (e.g., behaviourism). One weakness is that if one takes the determinist stance to its ultimate position it suggests that individuals do not have moral responsibility (Flanagan 2002). The belief in free will creates two problems: it is hard to provide a precise account of what is meant by free will, and most successful sciences are based on the assumption of determinism even if one recognises that uncertainty principles may operate (Eysenck & Flanagan, 2001).

The point made in **AO1** above about the two possible pitfalls applies equally here.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

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

Question 6 Assessment Objective 1*Description of the free will and determinism debate in psychological research.*

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

Question 6 Assessment Objective 2.*Evaluation of the free will and determinism debate in psychological research.*

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

Discuss psychology as a science.	(30 marks)
----------------------------------	------------

Discuss is 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 about psychology as a science. The **AO2** component of the question requires the candidate to make reference to different, if not contrasting points of view about psychology as a science.

Indicative AO1:

The psychology as 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).

One way of responding is for candidates to offer arguments for and against psychology as science. 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).

Eysenck (2000) offers the following arguments *for* psychology being a science:

- some theories in psychology have been successful in achieving the scientific goals of prediction, understanding and control
- some theories have also satisfied popper's criterion of falsifiability (i.e. can be disproved by empirical studies)
- there has been considerable success in replicability.

and the following *against*:

- imprecise formulation of many theories and models
- lack of objectivity of some data
- influence of the researcher upon the data gathering process (e.g. demand characteristics; participant reactivity) and interpretation of data
- lack of ecological validity
- lack of a Kuhnian paradigm.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

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)
- culture bias
- the use of non-human animals in psychology.

Links 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.

The most likely routes for **AO2** demonstration are an evaluation of the arguments for/against psychology being a science given as **AO1**, a critical match of the criteria of science (see above) with different branches of psychology.

Ideas for additional synopticity:

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.

Question 7 Assessment Objective 1

Description of psychology as a science.

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

Assessment Objective 2

Evaluation of psychology as a science.

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

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

A team of psychologists carried out a study on behalf of an insurance company into people who take part in potentially dangerous sports. These include white-water canoeing, free-fall parachuting, rugby and boxing. Some of the sports are team games (such as rugby) and some are solo activities, but all of them carry the risk of personal injury. The psychologists were interested in finding out why some people take part in potentially dangerous sports and others do not.

- (a) Describe how **two** approaches might try to explain why some people take part in potentially dangerous sports. *(6 marks + 6 marks)*
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations of why some people take part in potentially dangerous sports, in terms of its strengths and limitations. *(6 marks)*
- (c) How would **one** of these approaches investigate why some people take part in potentially dangerous sports? *(6 marks)*
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating why some people take part in potentially dangerous sports. *(6 marks)*

Two possible approaches here are:

Bio-psychology: It could be argued that many of the biological characteristics associated with fight/flight syndrome may be activated by the engagement in physically dangerous sports. There may also be other features of biological excitation such as adrenalin production. These may be perceived as exciting by those involved. By the same token there may be biological ‘release mechanisms’ associated with the termination of the excitation/stressful activity which could be perceived as stimulating or pleasurable. It is also possible to argue for a gene relating to risk-taking.

Behaviourism: The stimulus material states that some of the extreme sports are team activities and others solo. There is clear scope for reinforcement in team activities (approval by peers) but those involved may also be rewarded by admiration of others who do not participate in the sports or do so on their own too. This also, for once!, affords the opportunity for negative reinforcement as there may be a sense of pleasure when the person involved does something which results in him/her avoiding physical injury. There is also scope for modelling/imitative behaviour (perhaps media figures or other participants in extreme sports).

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

Examples here would be:

- For **bio-psychology** an experiment would be a good method of investigation. For example, volunteer participants could be divided into two groups one of whom could be placed in a situation which involved some acceptable physical risk (e.g. having to successfully complete an obstacle course such as those often used on ‘management-bonding’ courses) and others which still involve a comparable degree of physical exhilaration but no real risk (e.g., an aerobic class). Measurements of various CNS and ANS responses could be taken during and after the activities and comparisons made between the groups. Alternatively such measures could be taken immediately before and after participation in extreme sports or comparing those in contact sports (e.g. rugby) with non-contact sports (e.g. volleyball).
- For **behaviourism** a laboratory experiment could be carried out in which participants were rewarded by experimenter or peer praise for risk-taking activities (e.g. computer games with a high loss risk) and comparing them with a group of participants who took part in the same activities but without any reinforcement. Once again the two groups could be compared. Did the performances of the two groups differ in the degree of risk-taking, for example?

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.

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 ‘dangerous sports’). This tactic is unlikely to raise a candidate’s mark above Band 1 (Basic). If there is no link to the stimulus material the maximum mark is top of **Band 1**. 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.

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.

If there is no link to the stimulus material marks should be limited to a maximum of top of **Band 1** in each instance.

Import/Export

Material can only be imported/exported between (a) and (b) and between (c) and (d).

Question 8(a) Assessment Objective 1

AO1: For description of each approach.

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

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

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is reasonably thorough commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent .	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is reasonably appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable .	4-3
Band 1	There is basic commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is largely inappropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled or there is no meaningful attempt 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 reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent .	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable .	4-3
Band 1	There is basic commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. The material in which material has been used is restricted . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled or there is no meaningful attempt 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.	

Billy is very popular in the office where he works because he makes people laugh. He regards himself as a bit of a comedian. He goes out of his way to learn jokes and he does unexpected things which make people laugh. He also does imitations of other people. He has a light-hearted, humorous approach to life generally. How might this be explained?

- (a) Describe how **two** approaches might try to explain why some people take a humorous approach to life. (6 marks + 6 marks)
- (b) Assess **one** of these explanations of why some people take a humorous approach to life, in terms of its strengths and limitations. (6 marks)
- (c) How would **one** of these approaches investigate why some people take a humorous approach to life? (6 marks)
- (d) Evaluate the use of this method of investigating why some people take a humorous approach to life. (6 marks)

Nomothetic answers which make no reference to Billy are quite acceptable provided they engage with why some people gain pleasure from making other people laugh.

Possible approaches are:

- **A psychodynamic approach:** Psychodynamic psychologists could offer several explanations for the behaviour in the stimulus material. For example, it could be a result of a need for a person to distance him/herself from things in life which are emotionally demanding (hence being light-hearted or humorous). Equally it could be seen as a defence reaction (for example, a way of dealing the hostility against the world) or a need for love and acceptance.
- **Cognitive approach:** A cognitive approach may focus upon the schemas or belief systems that people hold. A relevant one here might be how important it is to make light of life and always being able to make people laugh at life or some particular aspect of it. Answers could also be in terms of self-image and the influence this may have upon a persons behaviour.

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 why a person might take a humorous approach to life. As the cause is likely to reside in unconsciousness the investigation could use methods such as dream analysis and projective techniques.
- Cognitive psychologists might use self-report or psychometric techniques. An example would be personality tests to enable them to measure peoples' value or belief systems and perhaps to see if certain personality characteristics tend to be associated together in large groups of people.

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.

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 ‘Billy taking a humorous approach to life’). This tactic is unlikely to raise a candidate’s mark above Band 1 (Basic). If there is no link to the stimulus material the maximum mark is top of Band 1. 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.

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.

If there is no link to the stimulus material marks should be limited to a maximum of top of Band 1 in each instance.

Question 9(a) Assessment Objective 1

AO1: For description of each approach.

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

Question 9(c) Assessment Objective 2

AO2: For one approach investigating the phenomenon.

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 3	There is reasonably thorough commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent .	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is reasonably appropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable .	4-3
Band 1	There is basic commentary in relation to how one of the approaches in (a) might investigate the topic in question. The plausibility of the answer is largely inappropriate . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled or there is no meaningful attempt 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 reasonably thorough commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in an effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is coherent .	6-5
Band 2	There is limited commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. Material has been used in a reasonably effective manner. Engagement with the stimulus material is reasonable .	4-3
Band 1	There is basic commentary and evaluation of the method used in (c) to investigate the topic in question. The material in which material has been used is restricted . Engagement with the stimulus material is muddled or there is no meaningful attempt 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

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