



2015 Psychology

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2015

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from SQA's NQ Assessment team.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's NQ Assessment team may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

Part One: General Marking Principles for: Psychology Higher

This information is provided to help you understand the general principles you must apply when marking candidate responses to questions in this Paper. These principles must be read in conjunction with the specific Marking Instructions for each question.

- (a) Marks for each candidate response must always be assigned in line with these general marking principles and the specific Marking Instructions for the relevant question. If a specific candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed Marking Instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your Team Leader/Principal Assessor.
- (b) Marking should always be positive ie, marks should be awarded for what is correct and not deducted for errors or omissions.

GENERAL MARKING ADVICE: Psychology Higher

The marking schemes are written to assist in determining the “minimal acceptable answer” rather than listing every possible correct and incorrect answer. The following notes are offered to support Markers in making judgements on candidates’ evidence, and apply to marking both end of unit assessments and course assessments.

Generic Marking Information

Approximate weighting of all questions: Knowledge and understanding – approximately 60% of the mark

Analysis and evaluation – approximately 40% of the mark

Assessment objective	Generic requirements
Knowledge and understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accurate, relevant and detailed psychological knowledge is demonstrated.• The information is presented in a coherent manner.• Information is communicated effectively using accurate psychological terminology and formal style.
Analysis and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Analysis of concepts, processes, evidence etc is shown, and/or• Evaluation is balanced and informed.

Generic Marking Information for 20-mark questions.

To award an answer a mark within a given band, all or most of the Generic Requirements for that band should apply.

Mark Band	Generic Requirements
18–20 (A1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accurate, relevant and detailed psychological knowledge is demonstrated; there is evidence of thorough understanding.• Response is coherent and logically structured; appropriate examples are provided and points expanded.• Integration of knowledge from other relevant areas is shown.• Analysis of concepts, processes, evidence, etc is thorough, and evaluation is balanced and informed.• Information is communicated effectively using extensive and accurate psychological terminology and formal style, following the conventions of the discipline.• Sentence construction and punctuation are good.
14–17 (A2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge of the topic is accurate, relevant and detailed in the main; material shows clear understanding.• The information is presented in a coherent manner, with use of examples and some expansion of points.• Integration of points from other relevant areas is shown, though may be slightly limited.• The answer is evaluative/analytical, although the balance of evidence may show minor weaknesses.• Information is communicated effectively using accurate psychological terminology and appropriate style, following the conventions of the discipline.• Sentence construction and punctuation should be good.
12–13 (B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge of the topic is relevant; it may be slightly lacking in detail, but there is evidence of understanding.• Information is presented in a coherent manner, with some use of examples; expansion of points may be limited.• Integration of knowledge from other areas is shown, but is limited.• Attempts at evaluation/analysis are evident, although a balance of evidence is not always achieved.• Information is communicated effectively using appropriate terminology, and style mainly follows the conventions of the discipline.• Sentence construction and punctuation are reasonable, though a few errors may be evident.

10–11 (C)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the topic is relevant, but lacks detail, or shows slight inaccuracies or misunderstandings. • Information is presented in a reasonably coherent manner, though use of examples and expansion of points are limited. • Some weaknesses are evident in analysis/evaluation. • Information is communicated reasonably effectively; however, terminology and/or style may lack clarity. • Sentence construction and punctuation are adequate, but a number of errors may be evident.
9 (D)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge lacks detail and/or shows errors or omissions. • Information is lacking in coherence, limited or irrelevant examples may be provided and points are not expanded or may demonstrate severe limitations. • Major weaknesses may be evident in analysis/evaluation or none attempted. • Effectiveness of communication of psychological information is limited, terminology is lacking and/or style is inappropriate. • Sentence construction and punctuation are weak.
0–8 (NA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no psychological knowledge is evident. • No analysis or evaluation is shown, and any evidence provided is irrelevant or anecdotal. • Communication of psychological information is ineffective. • Sentence construction and punctuation show major flaws.

Part Two: Marking Instructions for each Question

Section A – Understanding the individual

Question		Expected Answer/s	Approx Marks weightings: 80% ku – 20% ae	
A	1	<p>Early Socialisation</p> <p>A maximum of 1 KU mark can be awarded for a definition of attachment.</p> <p>(a) Her theories are based mainly on her research known as the “strange situation” eg Ainsworth et al (1978). She describes stages and types of attachment: Type A = insecure-avoidant, Type B = secure, Type C = insecure-resistant. These types depend on maternal sensitivity/sensitive responsiveness of the parent.</p> <p>Evaluation should address both her theory(ies) and the underpinning research, eg:</p> <p>Theory is based on large body of research evidence Findings have been replicated, providing further support for the theory, eg van Ijzendoorn and Kroonenberg (1988)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good internal reliability of the strange situation technique due to number of measures used • Laboratory-based therefore well controlled, and can conclude cause-and-effect • Confirmed some aspects of Bowlby’s attachment theory • Cultural bias in her research and theory, eg Grossmann and Grossmann (1991) • Attachment to fathers/other family members may be of different type to mother, eg Main & Weston (1981) • Some infants could not be categorised so type D was added by Main and Solomon (1986) • Ethical concerns over causing distress to young children • • A minimum of two correctly explained evaluative points should be given for full AE marks to be awarded. 	8	4

Question			Expected Answer/s	Approx Marks weightings: 80% ku – 20% ae	
A	1	(b)	<p>Distinction may be made between the three concepts, or definition(s) given, eg “separation” is usually brief and has no lasting effects, but “privation” is long-lasting/severe and is likely to have long-term adverse effects. (only 1 KU mark can be awarded for a definition)</p> <p>Severe implications should be described and supported with evidence, eg: difficulties in relationships, insecure attachment in adulthood; mental health problems/emotional maladjustment/affectionless psychopathy; delinquency; reactive attachment disorder; poor cognitive/language development, etc. Specific problems may be linked to specific causes, eg lack of stimulation/poor cognitive development.</p> <p>Evaluation/analysis could include limitations of research methodology, eg all studies are non-experimental. Evidence of long-term implications seems deterministic but studies have shown that improved environment reduces ill-effects of previous (de)privation, eg Hodges and Tizard (1989), Triseliotis (1984).</p> <p>Other possible studies might include: Hazan and Shaver (1987); Goldfarb (1943); Rutter et al (1998); Curtis (1977) (Genie).</p>	4	4
			In all questions alternative points may be credited as appropriate		
				12	8

Question		Expected Answer/s	Approx Marks weightings: 80% ku – 20% ae	
A	2	<p>Stress</p> <p>A maximum of 1 KU mark can be awarded for a definition of stress.</p> <p>(a) Individual differences such as gender and/or personality could be considered in relation to variations in stress susceptibility. Environmental sources could include overcrowding, noise, work-related conditions such as lighting. Social conflict could also be mentioned. Transactional nature of stress may be given as an explanation of individual differences. Research evidence could include eg Calhoun (1962); Glass et al (1969); Freidman and Rosenman (1974); Rotter (1966); Kobasa (1979); Taylor et al (2000).</p> <p>Optimism vs Pessimism-Greer (1992).</p>	8	4
A	2	<p>(b) Answers may include drug therapy, relaxation and/or biofeedback, and that their aim is to reduce the way the body responds to stress, ie to modify the response of the autonomic nervous system and production of stress hormones, so that the ill effects of stress are reduced. Psychological techniques may include: SIT (reducing catastrophic thinking) (Meichenbaum, 1976); Increasing hardiness (Kobasa, 1979, 1982); Coping strategies (Cohen & Lazarus, 1976); Problem and Emotion-Focused techniques (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).</p> <p>Evaluation can include (physiological techniques): in general, physiological methods are easier because they require less cognitive effort. Drugs can only be used in the short-term (due to potential for physical addiction). Some people, eg Type A personality type (Friedman and Rosenman, 1967) find relaxation very difficult. Biofeedback is useful for controlling the physical consequences of stress (raised blood pressure and headaches), but not the psychological consequences, such as anxiety, which are often more distressing. Biofeedback also requires access to biofeedback equipment. Psychological techniques: don't produce side-effects associated with drug therapies; don't need special equipment; effectiveness may be due to the attention of therapist, not therapy itself.</p>	4	4
In all questions alternative points may be credited as appropriate				
Totals			12	8

Question		Expected Answer/s	Approx Marks weightings: 80% ku – 20% ae	
A	3	<p>(a) A maximum of 1 KU mark can be awarded for a definition of memory.</p> <p>Answers should include a description of: sensory, STM, LTM and rehearsal. The answer may include capacity, duration and how information is coded and how it is transferred. Passive unitary stores. A diagram may be used to support the answer; a diagram alone without a supporting explanation may be awarded a maximum of 2 KU marks.</p> <p>The answer could include evaluation of the model or a comparison with another model of memory eg Working Memory Model. A minimum of two correctly explained evaluative points should be given for full AE marks to be awarded.</p> <p>Research could include the case study of HM (Milner 1966), Glanzer and Cunitz (1966), Sperling (1960), Conrad (1964), Peterson and Peterson (1959).</p>	8	4
A	3	<p>(b) A maximum of 1 KU mark can be awarded for a definition of EWT.</p> <p>Evaluation points may include: Conclusions from the study, eg influence of post-event information/leading questions Support from later research, eg Loftus et al (1978); Lindsay (1990)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenged by some later research, eg Bekerian and Bowers (1983); Yuille and Cutshall (1986) • Evaluation of methodology, eg poor ecological validity, possible demand characteristics • Application of findings/implications for practice, eg study has led to real-life research; police should avoid leading questions when taking witness statements 	4	4
<p>In all questions alternative points may be credited as appropriate</p>				
			12	8

Section B – Investigating Behaviour

Question		Expected Answer/s	Approx Marks weightings: 80% ku – 20% ae	
B	(a)	There is a relationship between optimism and health; there is a negative correlation between the level of optimism and illness or suitable alternative.	2	
B	(b)	Correlation. To establish relationship between variables. Positive: as one variable increases, so does the other. Negative: as one variable increases, the other decreases. Zero: no link found between variables. Correlation co-efficient calculated to establish the strength of the relationship between variables.	4	
B	(c)	Scattergram.	1	
B	(d)	Participants for the research are selected from whoever is available at the time and willing to take part. Advantage: inexpensive, straightforward Disadvantage: sample may be biased/unrepresentative	2	4
B	(e)	Three from, eg Self-report Use of questionnaires, interviews Open/Closed questions Face-to-face, postal, e-mail etc One strength must be given, depends on method eg questionnaire – large sample; interview – can explain questions.	3	2
B	(f)	Explanation might discuss informed consent, psychological distress, confidentiality of data, right to withdraw, etc.		2
In all questions alternative points may be credited as appropriate				
			12	8

Section C – The individual in the social Context

Social Psychology

Question		Expected Answer/s	Approx Marks weightings: 80% ku – 20% ae	
C	1	<p>Prejudice can be described as an attitude that predisposes us to think, feel, perceive and act in favourable or unfavourable ways towards a group or its individual members.</p> <p>Theories of prejudice fall into two broad categories. Personality theory – which places the emphasis on the personality dynamic of the individual Social psychological theories – which focus on the ways social systems, group dynamics and institutional factors within society can produce a negative attitude.</p> <p>Personality Theory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is within the psychodynamic explanations which see it as a result of the individual's own personal conflicts. Adorno et al (1950) were the main proponents of this by way of the Authoritarian Personality Theory. Strict parenting, high regard for authority importance of F scale rating could also be referred to. Research evidence may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Altemeyer (1981) Pettigrew (1958) Hyman (1954) Or any other relevant research. <p>Social Psychology Theory</p> <p>Social Identity Theory (Tafjel, 1982) argues that the mere identification with a social group is sufficient to cause hostility towards "outgroups"; "categorisation"; minimal group paradigm.</p> <p>Sherif's Inter Group Conflict Theory can be credited. Inter Group Conflict Theory (Sherif, 1966) argues that if two groups have the same goal, and if one group is perceived as frustrating the other, then inter-group prejudice and hostility is inevitable.</p> <p>Evaluation will depend on the research evidence used but could include the methodology, the sampling techniques, ethical issues etc.</p> <p>A maximum of 12 marks can be awarded if only <u>one</u> theory is included.</p>	12	8
		In all questions alternative points may be credited as appropriate		
		Totals	12	8

Question		Expected Answer/s	Approx Marks weightings: 80% ku – 20% ae	
C	2	<p>Definition of relationships; research focuses mainly on romantic attachments and marriage. Diversity of contemporary relationships.</p> <p>At least two from: Same-sex relationships: similarities and differences compared to heterosexual relationships, eg in terms of power relationships, attitudes to fidelity etc. Kitzinger and Coyle (1955); Bee (1994); Houston and Schwartz (1995). Cultural variations in relationships occur both across different cultures and within the same culture at different times. Examples may include arranged marriages; importance of economic factors; limited choice of partner in small communities; romantic love in western cultures. Duck (1999); Moghaddam et al (1993). Relationships formed/maintained via the internet; benefits and dangers of online relationships. Griffiths (2000), Williams (2000).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are relatively recent areas of research therefore findings are limited as yet. Evaluation and analysis may be demonstrated in various ways, including: research evidence supporting or challenging the topic; cultural/ethnocentric biases; methodology of relevant research, including ethical concerns; etc. • NB “Social” and “cultural” should be treated as interchangeable, ie candidates should not be penalised if they described a cultural variation as “social”, and vice versa. 	12	8
In all questions alternative points may be credited as appropriate				
			12	8

Question		Expected Answer/s	Approx Marks weightings: 80% ku – 20% ae	
C	3	<p>A definition of conformity – a form of social influence which results from exposure to the opinions of a majority. This should include compliance and internalisation or normative and informational social influence.</p> <p>A description of two or more factors eg personality and/or size of majority and/or importance of task etc.</p> <p>Eg Importance of task – Hornsey et al (2003) found that people who have strong moral basis for their beliefs (eg gay rights) will be less likely to conform.</p> <p>Eg Personality – Adorno et al (1950) described the “authoritarian personality” – these people are more likely to conform due to their upbringing/way they were socialised.</p> <p>Eg size of majority – Asch (1956) found that up to a point, as group size increased, so did the level of conformity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other possible factors: • Self-esteem – Asch (1956) showed that people with low self-esteem are more likely to conform. • Breaking the unanimous majority – Allen and Levine (1971) showed in a version of the Asch experiment that participants would follow an unreliable stooge eg “poorly sighted” if that stooge broke the unanimous majority. • Evaluation will depend on the research evidence used but might include eg reference to ecological validity, sampling, ethics etc. 	12	8
<p>In all questions alternative points may be credited as appropriate</p>				
			12	8

Question		Expected Answer/s	Approx Marks weightings: 80% ku – 20% ae	
C	4	<p>There is no universal definition of atypical behaviour. At least two definitions should be described from statistical infrequency, deviation from social norms, deviation from ideal mental health, maladaptiveness, failure to function adequately, personal distress.</p> <p>Relevant research evidence could include:</p> <p>Kessler et al (1994): 48% of Americans surveyed suffering at least one psychological disorder at some point in their lives. Cochrane (1977): Afro-Caribbean immigrants between two and seven times more likely to be diagnosed with schizophrenia than white people. Or any other relevant research study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Evaluation will depend on the research evidence used but might include cultural relativism, objective/subjective perception of reality, social control, labelling, gender stereotyping, concept of 'abnormal', based on psychological theory from eg Jahoda (1958), Szasz (1960), Laing (1959), Rosenhan (1973). 	12	8
In all questions alternative points may be credited as appropriate				
			12	8

Question		Expected Answer/s	Approx Marks weightings: 80% ku – 20% ae	
C	5	<p>A definition of intelligence – the ability to acquire information, to think and reason well and adapt to the environment; to grasp the essentials in a situation and respond appropriately.</p> <p>A description of two theories – these could consist of a factor theory and an information processing theory OR two factor theories OR two information processing theories – factor theories might include Spearman (1904), Thurstone (1938), Vernon (1950), Cattell (1963)</p> <p>Eg Spearman’s two-factor theory found a positive correlation in mental tests conducted on children so suggested that there was one general mental ability underlying all cognitive performance – the g factor. He also suggested that s factors – specific factors – explain why we are better at some tasks than others.</p> <p>Information processing theories might include Sternberg’s Triarchic Theory (1988), Case (1992), Gardner (1983) Eg Sternberg’s Triarchic Theory, based on concepts from computer technology, suggested three aspects to intelligence – analytical (the individual’s internal world eg reasoning), practical (the individual’s external world eg how we use our intelligence in everyday life) and creative (how an individual’s past experiences link the internal and external world)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengths and weaknesses of each theory – these will vary depending on the theory but eg • Factor theories (like Spearman’s) produce statistics which can be measured and compared. However, such theories suggest a large part of intelligence is inherited – this is debatable. Also – often the samples used were rather restricted eg Spearman and Vernon tested schoolchildren. <p>Information processing theories (like Sternberg) address the issue of how we solve problems, not just a description of our abilities. Sternberg’s theory can be applied to training programmes which can provide the strategies to use when dealing with novel tasks/situations.</p> <p>However, it is not clear exactly how the three subtheories relate to each other. Gottfredson (2003) suggests there is no evidence that “practical intelligence” is any different from skills already measured.</p> <p>A maximum of 12 marks can be awarded if only <u>one</u> theory is included.</p>	12	8
		In all questions alternative points may be credited as appropriate		
		Totals	12	8

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]