



General Certificate of Education

Psychology 6181
Specification A

**Unit 5 (PYA5) Individual Differences and
Perspectives**

Mark Scheme

2008 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2008 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

**QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION
(QoWC)**

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

Synoptic Possibilities

Unit 5 rewards the demonstration of synopticity.

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

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

Possible routes identified in the specification are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION A: INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES**1**

(a)	Describe two case studies of dissociative identity disorder.	(10 marks)
(b)	Outline and evaluate research into dissociative identity disorder as a spontaneous or iatrogenic (manufactured by the therapist) phenomenon.	(20 marks)

Marking criteria**Part (a) AO1:**

Candidates are required here to describe two case studies of DID. They are most likely to select the case studies of Eve White/Black, Sybil and Ken Bianchi, since these are the ones most frequently mentioned in text books. Given that there are only 10 marks for this part of the question, it is reasonable to expect candidates to give fairly equal weighting to each case study. Accounts that are very unbalanced cannot gain more than 6 marks.

Where candidates describe only one case study, partial performance criteria will apply.

Where candidates describe more than two case studies, all should be marked and credit given for the best two accounts.

NB: THERE ARE ONLY 10 MARKS AVAILABLE FOR THIS PART OF THE QUESTION**Part (b) AO1:**

There are only 5 AO1 marks available here so candidates are required only to give a brief descriptive outline of relevant research. They cannot be credited with AO1 marks for repeating material on case studies that they have already used in part (a).

Part (b) AO2:

The question requires the candidates to evaluate research into DID. They can do this by offering commentary on the case studies or by discussing other related research, eg Spanos (1985), Scroppo et al (1988). Straight descriptions of research constitute AO1 material – candidates must evaluate the research or discuss it in the context of its relevance to the spontaneous versus iatrogenic debate to gain AO2 credit.

It is also possible to gain AO2 marks by discussing slightly broader issues, eg reliability and validity of diagnosis, implications of diagnosis, cultural bias in the identification of DID, false memory syndrome and ethical issues surrounding the most well-known cases of DID, provided these discussions are linked to spontaneity versus iatrogenesis.

Part (a) AO1:*Description of two case studies of DID*

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

Part (b) AO1:*Outline of research into DID as spontaneous or iatrogenic*

Band	Mark allocation	Mark
Band 3	Outline of research into DID as spontaneous or iatrogenic is reasonably thorough, accurate and coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS	5-4
Band 2	Outline of research into DID as spontaneous or iatrogenic is limited, generally accurate and reasonably coherent . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS	3-2
Band 1	Outline of research into DID as spontaneous or iatrogenic is weak and muddled . AS APPROPRIATE FOR 5 MARKS	1-0

Part (b) AO2:*Evaluation of research into DID as spontaneous or iatrogenic*

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Evaluation of research into DID as spontaneous or iatrogenic is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Evaluation of research into DID as spontaneous or iatrogenic is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities.	11-8
Band 2	Basic Evaluation of research into DID as spontaneous or iatrogenic is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities.	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Evaluation of research into DID as spontaneous or iatrogenic is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities.	3-0

2

'Depression tends to run in families and symptoms are similar across cultures, gender and ages. This suggests that biological mechanisms play a strong part in the development of the disorder.'

Describe and evaluate explanations of depression. Refer to issues such as those raised in the above quotation. (30 marks)

Marking criteria

AO1:

The question requires an account of various **explanations** of depression. Straight descriptions of the characteristics of depression are not creditworthy except where the symptoms are used explicitly in the context of explanations. For example, signs of depression such as weight loss and physical aches and pains might be attributable to underlying biological mechanisms, but cognitive/emotional symptoms might be caused by other mechanisms.

The question is fairly open and requires a description of **more than one** explanation but does not restrict the candidate to either biological or psychological. However, it is likely that the quotation will lead candidates to a description of biological explanations.

Candidates who offer only one explanation are partially performing. However, the '*biological*' explanation is an umbrella term and candidates will meet the requirement for more than one explanation if they describe, for example, genetic *and* hormonal explanations.

It is acceptable for candidates to focus solely on unipolar disorder, but material on bi-polar disorder is equally acceptable.

AO2

Candidates are required to evaluate their chosen explanations. If they evaluate only one, they are partially performing.

The wording of the question is such that candidates do not have to refer to the issues specifically raised in the quotation. The issues raised in the quotation are as follows:

- Depression runs in families
- Symptoms of depression are universal across cultures, age ranges and gender.
- There is strong evidence that depression is caused by biological factors.

Candidates can access AO2 marks by discussing these issues, eg by looking at the evidence for depression running in families and by considering possible reasons for these findings.

The nature of the evaluation will vary depending on the explanations chosen, but evaluation/commentary is likely to include issues such as quality of empirical evidence and the difficulties of disentangling cause and effect. AO2 marks could also be gained by considering broader issues such as reductionism and the nature/nurture debate. The effectiveness of therapies could also be made relevant provided the candidate uses such evidence to evaluate the underlying explanation.

Candidates who offer general evaluations of, for example, psychodynamic or behavioural explanations without making them relevant to depression are not using material effectively and cannot, therefore, access the higher mark bands.

AO1:*Description of explanations of depression*

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

AO2:*Evaluation of explanations of depression*

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

3

'Therapies can sometimes be expensive, time-consuming and even uncomfortable. It is, therefore, important that the therapy chosen is the most appropriate and effective one for any particular individual.

Discuss biological therapies with reference to issues such as those raised in the above quotation.

(30 marks)

Marking criteria**AO1:**

Candidates gain AO1 marks by describing biological therapies. There is a requirement for more than one therapy and, where candidates offer only one, partial performance criteria apply and a maximum of 9 marks can be awarded. It is likely that candidates will offer outlines of chemotherapy, ECT and psychosurgery since these are required by the specification. However, techniques such as bio-feedback are also acceptable. There is considerably more information available to students about drug therapy than the other types of biological therapy and it is acceptable to give more weight to one type than to others. It is possible for candidates to gain full AO1 marks by only describing two or more distinct drug therapies. However, this is only possible if candidates make a clear distinction between the different drugs in terms of their underlying modes of action.

AO2

The quotation is intended to give candidates some ideas for discussion. The issues raised in the quotation are as follows:

- Therapies can be time-consuming, expensive and uncomfortable
- There is some choice in the therapy offered to individuals
- These factors are important in the choice of therapy
- The therapy that is the most appropriate and effective for the individual should be chosen.

Candidates are likely to focus on the issues mentioned in the quotation but the wording of the question means that they do not have to refer to these particular issues. Issues of appropriateness could include: the nature of the psychological disorder for which the therapy is being applied (eg is the therapy more likely to be successful for schizophrenia than for an anxiety disorder?); factors that affect choice of treatment (eg financial constraints or the availability of the appropriate therapist); ethical issues (eg the issue of consent for highly invasive treatments such as psychosurgery, the issue of stigma attached to certain treatments).

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

When awarding AO2 marks, examiners should remember that candidates need to provide sustained critical commentary. The focus of this question should be on the issues surrounding the use of biological therapies – material on alternative therapies should only receive credit insofar as it is explicitly and consistently used to evaluate the biological therapies.

AO1:*Description of biological therapies*

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

AO2:*Evaluation of biological therapies*

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

SECTION B: PERSPECTIVES - ISSUES AND DEBATES**4**

Discuss cultural bias in psychological research.
--

(30 marks)

Marking criteria**AO1:**

Candidates are required to describe cultural bias in psychological research. It is not necessary for them to define what is meant by cultural bias but they can gain AO1 marks by explaining the different types of cultural bias, eg ethnocentrism, historical bias, imposed etic provided they do so within the context of psychological research. It is important that candidates describe studies/theories in terms of their cultural bias and not in terms of cultural differences. Straight descriptions of studies without any reference to their cultural bias are unlikely to gain credit.

AO2:

Candidates can gain AO2 marks by examining the cultural bias in research they have described for AO1 marks to investigate whether it really does show cultural bias. For example, there is some evidence to suggest that the first 4 stages in Kohlberg's theory of moral development have universal application even if the higher stages do not. They might also consider issues such as the historical context of the research and the effect of different research techniques. It is also acceptable to discuss ways in which cultural bias could be eliminated or reduced in future psychological research. Implications/consequences of cultural bias are also creditworthy.

AO1:*Description of cultural bias in psychological research*

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

AO2:*Commentary on cultural bias in psychological research*

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Commentary on cultural bias in psychological research is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Commentary on cultural bias in psychological research is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities.	11-8
Band 2	Basic Commentary on cultural bias in psychological research is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities.	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Commentary on cultural bias in psychological research is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities.	3-0

5

- (a) Identify **two** psychological studies that can be considered socially sensitive. Explain why each study can be considered socially sensitive. (15 marks)
- (b) Consider the extent to which it is ethically justifiable for psychologists to carry out socially sensitive research. (15 marks)

Marking criteria**AO1:**

Candidates need to identify two studies to illustrate their answers, but descriptions of studies will only gain credit insofar as they are explicitly focused on the socially sensitive issues they raise. Identification of ethical issues in studies by Milgram and Zimbardo will only be creditworthy if their socially sensitive nature is made explicit. Animal research will only be creditworthy if candidates make a legitimate case for the research being seen as socially sensitive. Candidates are likely to refer to issues such as privacy, confidentiality, the need for sound and valid methodology, justice and equitable treatment, scientific freedom, ownership of data. NB: it is important that candidates focus on the socially sensitive aspects of research rather than on ethical issues per se.

Candidates who offer only one study are partially performing and can gain a maximum of 9 marks. Candidates who offer more than two studies should gain credit for the two for which they would gain the most marks.

AO2

The material here must be evaluative/analytical and provide commentary on the issues such as those explained for AO1. One possibility is a discussion of the 'hanged if you do, hanged if you don't' argument, ie the social responsibility of psychological researchers not to ignore important areas of investigation in spite of the controversy such research might provoke. There could also be a discussion of the wide-ranging implications (eg political, social, economic) of some types of socially sensitive research. Another possibility would be to consider ways in which psychologists have tried to deal with ethical issues in such research (eg the use of guidelines, peer appraisal).

AO1:

Explanation of why two identified psychological studies can be considered socially sensitive

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

AO2:

Consideration of the extent to which it is ethically justifiable to carry out socially sensitive research

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
Band 4	Thorough Consideration of the extent to which it is ethically justifiable to carry out socially sensitive research is thorough . The material is used in a highly effective manner and shows evidence of appropriate selection and coherent elaboration . There is substantial evidence of synoptic possibilities.	15-12
Band 3	Reasonable Consideration of the extent to which it is ethically justifiable to carry out socially sensitive research is limited . The material is used in a reasonably effective manner and shows evidence of reasonably appropriate selection and elaboration . There is evidence of synoptic possibilities.	11-8
Band 2	Basic Consideration of the extent to which it is ethically justifiable to carry out socially sensitive research is basic . The material is used in a restricted manner and shows some evidence of elaboration . There is some evidence of synoptic possibilities.	7-4
Band 1	Rudimentary Consideration of the extent to which it is ethically justifiable to carry out socially sensitive research is rudimentary . It is weak, muddled and incomplete . The material is not used effectively and may be mainly irrelevant . There is little or no evidence of synoptic possibilities.	3-0

6

Using psychological research to illustrate your answer, discuss arguments **against** free will.
(30 marks)

Marking criteria**AO1:**

It is acceptable for candidates to set the scene in their answer by defining what is meant by free will and, by association, by determinism, and such definitions can gain AO1 credit. They can also gain credit by identifying the arguments against free will which include the following:

- It is hard to provide a precise definition of what is meant by free will
- Most sciences have produced valid data based on the notion of determinism
- There is a subjective sense that human behaviour is predictable
- There is some evidence that the activity of making choices (ie free will) is controlled by brain systems.

Accounts of studies/theories which illustrate arguments against free will gain AO1 credit. However, candidates must make the relevance to the free will debate clear. Description of studies with no reference to their bearing on the free will/determinism debate is not creditworthy.

AO2:

Candidates can offer arguments for free will as AO2 but they need to be used as sustained commentary. A straight list of counter-arguments on its own cannot gain more than Band 2 marks.

They can also broaden out their evaluation/commentary by considering issues/debates such as psychology as a science or the nature-nurture debate. A discussion of the appropriateness or usefulness of the free will/determinism debate is another way of accessing AO2 marks.

NB In the unlikely event that candidates answer the question without referring to psychological research, their scores will be limited to Band 1.

AO1:*Description of arguments against free will in psychological research*

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

AO2:*Evaluation of arguments against free will in psychological research*

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

Outline examples of reductionism in psychological research, and discuss arguments **for** reductionist explanations. (30 marks)

Marking criteria

AO1:

Candidates are required to outline examples of reductionism in psychological research. Candidates are required to describe at least two examples of reductionism in psychological research. Candidates who provide only one relevant example meet the criteria for partial performance. For candidates who provide more than two relevant examples, there is a depth/breadth trade-off.

Candidates might choose to describe different types of reductionism as identified by Rose (1997) since these are included in some of the text books:

- Methodological reductionism – eg the experimental method which involves breaking down a complex issue by manipulating the IV in order to investigate the effects on the DV.
- Philosophical reductionism – the idea that there is a single, overarching theory that can explain everything.
- Ideological reductionism – this is when reductionism serves ideological or political ends, eg explaining political dissidence as a symptom of underlying mental illness.

Alternatively, they could describe, in a more general way, the reductionist nature of certain theories, eg the environmental reductionism of behaviourist theory, the reduction of complex behaviours to cellular explanations found in physiological psychology, the principles of natural selection embodied in evolutionary theory. They could also describe reductionism in the context of particular psychological studies.

There are two main pitfalls for candidates answering this part of the question. One is to focus too heavily on reductionism per se and the other is to write out detailed accounts of psychological theories/studies without relating them sufficiently to reductionism.

Identification and *brief* description of the arguments *for* reductionism also constitute AO1. The main arguments for reductionist explanations in psychological research are:

- the intuitive appeal of reductionist explanations
- the scientific status it affords psychology
- the compatibility with related disciplines, eg physiology
- the simplicity/parsimony of reductionism.

AO2

There are two main ways in which candidates can demonstrate AO2 in answering this question. The first is for them to analyse/evaluate the arguments they have outlined **for** reductionist explanations. The second is for them to consider arguments **against** reductionism in psychology as these will constitute counter-points to the arguments for. However, they need to be used as part of a sustained argument. A simple list of counter-arguments cannot access high mark bands.

AO1:

Outline of examples of reductionism in psychological research and description of arguments for reductionist explanations in psychology

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

A02:*Evaluation of arguments for reductionist explanations in psychological research*

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

SECTION C: PERSPECTIVES – APPROACHES**8**

Some young people love going out and being sociable. They are miserable if they have to be on their own for any length of time. They are really only happy when they are in a group and doing something active. They love the noise and buzz of parties, and would prefer to go out rather than stay in and watch television or read a book.

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

Marking criteria**Possible approaches here are:****Biological approach**

It might be that people who are very sociable are extraverts and that this personality trait has a physical underpinning. Eysenck, for example, suggested that extraverts react less strongly and more slowly to outside stimuli than introverts. This means that extraverted people need a higher level of stimulus input than introverts in order to achieve optimum excitation. People who crave company and noise are, perhaps, stimulus hungry and need to seek out excitement to maintain their equilibrium. There is some evidence that caffeine, which increases excitation, enhances performance in cognitive tests in extraverts, but not introverts. This suggests that extraverts will actually feel better and believe that they are performing at their best when they are in stimulating surroundings. This explains why they constantly seek out such excitement and why they feel down if they are deprived of stimulation. It is possible that such a personality trait is passed on genetically.

Behavioural approach

The behavioural approach might explain this behaviour in terms of operant conditioning and SLT. People who socialise a lot get rewards from going out (positive reinforcement), eg good company, flattery from attracting possible boyfriends/girlfriends. Negative reinforcement might also play a role here – all the while the person is filling his/her time with social activities (pleasant activity), s/he does not have time alone to think about other things that might be a source of worry, eg money or relationship problems (unpleasant activity). SLT could also play a part here. Popular peers at school are often people who have very active social lives and they would be likely role models. Magazines, films and TV also often portray glamorous, celebrity life-styles where partying and clubbing are seen as central.

It would also be possible to explain this kind of behaviour in psychodynamic or evolutionary terms.

Some people are very superstitious and think that they will have bad luck if they do not behave in a certain way. Sometimes this involves avoidance behaviour, such as not travelling on Friday 13th, not walking under ladders and not stepping on the cracks in the pavement, etc. For other people, it involves ritualistic behaviour such as always wearing a particular shirt to watch their favourite football team or taking a 'lucky mascot' into an examination.

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

Marking criteria

Possible approaches here are:

Cognitive approach

People might have developed faulty schemas. It might be that, on one occasion, someone wore a particular shirt to watch his/her football team in a difficult fixture. The team won against the odds and the next time they play, the individual wants to have the same outcome and so tries to make sure that other things remain the same as well. The shirt becomes a kind of talisman and the individual develops the irrational belief that wearing the shirt is vital for the team's success. Every time the team wins, this irrational belief is strengthened. People generally like to feel that they have some control over events, and indulging in ritualistic behaviours might endow a sense of control, ie that the individual has done everything possible to ensure the outcome they are looking for. Where individuals take lucky mascots into exams, it might, for example, be explained in terms of a placebo effect. The strong belief that the mascot endows special power and aids memory and performance will influence expectations and preconceptions and, as a result, might have an actual effect on performance.

Psychodynamic approach

Psychoanalysts might explain the behaviour in terms of orally dependent personality. This is related to the oral stage of development where children can become too dependent and fail to develop true independence and responsibility for their own lives. Such people tend to have an external locus of control where they feel that things happen to them instead of them being in control of their own fate. Research has shown that such people are more likely to be superstitious, possibly as a way of trying to exert more power over their own lives.

It would also be possible to explain this kind of behaviour in biological or behavioural terms.

Marking guidelines for Questions 8 and 9

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

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

The accounts must be plausible. For example, in behavioural theory, classical conditioning can only account for a relatively small range of behaviours and should not attract marks where it is implausible. Similarly, genetic susceptibility is a legitimate way of explaining, for example, certain aspects of personality or aptitude (eg anxiety or dependence behaviour), but not specifically for avoiding the cracks in the pavement. Where candidates offer more than two explanations, all should be marked and, usually, the best two should be credited. However, the examiner needs to look at parts (b) and (c) as well before deciding what to credit in (a).

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

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

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

Part (c): Candidates can choose either of the approaches offered in part (a), but will gain no marks if they introduce a completely new approach here. The method must be one that could be plausibly used by one of the approaches described in (a). The investigation must embrace the principles of the approach chosen. It is unlikely, for example, that behaviourists would use questionnaires to explore the ‘feelings’ of people who are sociable although, in some circumstances, it would be legitimate to use questionnaires within the behavioural approach.

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

The candidate is not meeting the requirement ‘to demonstrate psychological knowledge’ if the method of investigation is implausible, impractical or completely unethical. No marks can be

awarded to answers which describe completely implausible methods. Answers which are substantially implausible can earn up to 2 marks, provided there is some part of the method which is appropriate.

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

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

If the answer to part (c) has gained no marks, examiners should still read part (d) as it may be appropriate to export material to (c).

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

In order to gain Band 3 marks, candidates must explicitly evaluate the use of the method as a way of investigating why (Question 8) some people are very sociable or (Question 9) why some people are superstitious. Candidates who have described *wholly* implausible or *grossly* unethical methods in (c) cannot gain marks for criticising those aspects of the methods in part (d). The wording of this part of the question does not require a consideration of strengths and limitations so partial performance does not apply.

Mark allocations for Questions 8 and 9

Question 8 and 9(a)

AO1: For description of each approach

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

Question 8 and 9(b)

AO2: For assessment of strengths and limitations of one approach

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

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

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

Question 8 and 9(d)**AO2:** For evaluation of this investigative approach

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

Assessment Grid

Question	AO1	AO2
1(a)	10	
1(b)	5	15
2	15	15
3	15	15
4	15	15
5(a)	15	
5(b)		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