



EXAM PAPERS PRACTICE

Psychology

Loads of issues and debates Mark Scheme

Mark schemes

1

[AO1 = 2]

C and E

2

[AO1 = 2]

Hard determinism
Soft determinism
Biological determinism
Environmental determinism
Psychic determinism

Accept any other valid answer.

3

[AO3 = 4]

In each case:

2 marks for a brief, clear and coherent outline of the problem.

- In the case of alpha bias there is a misrepresentation of behaviour researchers / theorists overestimate / exaggerate gender differences
- In the case of beta bias there is a misrepresentation of behaviour because researchers / theorists underestimate / minimise gender differences

1 mark for a problem partially outlined or merely stated.

Credit other valid problems.

4

[AO1 = 2]

2 marks for clear and coherent outline which explains how explanations vary from those at a lower or fundamental level focusing on basic components or units to those at a higher more holistic multivariable level.

1 mark for vague or incomplete outline which refers to explanations at fundamental / basic and more holistic levels.

0 marks for mere reference to there being different levels of explanation.

Credit answers where knowledge of term is embedded in an example.

Level	Marks	Description
3	5 – 6	Proposals for developing the research by taking a nomothetic approach are clear and appropriate. Explanation is mostly effective. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. There is clear focus on the question.
2	3 – 4	Proposals for developing the research by taking a nomothetic approach are apparent and mostly appropriate. Explanation is partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1 – 2	There is some useful proposal of how the researcher could develop the research by taking a nomothetic approach. Explanation is limited and / or poorly focused. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is often used inappropriately.
	0	No relevant content.

Explanation possible points:

- taking a nomothetic approach would involve the researcher testing a larger sample of offenders
- sampling should involve a method of sample selection to give representativeness of a larger population, eg random sampling of the prison population
- the researcher would probably use a testable hypothesis, eg violent offenders have more negative thoughts about childhood than non-violent offenders
- taking a nomothetic approach would involve collection of a large amount of data
- analysis would probably involve quantitative methods, eg statistical testing and the drawing of conclusions in relation to a wider population
- credit also comparison of the worth of idiographic and nomothetic approaches, eg how idiographic investigations yield information that is rich, in-depth (journals inform about the precise nature of the negative thoughts enabling greater insight) whereas nomothetic investigations enable the formulation of general laws, eg offenders have a more negative view of their childhood.

Credit other relevant explanatory points.

6**[AO1 = 2]**

2 marks for the possibility that behaviour is governed by nature (genes etc) and by nurture (eg environment, experiences etc) and reference to the debate being about the relative contribution of each of these influences.

1 mark for reference to the possibility that behaviour is governed by nature (genes etc) and (or) by nurture (eg environment, experiences).

0 marks for focus solely on one possible explanation (nature or nurture) or no relevant content.

7**(a) [AO2 = 2]**

1 mark appears to support the nature side of the debate.

Plus

1 mark because the concordance rate is stronger in the identical twins where there is greater genetic relatedness (or nurture must also play a role – not 100% concordance).

Full credit can be awarded to answers which argue for mathematical ability being partly due to nurture as both percentage concordance rates are less than degree of genetic relatedness.

(b) [AO2 = 4]

Level	Marks	Description
2	3 – 4	Answer focuses clearly on concurrent validity. How a correlational test would be used to determine the relationship between the two sets of scores is clearly described with reference to calculation of a correlation coefficient and need for a significant positive correlation.
1	1 – 2	Answer focuses on validity. How a correlational test would be used to determine the relationship between the two sets of scores is partly described. The answer lacks accuracy and detail.
	0	No relevant content.

Content:

- concurrent validity would involve correlating the results on the maths test with results for the same group of people on an established maths reasoning test
- A Spearman's rho or Pearson's r test should be used for the two sets of test results
- if the mathematical ability test is valid then there should be a significant positive correlation between the two sets of test scores at the 0.05 level.

8**AO1 = 1**

C

9**(a) AO2 = 6**

Level	Marks	Description
3	5 – 6	There is accurate and detailed knowledge of determinism with appropriate reference to three different types of determinism. Most of the application to the stem is clear and effective. The answer is coherent and well organised with effective use of specialist terminology.
2	3 – 4	There is some relevant knowledge of determinism and types of determinism and some appropriate application to the stem. The answer is mostly clear and organised, with appropriate use of specialist terminology.
1	1 – 2	Knowledge of determinism and/or types of determinism is muddled but can be inferred. Application is limited/absent. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Content and application:

- determinism – understanding that behaviour is controlled and we do not exercise free will over our own behaviour
- biological determinism – behaviour is controlled by aspects of biology eg genes, chemicals etc – depression ‘runs in families’ implies biological determinism
- environmental determinism – behaviour is controlled by external influences eg parents, society etc – ‘serious social problems’ implies environmental determinism
- psychic determinism – behaviour is controlled by unconscious fears, desires etc – ‘experienced traumatic events in the past’ implies psychic determinism

Credit also appropriate references to hard and soft determinism

(b) AO2 = 2

1 mark – nature is indicated by reference to genetic inheritance ‘runs in families’

Plus

1 mark – nurture is indicated by reference to environment or experience ‘serious social problems’, ‘traumatic events in the past’.

10(a) **AO3 = 4**

Level	Marks	Description
2	3 – 4	Clear understanding of the notion of social sensitivity is demonstrated through effective application to the stem. Explanation of how the researchers could have dealt with the issue of social sensitivity in this case is clear. The answer is generally coherent with effective use of terminology.
1	1 – 2	Some understanding of the notion of social sensitivity is demonstrated through limited application to the stem. There is limited/partial explanation of how the researchers could deal with the issue of social sensitivity in this case. The answer lacks accuracy and detail. Use of terminology is either absent or inappropriate.
	0	No relevant content.

Content:

- Awareness of issue: Researchers should be aware of the implications of their research: possible negative impact for the children in the sample; possible negative implications of the research for the reputation of Crayford school and the wider community; possible self-fulfilling prophecy
- Dealing with the issue: Researchers should take adequate steps to counter the above: sensitive briefing/debriefing of participants, parents, teachers etc; care in relation to publication, disclosure of results and confidentiality/anonymity.

(b) **AO2 = 1****1 mark** for nominal level/categorical level(c) **AO3 = 2****1 mark** – categorical data is crude/unsophisticated/does not enable very sensitive analysis

Plus

1 mark – because it does not yield a numerical result for each participant

Level	Marks	Description
4	7 – 8	Outline of reductionist explanations is accurate and generally well detailed. Evaluation is effective, with some balance. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.
3	5 – 6	Outline of reductionist explanations is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. There is some effective evaluation. The answer is mostly clear, organised and focused. Specialist terminology mostly used effectively.
2	3 – 4	Outline of reductionist explanations is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any evaluation is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy, organisation and focus in places. Specialist terminology used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1 – 2	Outline of reductionist explanations is limited. Evaluation is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- Reductionism – explaining a phenomenon in terms of constituent parts
- Studying underlying elements
- Description linked to approaches eg biopsychologists analyse brain chemicals, neurons; cognitive psychologists analyse components of models eg models of memory

Possible evaluation:

- Parsimonious thus economical
- Consistent with approach used in other sciences
- Enables a more concrete understanding
- Focus on elements enables greater testability
- Misses complexity of many behaviours
- Fails to take account of context of behaviour
- Contrast with holistic approach

Answers that focus on a particular approach that is reductionist can gain full credit as long as the focus is on the issue of reductionism.

Credit other relevant information.

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

- AO1 knowledge and understanding
- AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)
- AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

Although the essential content for this mark scheme remains the same, mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) take a different format as follows:

- A single set of numbered levels (formerly bands) to cover all skills
- Content appears as a bulleted list
- No IDA expectation in A Level essays, however, credit for references to issues, debates and approaches where relevant.

(a) **AO3 = 4**

Suitable behavioural categories for investigating children's aggressive behaviour could be:-

pushing, hitting, biting, punching, swearing, etc.

Maximum 2 marks – 1 for each suitable behaviour category.

Candidates may suggest recording playground behaviour on CCTV for later analysis by ticking a box when a relevant behaviour is shown by the child. Alternatively the researcher could watch each child's behaviour in the playground and tick the box when each behaviour is shown. In this case where the researcher stands and whether the children know they are being observed would be relevant.

1 mark for a very brief or slightly muddled explanation e.g. use a tally chart

2nd mark for accurate elaboration

(b) **AO3 = 4**

There are no ethical issues named in the specification, so any potentially relevant issues in this research should be credited.

Although the psychologist would not be responsible for the behaviour of the children in the playground he might consider his responsibility if he saw that one of the children was being harmed.

Likely ethical issues include informed consent, right to withdraw, confidentiality or respect. Ways of dealing will depend on the issue selected.

There are different routes to achieving 4 marks depending on the ethical issue selected, but for full marks both the ethical issue and how the psychologist could have dealt with it should be clear.

AO3 Knowledge of research methods
4 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed Accurate and reasonably detailed answer that demonstrates sound understanding of one relevant ethical issue and how the psychologist could have dealt with this issue.
3 marks Less detailed but generally accurate answer that demonstrates relevant understanding of one relevant ethical issue and how the psychologist could have dealt with this issue. or Accurate and reasonably detailed answer that demonstrates sound understanding of one relevant ethical issue or how the psychologist could have dealt with an issue.
2 marks Basic Basic answer that demonstrates some relevant understanding of one relevant ethical issue and / or how the psychologist could have dealt with an ethical issue, but lacks detail and may be muddled.
1 mark Very brief / flawed Very brief or flawed answer demonstrating very little understanding of a relevant ethical issue and / or how the psychologist could have dealt with an issue.
0 marks No creditworthy material.

(c) **AO3 = 4**

There are different routes to full marks in this question. Candidates explain one advantage in reasonable detail or more advantages in less detail.

Advantages of using an interview rather than a questionnaire could include it would allow the interviewer to clarify questions and answers; it might be easier to see if participants were answering honestly because their reactions could be observed; it is easier to collect detailed qualitative data.

AO3 Knowledge of research methods
4 marks Accurate and reasonably detailed Accurate and reasonably detailed answer that demonstrates sound understanding of one or more advantages of using interviews rather than questionnaires in this situation.
3 marks Less detailed but generally accurate Less detailed but generally accurate answer that demonstrates relevant understanding of one or more advantages of using interviews rather than questionnaires in this situation.
2 marks Basic Basic answer that demonstrates some relevant understanding of one or more advantages of using interviews rather than questionnaires in this situation, but lacks detail and may be muddled.
1 mark Very brief / flawed Very brief or flawed answer demonstrating very little understanding of one or more advantages of using interviews rather than questionnaires in this situation.
0 marks No creditworthy material.

13

[AO2 = 3]

One mark for the definitions of / distinction between hard determinism and soft determinism. Hard determinism is the view that all behaviour is caused by forces outside a person's control / behaviour caused by coercion whereas soft determinism is the view that behaviour is still caused but not by coercion / force / external events / environment but by their own wishes / conscious desires.

Up to two marks for applying the distinction to behaviour.

One mark for an appropriate application to behaviour but incomplete or basic distinction.

Two marks for a clear application which contrasts soft determinism with hard determinism.

Markers should be aware that the distinction will most probably be contained within the application.

14

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10

Level	Marks	Description
4	13 – 16	Knowledge is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion / evaluation / application is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and / or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.
3	9 – 12	Knowledge is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Discussion / evaluation / application is apparent and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.
2	5 – 8	Some knowledge is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion / evaluation / application is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1 – 4	Knowledge is limited. Discussion / evaluation / application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

EXAM PAPERS PRACTICE

Please note that although the content for this mark scheme remains the same, on most mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) content appears as a bulleted list.

AO1

Marks for demonstrating knowledge and understanding relevant to the nature-nurture debate, including explanations of behaviour relating to both nature and nurture; knowledge and understanding of relevant terminology such as nativism, empiricism, interactionism, shared and non-shared environments, pre- and post-natal environments; active-passive environments; heritability co-efficient; methods of research used in relation to the debate, the standing of different approaches is psychology in relation to the debate.

AO3

Marks for discussion, analysis and application of the debate to behaviour. Behaviour will most likely emerge from topic areas such as schizophrenia and children's thinking, but accept other examples such as PKU and language. Discussion may include the difficulties of establishing the relative contributions of nature and nurture, the implications of the debate for the prediction and control of behaviour, theoretical and methodological complexities including twin studies and the need to take an interactionist approach. Credit references to approaches and to other debates in psychology. Credit use of relevant evidence.

15

[AO2 = 4]

This is a question requiring application of knowledge.
Up to two marks for explaining determinism.

Possible points; credit any two of the following:

- behaviour caused by the environment eg family, peers, consequences of behaviour etc
- behaviour caused by biological factors eg genes, hormones, brain structure
- behaviour caused by unconscious forces eg instincts, repressed experiences, fears, motives; displacement.

References to hard and soft determinism can also receive full credit.

Can award 1 mark for a very general explanation of determinism.

Plus 2 marks for application to Joel which must be consistent with the explanation given.

Biological – brothers were also aggressive

Environmental – learned to get his way (desirable / positive consequences of aggression) / brothers as role models.

Psychic – use of displacement / fighting with other children

Both application marks can come from the same approach.

16

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10

Level	Marks	Description
4	13 – 16	Knowledge is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion / evaluation / application is thorough and effective. Effective use of at least one topic. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and / or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.
3	9 – 12	Knowledge is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Discussion / evaluation / application is apparent and mostly effective. Some use of at least one topic. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.
2	5 – 8	Some knowledge is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion / evaluation / application is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1 – 4	Knowledge is limited. Discussion / evaluation / application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Please note that although the content for this mark scheme remains the same, on most mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) content appears as a bulleted list.

AO1

Marks for demonstrating knowledge and understanding relevant to the holism-reductionism debate. Likely content: the types of reductionism such as structuralism, biological, behaviourist / environmental / S-R; psychic-reductionism; levels of explanation; humanistic psychology and emphasis on the whole person / whole of experience; Gestalt psychology; interactionism.

Minimal credit for simply defining the debate: whether or not behaviour should be explained or studied as a whole or its component parts.

AO3

Marks for discussion, analysis and application of the debate to topics. Likely discussion points might stem from an evaluation of reductionism and comparisons with holism and interactionism, and include: advantages of parsimony; scientific and analytic approach; ease of testing; scientific support and credibility; control and prediction, implications for treatment.

Limitations may include oversimplification; value and reduced validity of explanation.

References to topics might cover theories of learning eg conditioning vs. insight learning; gender; perception; face recognition; schizophrenia; substance abuse; forensic psychology.

Credit references to approaches and to other philosophical debates.

Credit use of relevant evidence.

17

AO3 = 4

For each issue, 1 mark for identification of issue and a further mark for elaboration. For example, one issue is deception (1 mark); Milgram deceived participants into believing that they had an equal chance of being the teacher or learner, when in fact it was rigged (further mark for elaboration).

Right to withdraw is only an ethical issue in terms of it being made difficult to withdraw.

Milgram did in fact give his participants the right to withdraw at the very start of the experiment; however he then made it very difficult for them to do so. Simply stating 'there was no right to withdraw' will not gain credit.

Explanation doesn't have to explicitly refer to Milgram's research.

18

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

- AO1 knowledge and understanding
- AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)
- AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

AO3 = 2

1 mark for a brief answer and a further mark for elaboration.

For example, deception is necessary because if participants knew the aim, they might change their behaviour (1 mark). Second mark for elaboration eg this might affect validity.

19

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

- AO1 knowledge and understanding
- AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)
- AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

AO3 = 2

Deception has been dealt with by:

- Presumptive consent
- Prior general consent
- Retrospective consent
- Debriefing.

1 mark for a brief answer and a further mark for elaboration. For example, gain presumptive consent (1 mark) by asking people similar to the participant if they think it is OK to do the experiment (further mark for elaboration). Candidates may answer this generically or they may refer to a specific study. For example, Milgram debriefed his participants (1 mark) he reassured them that they were normal and answered all their questions (further mark for elaboration).

20

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

- AO1 knowledge and understanding
- AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)
- AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

(a) **AO3 = 3**

This is a volunteer / self-selected / voluntary sample.

Only people who read this newspaper could take part. The participants have chosen to take part, so it is a biased sample. Findings cannot be generalised to a wider population. Volunteer sample or self-selected sample (1 mark).

Candidates can receive credit for a correct outline of a relevant disadvantage of volunteer sampling even if they have not identified the correct sampling method.

1 mark for a brief disadvantage. Eg It is biased.

2nd mark for some elaboration eg It is a biased because only some people who read the newspaper respond and they may not be typical of all readers.

(b) **AO3 = 3**

Any relevant issue should be credited.

Likely ethical issues include informed consent, right to withdraw or confidentiality.

1 mark for identification of a relevant ethical issue.

1 mark for a brief mention of a way of dealing with an ethical issue. Further mark for elaboration.

Eg Confidentiality (1 mark). Keep the participants details private (1 mark).

The psychologists should not use the participants' names in published work, or allow them to be identified in any way (2 marks).

21

Please note that the AOs for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) have changed. Under the new Specification the following system of AOs applies:

- AO1 knowledge and understanding
- AO2 application (of psychological knowledge)
- AO3 evaluation, analysis, interpretation.

(a) **AO3 = 4**

For each issue, 1 mark for identification of issue and a further mark for elaboration. For example, one issue is deception; Milgram deceived participants into believing that they had an equal chance of being the teacher or learner, when in fact it was rigged.

The ethical issue could be for either the participant or the experimenter.

(b) **AO3 = 2**

1 mark for identification of a way of dealing with the issue and a further mark for elaboration.

For example, deception could be dealt with by debriefing the participant. It would have to be explained why it was necessary to deceive them and answer any questions that they might have wanted to ask, as well as reassuring them.

If the answer could apply to either ethical issue it is credit-worthy. The candidate doesn't need to specify which ethical issue they have chosen to deal with.

22

(a) **AO2 = 2**

Digit span is normally considered to be $7+ / -2$, so Peter's was much shorter.

1 mark for simply stating his digit span was shorter than normal.

Second mark for an explanation of the difference, eg Peter's digit span of two items was much shorter than the average span of around 7 items.

(b) **AO2 = 4**

The MSM suggests there are separate ST and LT stores. Peter's short-term memory was impaired, but his long-term memory was not. This supports the idea of separate ST and LT stores, because one was damaged but not the other.

One mark for some reference to separate ST and LT stores. Three further marks for elaboration of the explanation.

Alternatively, candidates could suggest the evidence goes against MSM. If memory has to pass through the ST store to reach the LT store, it is likely that damage to the ST store would impair the transfer. Candidates could legitimately refer to evidence both for and against the model.

(c) **AO3 = 4**

There are no ethical issues named in the specification, so any potentially relevant issues should be credited.

Likely ethical issues include informed consent, right to withdraw, confidentiality or respect. Candidates may point out that as the man has brain damage, his ability to give informed consent might be in doubt.

One mark for identification of a relevant ethical issue.

One mark for a brief mention of how the issue could be dealt with. Two further marks for elaboration.

For example: confidentiality (1 mark); keep the man's details private (1 mark); the psychologists should not use the man's name in published work, but could use his initials instead (2 further marks).

23

AO3 = 3

Simply identifying or naming one or more potentially relevant ways of dealing with the ethical issue – maximum 1 mark. For example, confidentiality, anonymity, debrief. Further marks for explaining how psychologists could deal with this ethical issue.

For example:

Right to withdraw (1 mark)

Participants should be reminded of their right to withdraw from the research (2 marks)

If participants are showing signs of distress, the psychologist should remind the participants of their right to withdraw (3 marks).

24

AO3 = 2

There are several ways in which Milgram's work has been criticised as being unethical:

- Deception – participants were deceived in many ways, the initial advert, the selection of teacher and learner, the fake shocks etc.
- Lack of informed consent – because they were deceived participants could not give their full informed consent.

- Harm – some participants suffered extreme stress reactions, as well as embarrassment and the feelings of being used.

For example, one aspect of Milgram's work that was unethical was the fact that some participants were harmed (1 mark). Some were seen to sweat; tremble and shake with the stress in fact some even had seizures (a further mark for elaboration). Candidates do not have to name the issue itself, but should receive credit if they do.



EXAM PAPERS PRACTICE