

GCE 2005  
*January Series*



# Mark Scheme

## Psychology A Specification

**PYA4 Social Psychology, Physiological Psychology,  
Cognitive Psychology, Developmental Psychology and  
Comparative Psychology**

---

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 from the AQA website:  
[www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2005 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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

*Dr. Michael Cresswell Director General*

## UNIT 4 (PYA4)

## MARK ALLOCATIONS FOR ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE ONE

Band	Marking Criteria	Marks
3	<p><i>At the top of the band</i> psychological content is <b>ACCURATE</b> and <b>WELL-DETAILED</b> at the level of knowledge, description and understanding. The organisation and structure are <b>PRESENTED COHERENTLY</b>. There is <b>SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OF BREADTH AND DEPTH</b> and a <b>BALANCE</b> between them has been <b>ACHIEVED</b>.</p> <p><i>At the bottom of the band</i> <b>SLIGHTLY LIMITED</b> psychological content is cited, which is <b>ACCURATE</b> and <b>WELL-DETAILED</b> at the level of knowledge, description and understanding. The organisation and structure are <b>PRESENTED COHERENTLY</b>. There is <b>EVIDENCE OF BREADTH AND DEPTH</b> although a <b>BALANCE</b> between these is <b>NOT ALWAYS ACHIEVED</b>.</p>	12 - 9
2	<p><i>At the top of the band</i> <b>LIMITED</b> psychological content is cited, which is <b>ACCURATE</b> and <b>REASONABLY DETAILED</b> at the level of knowledge, description and understanding. The answer is <b>REASONABLY CONSTRUCTED</b> in its attempt to answer the question. There is <b>SOME EVIDENCE OF BREADTH AND/OR DEPTH</b>.</p> <p><i>At the bottom of the band</i> <b>LIMITED</b> psychological content is cited which is <b>GENERALLY ACCURATE</b> at the level of knowledge, description and understanding but <b>LACKING IN DETAIL</b>. The answer is <b>REASONABLY CONSTRUCTED</b> in its attempt to answer the question. There is <b>SOME EVIDENCE OF BREADTH AND/OR DEPTH</b>.</p>	8 - 5
1	<p><i>At the top of the band</i> there is <b>BASIC</b> psychological content, <b>RUDIMENTARY</b> and <b>SOMETIMES FLAWED</b> description. The answer is <b>SOMETIMES FOCUSED</b> on the question but may be irrelevant or superficial.</p> <p><i>At the bottom of the band</i> the psychological content is <b>JUST DISCERNIBLE</b> and the views expressed may be largely ‘anecdotal psychology’, and/or the candidate makes <b>INACCURATE</b> assertions about the subject of the question. Description is <b>WEAK</b> and understanding is <b>MUDDLED</b> and <b>INCOMPLETE</b>. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>IRRELEVANT</b> to the problem it addresses.</p>	4 - 0

**MARK ALLOCATIONS FOR ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE TWO**

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marking Criteria</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>3</b>	<p><i>At the top of this band</i> commentary is <b>INFORMED</b> and <b>THOROUGH</b> in terms of analysis, evaluation and interpretation of relevant psychological theories, concepts, evidence or applications. Material has been used in a <b>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>APPROPRIATE SELECTION</b> and <b>COHERENT ELABORATION</b>.</p> <p><i>At the bottom of this band</i> commentary is <b>SLIGHTLY LIMITED</b> in terms of analysis, evaluation and interpretation of relevant psychological theories, concepts, evidence or applications. Material has been used in an <b>EFFECTIVE</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>APPROPRIATE SELECTION</b> and <b>COHERENT ELABORATION</b>.</p>	<b>12 - 9</b>
<b>2</b>	<p><i>At the top of this band</i> commentary is <b>REASONABLE</b> but <b>LIMITED</b> in terms of analysis, evaluation and interpretation of relevant psychological theories, concepts, evidence or applications. Material has been used in an <b>EFFECTIVE</b> manner and shows evidence of <b>COHERENT ELABORATION</b>.</p> <p><i>At the bottom of this band</i> commentary is <b>REASONABLE</b> but <b>LIMITED</b> in terms of analysis, evaluation and interpretation of relevant psychological theories, concepts, evidence or applications. Material has been used in a <b>REASONABLY EFFECTIVE</b> manner, and shows <b>SOME</b> evidence of <b>ELABORATION</b>.</p>	<b>8 - 5</b>
<b>1</b>	<p><i>At the top of this band</i> commentary is <b>MINIMAL, SUPERFICIAL</b> and <b>RUDIMENTARY</b> in terms of analysis, evaluation of psychological theories, concepts, evidence or applications. Material used is of a <b>RESTRICTED</b> nature and provides <b>MINIMAL INTERPRETATION</b>.</p> <p><i>At the bottom of this band</i> the psychological content is <b>JUST DISCERNIBLE</b>. Analysis is <b>WEAK</b> and evaluation is <b>MUDDLED</b> and <b>INCOMPLETE</b>. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>IRRELEVANT</b> to the problem it addresses.</p>	<b>4 - 0</b>

**QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION  
(QoWC)**

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

**General Note**

- i.** As a general rule, description of research studies should be credited as **AO1** material unless there is an explicit attempt to contextualise it as support/commentary/evaluation, in which case it can receive **AO2** credit.
  
- ii.** Where questions contain the bracketed phrase "theories **and/or** studies", or "explanations **and/or** studies", this does not imply a plurality requirement. The phrases are intended only to clarify the meaning of the term 'research' for candidates. Any plurality requirement will be contained in the remainder of the question.

**TURN OVER FOR THE FIRST QUESTION**

**SECTION A - SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY****1****Total for this question: 24 marks****Outline and evaluate *two* explanations for the origins of prejudice.****(24 marks)**

*Outline* is an **AO1** term, which requires candidates to provide a summary description of two explanations of the origins of prejudice. The **AO2** term is *Evaluate*, which requires candidates to present evidence of **AO2** in relation to the two explanations previously outlined.

**AO1**

There are numerous theories about the origins of prejudice, including personality theories (such as Adorno's Authoritarian Personality Theory), realistic conflict theory (demonstrated in the Robbers' Cave experiment, Sherif, 1967) and social identity theory.

If candidates outline (or later evaluate) more than two explanations, the best two should be credited (it is possible, however, that other theories may be used as part of the evaluative content of the question - see below). If candidates present only one, then partial performance penalties apply (see **AO1** mark allocation). Note that within major theoretical perspectives (such as social identity theory) there are a number of 'sub-theories', therefore candidates who draw exclusively from within one perspective, but nonetheless have outlined *two* explanations, should not be penalised. Note that material relating to the 'maintenance' or 'reduction' of prejudice is acceptable in this context provided that it is made explicitly relevant to the origins of prejudice.

Note that the term *Outline* does not require the same degree of descriptive detail as the *Describe* term.

**AO2**

Evaluation of the chosen theories may be accomplished in many ways, including their ability to explain social trends, their research support and so on. Note that evaluation can be positive as well as negative. Candidates who use research support as their chosen method of evaluation should make some attempt at building a critical argument using this research evidence rather than simply describing evidence that may or may not support the theory in question.

Candidates may introduce alternative theories of the origins of prejudice. These may earn credit if they are used as part of a sustained critical evaluation of the two original explanations. If candidates evaluate only one theory, then partial performance penalties apply (see **AO2** mark allocations).



**QUESTION 1: AO1**

Outline of two explanations of the origins of prejudice

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Outline of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Outline of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Outline of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i>	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Outline of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate but lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Outline of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>rudimentary and sometimes flawed</b> . There is <b>some focus</b> on the question. The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . <i>Partial performance is basic, generally accurate and lacking detail.</i>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Outline of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled understanding</b> . The answer may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. <i>Partial performance is rudimentary and sometimes flawed with little focus on the question.</i>	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 1: AO2**

Evaluation of two explanations of the origins of prejudice

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection</b> and <b>coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection</b> and <b>elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner. <i>Partial performance is thorough, coherent with highly effective use of material (top of band) or slightly limited and effective use of material (bottom of band).</i>	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence</b> of elaboration. The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner. <i>Partial performance is limited with reasonable elaboration, and reasonably effective use of material.</i>	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>superficial</b> and <b>rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> . <i>Partial performance is basic with some evidence of elaboration, and restricted use of material.</i>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of two explanations of the origins of prejudice is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> . <i>Partial performance is superficial with no evidence of elaboration; material not used effectively.</i>	<b>2-0</b>

2

Total for this question: 24 marks

**Discuss research (explanations and/or studies) into interpersonal attraction. (24 marks)**

*Discuss* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate research (explanations and/or studies) into interpersonal attraction. In the *Terms Used in Examination Questions* document, the term ‘research’ is defined as ‘the process of gaining knowledge and understanding via either theory construction, examination, or empirical data collection’.

**AO1**

There are three main approaches to this question. Candidates may, for example, examine research into the role of personal characteristics (such as physical attractiveness or personality) or explanations based on the evolutionary significance of male and female characteristics. Alternatively, candidates may focus more on theories of the formation of relationships *provided* they concentrate on those factors that are pertinent to the initial attraction phase rather than the development of a relationship. Thus, candidates may describe the reinforcement-affect model (Byrne and Clore, 1970) or perhaps the social-exchange theory (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959). These theories are more concerned with the development of relationships than initial attraction, but there are aspects that could be made relevant to this question. The third, and perhaps most likely, approach, is for candidates to examine research that has focused on *factors* that have been shown to be important in initial attraction (such as proximity, familiarity and so on). This is consistent with the ‘filter theory’ advocated by Kerckhoff and Davis, (1962). As the question allows for both theoretical or empirical accounts of these factors, any of these approaches would receive credit.

**AO2**

For the **AO2** component of this question, it is acceptable for candidates to evaluate in terms of the evidence for or against their chosen theories/research studies, the cultural or gender biases inherent in certain theories or in terms of alternative explanations and perspectives.

Some candidates may choose to write about post-modern explanations of relationships and the nature of male and female discourses relating to the attraction process. This is perfectly acceptable either as distinctive *theories* of relationships or as evaluation of other theories. Likewise, some candidates may choose to offer discussion of the evolutionary significance of male-female differences in attraction as part of their **AO2** evaluation. Provided this is presented as commentary rather than simply *description*, it can be credited as **AO2**.

Note that the question does not carry a plurality requirement, the critical word being *research* rather than research *studies*. Material on computer mediated communication (CMC), gay and lesbian relationships or even cross-cultural differences in relationships are all relevant, but only material that is specifically linked to *attraction*.

Candidates who merely describe research studies should have such material credited as **AO1**, unless there is an explicit attempt to contextualise the material as evaluation/commentary, in which case it may be credited as **AO2**.

**QUESTION 2: AO1***Description of research into interpersonal attraction*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Description of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth and depth and an appropriate balance between them is achieved.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Description of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is evidence of <b>breadth and depth</b> , although a balance between them is not always achieved.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Description of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . There is <b>increasing evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Description of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate but lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Description of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>rudimentary and sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Description of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement.	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 2: AO2***Evaluation of research into interpersonal attraction*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research into interpersonal attraction is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>2-0</b>

3

Total for this question: 24 marks

- (a) Outline and evaluate *one or more* studies relating to media influences on pro-social behaviour. (12 marks)
- (b) Outline and evaluate *one or more* studies relating to media influences on anti-social behaviour. (12 marks)

*Outline* is an AO1 term, which requires candidates to provide a summary description of one or more studies relating to media influences. The AO2 term is *evaluate*, which requires the candidate to present evidence of AO2, in relation to the two theories previously outlined, in terms of relevant research evidence.

Note that the question is not restricted to studies of *television* effects, so candidates can include reference to studies of other forms of media as well. For some candidates who take a more expansive approach to the question (i.e. writing about *more* than one study), there will be an inevitable trade-off of depth against breadth. Examiners should bear this in mind and make suitable allowances for it.

**(a) AO1**

Reference to ‘research’ in general terms rather than studies would count as ‘just discernible’ AO1. Research studies may include *specific* studies relating to media influences on pro-social behaviour (e.g. Johnston and Ettema, 1982) or *meta-studies* such as those carried out by Hearold (1986) or Mares (1996). Some of these studies (such as Hearold’s meta-study) were designed to investigate both pro-social *and* anti-social effects, but only the results relating to pro-social effects are relevant here. Material relating to *anti-social* effects might be used as part of the evaluation of pro-social effects, or it may be exported to part (b) of the question.

**(a) AO2**

Evaluation may be aimed at specific methodological or interpretative problems of these studies (e.g. the claim that many of Hearold’s studies were of specially made pro-social programmes rather than real television shows). Alternatively, some candidates may use these findings to offer *explanations* of the pro-social influence of the media (e.g. the acquisition of pro-social behaviours through social learning). This is appropriate provided candidates are *using* this material in an AO2 manner, rather than simply offering descriptions of these explanations.

**(b) AO1**

The same comments apply as in part (a) above. Again, candidates may choose to write about specific studies or meta-studies (such as Paik and Comstock, 1994).

**(b) AO2**

They may also use other studies as part of their evaluation of their chosen AO1 studies. For example, the St Helena study (Charlton et al., 2000) appears to contradict many of the earlier findings in natural experiments in other societies. Similarly, the findings from research studies may be used to construct an explanatory framework for possible media effects (e.g. desensitisation and justification). Again, this is appropriate provided candidates are *using* this material in an AO2 manner, rather than simply offering descriptions of these explanations.

Some candidates may offer general comments about the media effects debate, such as those detailed in David Gauntlett’s ‘*Ten things wrong with the media effects debate*’ or Sonia Livingstone’s book ‘*Making sense of television*’. It is possible to use general comments (such as the artificiality of laboratory work versus the lack of control of studies in the field) for both parts of this question.

**QUESTION 3 (a) and (b): AO1 (Use for both parts of the question)**

Outline of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Outline of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>6</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Outline of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>5</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Outline of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably</b> constructed.	<b>4</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Outline of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate but lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>3</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Outline of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>rudimentary and sometimes flawed</b> . There is <b>some focus</b> on the question. The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>2</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Outline of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak and shows muddled understanding</b> . The answer may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement.	<b>1-0</b>

**QUESTION 3 (a) and (b): AO2 (Use for both parts of the question)***Evaluation of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>6</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>5</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>4</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence</b> of elaboration. The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner..	<b>3</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence</b> of elaboration. The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>2</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one or more studies relating to media influences on pro-social/anti-social behaviour is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>1-0</b>

**SECTION B: PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY**

4

**Total for this question: 24 marks****Discuss the organisation of language in the brain.****(24 marks)**

*Discuss* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate (i.e. provide commentary on) the organisation of language in the brain.

**AO1**

It is likely that most answers to this question may deal with issues of both *localisation* and *lateralisation*. Verbal behaviour is a lateralised function, with most language disturbances occurring after damage to the left side of the brain. Candidates may, make reference to the existence of specialised language areas in the brain (e.g. Broca's area and Wernicke's area). Candidates may also point out, for example, that the left hemisphere has become specialised in the analysis of sequences of behaviour (such as sentences) and in the production of sequences of voluntary movements (such as in speech).

Also appropriate in this context would be a discussion of speech disorders and the insights they give into the way that language is organised in the brain. Appropriate disorders include apraxia (the inability to execute a learned movement), aphasia (in various forms – surface or deep, Broca's, Wernicke's) and so on. Although unlikely, it is possible that some candidates may offer a discussion of Chomsky's views on language organisation (e.g. the language acquisition device). Such material may be credited *provided* it addresses how such organisation relates to brain structure.

The wording of the question allows for both research studies and explanations generated by such studies. Some candidates may attempt to explain *why* language is organised in this way, and how it these brain structures have evolved. This approach is perfectly acceptable and should receive credit.

**AO2**

Commentary may be achieved in a number of ways, e.g. through examination of alternative explanations, supporting research evidence or other forms of relevant *commentary*. It is most likely that candidates may use research studies to evaluate assumptions about language organisation in the brain, or perhaps use the insights from brain injury as a way of confirming the claims made previously. It is also possible that candidates might consider how such organisation might have evolved in the first place. One such explanation sees lateralisation in the brain evolving because of the functional incompatibility of brain systems. It is possible that two functions (such as language and spatial processing) must be kept apart because optimal performance in one is somehow detrimental to optimal performance in the other. Cues that are important for language are irrelevant for spatial processing, and vice-versa. Such discussion would count as 'commentary' on the organisation of language, and therefore is acceptable as **AO2**. Note that discussion of other forms of brain organisation or hemispheric asymmetries (e.g. handedness) would not be relevant in the context of this question, unless the candidate is making an explicit link with the organisation of language in the brain. The **AO2** approach taken will largely be dictated by the **AO1** approach adopted (e.g. discussion of Broca's aphasia may be offered as either **AO1** or **AO2**).

**QUESTION 4: AO1**

Description of the organisation of language in the brain

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Description of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth and depth and an appropriate balance between them is achieved.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Description of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is evidence of <b>breadth and depth</b> , although a balance between them is not always achieved.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Description of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . There is <b>increasing evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Description of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Description of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>rudimentary</b> and <b>sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Description of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement.	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 4: AO2***Evaluation of the organisation of language in the brain*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of the organisation of language in the brain is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>2-0</b>

5

Total for this question: 24 marks

<b>Describe and evaluate research (theories <i>and/or</i> studies) relating to the nature of dreams (e.g. content, duration, relationship with the stages of sleep). (24 marks)</b>
---

*Describe* is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO1** with relation to research findings relating to the nature of dreams. *Evaluate* is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO2** with relation to these research. Note that, in the *Terms used in examinations* document, the term 'research' is defined as 'the process of gaining knowledge and understanding via either theory construction, examination, or empirical data collection. The term 'findings' refers to 'The outcome or product of research.'

**AO1**

Candidates have a number of ways to answer this question. They may describe research into the *content* of dreams (e.g. Cartwright et al's observation that people undergoing marital separation and divorce tend to dream about their problems) or the different *kinds* of dreams (e.g. the distinction between REM-state dreams and NREM-state dreams) or even research into *lucid dreams*.

As the use of the term 'research' allows for both theories and research studies of dreams, it is acceptable for candidates to describe *neurobiological* (e.g. Crick and Mitchison's 'reverse learning' theory of dreams and Hobson and McCarley's 'activation synthesis' theory of dreams) and/or *psychological* theories (e.g. Freud and Jung) as well as research studies relating to these explanations. However, for marks across the scale, candidates must make it clear what these theories tell us about the nature of dreams. Otherwise such material can earn a maximum of 4 marks for **AO1** and 4 marks for **AO2**.

**AO2**

Evaluation may take the form of alternative theoretical explanations for the phenomenon of dreams, or the extent of research support for a particular explanation or piece of research. It is important that candidates who use alternative explanations of research evidence do so in such a way that their inclusion is part of a sustained critical commentary, rather than such material merely being included as an extension to the descriptive detail already presented. Although candidates may describe specific theories or research studies in response to this question, their evaluation may be more general. Thus, it is perfectly acceptable for candidates to consider the problems faced by laboratory studies of dreams (the artificial nature of the laboratory environment) as part of their AO2 evaluation.



**QUESTION 5: AO1**

Description of research relating to the nature of dreams

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Description of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth and depth and an appropriate balance between them is achieved.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Description of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is evidence of <b>breadth and depth</b> , although a balance between them is not always achieved.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Description of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . There is <b>increasing evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Description of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate but lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Description of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>rudimentary and sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Description of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement.	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 8: AO2***Evaluation of research relating to the nature of dreams*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research relating to the nature of dreams is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>2-0</b>

6

Total for this question: 24 marks

- (a) Outline and evaluate *one* physiological theory of emotion (e.g. James-Lange). (12 marks)
- (b) Outline and evaluate *one* combined physiological/psychological theory of emotion (e.g. Schachter's cognitive labelling theory). (12 marks)

(a) *Outline* is an **AO1** term, which requires candidates to provide a summary description of one physiological approach to explaining emotional behaviour and/or experience. *Evaluate* is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO2** relating to this approach.

(b) *Outline* is an **AO1** term, which requires the candidate to provide a summary description of one combined approach to explaining emotional behaviour and/or experience from a physiological perspective. *Evaluate* is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO2** relating to this approach.

(a) The question offers candidates the opportunity to write about any aspect of emotional behaviour or experience. Thus, candidates may achieve credit by describing theories relating to the role played by different brain structures (such as the hypothalamus, limbic system, and cerebral hemispheres). However, it is more likely that candidates will select theories which attempt to explain emotional *experience*. The main requirement of this part of the question, therefore, is that the chosen theory is *physiological* in nature. The most likely theories that would fulfil this criterion are the James-Lange and Cannon-Bard theories. It is possible, that some candidates may adopt a wider interpretation of the term 'emotion' and write about physiological theories of emotional *disorders*. Thus, we might expect answers that described theories of anxiety disorders and depression. These are acceptable and would receive credit.

(b) The main requirement of this second part of the question is that the chosen theory is drawn from a *combined* physiological/psychological approach. The most likely theories that would fulfil this criterion are the theories of Schachter and Lazarus. As with part (a) of this question, some candidates describe and evaluate *combined* theories of emotional *disorders*. Provided these meet the criteria of a combined physiological/psychological approach, they would receive credit.

If a candidate includes material that is *clearly relevant* and would earn marks in one part of a question, it should remain (when determining marks) *regardless* of whether it might earn more marks elsewhere. If the material is only *peripherally relevant* or *irrelevant* to one part of the question and would earn marks in the other part, then it should be '*exported*' (when determining marks) to that part.

**QUESTION 6 (a) and (b): AO1 (Use for both parts of the question)*****Outline of one physiological/combined theory of emotion***

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Outline of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>6</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Outline of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>5</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Outline of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> .	<b>4</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Outline of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>3</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Outline of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>rudimentary</b> and <b>sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>2</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Outline of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement.	<b>1-0</b>

**QUESTION 6: AO2*****Evaluation of one physiological/combined theory of emotion***

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>6</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>5</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>4</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>3</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>2</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one physiological/combined theory of emotion is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>1-0</b>

**SECTION C: COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY**

7

**Total for this question: 24 marks**

**Describe and evaluate *one or more* theories of face recognition (e.g. Bruce and Young). (24 marks)**

*Describe* is an **AO1** term, which requires candidates to provide evidence of **AO1** with respect to one or more theories of face recognition. *Evaluate* is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO2** in terms of research studies relevant to this theory/theories.

**AO1**

The most likely theory of face recognition is the Bruce and Young functional model of face recognition (Bruce and Young, 1986), although there are a number of other models that might also be included in response to this question. These include the 'face-space' model proposed by Valentine (1991), Burton's connectionist model of face recognition (Burton, 1994), as well as computational models (e.g. Marr, 1982). The question does not rule out other theories of face recognition that might be rooted in neurophysiology in computer modelling. Credit should be given for any theories that address the problem of face recognition.

**AO2**

As this is a fairly contemporary area of research, there is no shortage of research evidence carried out to test the assumptions of these theories. Again, the Bruce and Young model has been subjected to perhaps the most rigorous empirical testing, and therefore candidates may probably be aware of studies appropriate to this part of the question. Note, that candidates who simply *describe* such appropriate research evidence without using this material as part of a sustained critical commentary will receive a maximum of 4 marks (top of Band 1) for this skill component. It would be entirely appropriate for candidates to use alternative theories/models as a method of evaluation.

For some candidates who take a more expansive approach to the question (i.e. writing about *more* than one theory), there will be an inevitable trade-off of depth against breadth. Examiners should bear this in mind and make suitable allowances for it.

**QUESTION 7: AO1*****Description of one or more theories of face recognition***

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Description of one or more theories of face recognition is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth and depth and an appropriate balance between them is achieved.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Description of one or more theories of face recognition is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is evidence of <b>breadth and depth</b> , although a balance between them is not always achieved.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Description of one or more theories of face recognition is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . There is <b>increasing evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Description of one or more theories of face recognition is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate but lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Description of one or more theories of face recognition is <b>rudimentary and sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Description of one or more theories of face recognition is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement.	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 7: AO2*****Evaluation of one or more theories of face recognition***

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of one or more theories of face recognition in terms of relevant research studies is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one or more theories of face recognition in terms of relevant research studies is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of one or more theories of face recognition in terms of relevant research studies is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one or more theories of face recognition in terms of relevant research studies is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of one or more theories of face recognition in terms of relevant research studies is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one or more theories of face recognition in terms of relevant research studies is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>2-0</b>

8

Total for this question:

**Describe and evaluate one or more direct theories of visual perception (e.g. Gibson). (24 marks)**

*Describe* is an **AO1** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO1** with relation to one or more direct theories of perception. *Evaluate* is an **AO2** term which requires the candidate to give evidence of **AO2** with relation to this theory/theories.

**AO1**

Although Gibson's theory is used only as an example in the question, it is undoubtedly the one most likely to be chosen by candidates. Therefore, appropriate content might include the importance of the optic array, the provision of invariant information such as texture gradient and flow patterns, affordance, and the importance of movement in perception. It is likely that many candidates may elaborate through the use of appropriate examples. These can be credited as elaboration of their description of the theory, but should not be used exclusively in lieu of informed psychological description of the theory itself.

It is possible that some candidates might choose an alternative to Gibson's theory. Some may choose to represent Marr's explanation of perception as a theory of 'direct' perception (Marr, 1982) or Greeno's 'situation theory' (Greeno, 1994). This is acceptable if unlikely as a response to this question. Candidates who write about Gregory's constructivist theory of perception will not receive marks.

**AO2**

Evaluation is most likely to take the form of either reviewing research support for the chosen theory or perhaps its explanatory power. A particular difficulty for Gibson's theory is in the explanation of visual illusions - phenomena that are perhaps a strength of the alternative constructivist theories such as Gregory's theory of perception.

It is possible that some candidates may *describe* alternative perspectives on perception (e.g. Gregory's theory) rather than using them explicitly as evaluation of their chosen direct theory. Better candidates may *evaluate* their chosen theory in a more explicit way. They may, for example, point out that a weakness of one theory (e.g. Gibson's failure to provide a convincing explanation for visual illusions) is a strength of the alternative theory. They would receive more marks because the evaluative material is being used more *effectively*. Candidates who simply *describe* alternative theories without making any explicit attempt to use these in explicit evaluation of their chosen theory will receive a maximum of 4 marks (top of Band 1) for the **AO2** component.

**QUESTION 8: AO1***Description of one direct theory of visual perception*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Description of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth and depth and an appropriate balance between them is achieved.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Description of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is evidence of <b>breadth and depth</b> , although a balance between them is not always achieved.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Description of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . There is <b>increasing evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Description of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Description of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>rudimentary</b> and <b>sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Description of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement.	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 8: AO2***Evaluation of one direct theory of visual perception*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of one direct theory of visual perception is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>2-0</b>

9

Total for this question: 24 marks

<b>Critically consider research (theories <i>and/or</i> investigations) into social and cultural aspects of language use (e.g. Bernstein, Labov). (24 marks)</b>
--

*Critically consider* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term, which requires candidates to both describe (**AO1**) and evaluate, i.e. provide commentary on (**AO2**), social and cultural aspects of language use.

**AO1**

It is most likely that candidates will choose research *studies* carried out by Bernstein or Labov, although other studies and/or theories (e.g. on gender differences in language usage) would also be appropriate. It is possible that some candidates may include material based on the 'linguistic relativity hypothesis' (Whorf, 1956). This *may* be credited as appropriate provided the candidate has stressed the important role of social/cultural determinants of the relationship between language and thought. It is also possible that some candidates may focus on the social use of language from a Vygotskyian perspective - this is also acceptable in the context of this question. As the question does not stress language use *in humans*, it is permissible for candidates to consider investigations that have focused on the social/cultural use of 'language' in non-humans. Although such an approach would be unlikely, it would be acceptable *provided* the candidate made a sound case for the behaviour being *language*, and the context social/cultural.

Although the question asks for the social *and* cultural aspects of language use, this is not meant to imply a plurality response (i.e. both social *and* cultural aspects) as it would clearly be unfair to expect candidates to distinguish between these terms in this context..

**AO2**

Commentary may be accomplished in many ways, including criticisms of the chosen studies (e.g. Labov's criticisms of Bernstein's work), the degree to which these studies are supported by other research studies, or comments on the conclusions that might be drawn. If candidates take the 'theory' route in their answer, they may focus on the explanatory power of the chosen theories, their research support, or inconsistencies within the theories themselves. It is possible that candidates may introduce further theories or studies as a way of demonstrating alternative perspectives on this topic. The degree to which candidates *use* this material as part of a developed critical argument, rather than simply presenting alternative perspectives, will constitute the *effectiveness* of the evaluation, and hence the number of marks awarded for this component. Candidates who simply *describe* alternative theories or appropriate research evidence without using this material as part of a sustained critical commentary will receive a maximum of 4 marks (top of **Band 1**) for this component.



**QUESTION 9: AO1***Description of research into the social and cultural aspects of language use*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Description of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth and depth and an appropriate balance between them is achieved.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Description of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is evidence of <b>breadth and depth</b> , although a balance between them is not always achieved.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Description of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . There is <b>increasing evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Description of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Description of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>rudimentary</b> and <b>sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Description of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement.	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 9: AO2***Evaluation of research into social and cultural aspects of language use*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research into social and cultural aspects of language use is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>2-0</b>

**SECTION D: DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY****10****Total for this question: 24 marks****Discuss one or more theories of pro-social reasoning (e.g. Eisenberg).****(24 marks)**

*Discuss* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate one or more theories of pro-social reasoning. For some candidates who take a more expansive approach to the question (i.e. writing about *more* than one theory), there will be an inevitable trade-off of depth against breadth. Examiners should bear this in mind and make suitable allowances for it.

**AO1**

The most obvious theory of pro-social reasoning is Eisenberg (1982), and this is the example given in the question. There are other theories that deal with pro-social reasoning, most notably Hoffman's theory of empathetic arousal (Hoffman, 1991). It is most likely that candidates focus on the former, therefore they may include the need for empathetic concern and perspective-taking, Eisenberg's six stages of pro-social reasoning, and description of the dilemmas used to test pro-social reasoning in children. Some candidates may choose theories that are more associated with *moral* reasoning rather than pro-social reasoning (e.g. Kohlberg, Gilligan etc.). There are certainly aspects of these theories that might be considered 'pro-social', for example Kohlberg's conventional level of morality stresses the importance of positive relationships and societal order. Likewise, Gilligan suggests that women tend to use a 'morality of care' rather than one based on abstract principles. Candidates who take this latter route should make the 'pro-social' nature of their chosen theories (if not directly a theory of pro-social reasoning as above) explicit. Candidates who describe theories of moral understanding without making this link explicit should receive a maximum of 4 marks for this assessment objective.

**AO2**

Evaluation may be both negative *and* positive, therefore it is possible that some candidates may stress strengths and/or limitations of their chosen theory/theories as well as the research support for its/their assumptions, or related gender and cultural issues. It is possible that candidates may introduce further theories (such as Gilligan's morality of care perspective) as a way of demonstrating alternatives to their chosen theory/theories. The degree to which candidates *use* this material as part of a developed critical argument, rather than simply presenting alternative perspectives, should constitute the *effectiveness* of the evaluation, and hence the number of marks awarded for this component. Candidates who simply *describe* alternative theories or appropriate research evidence without using this material as part of a sustained critical commentary should receive a maximum of 4 marks (top of Band 1) for this component.

Candidates who simply describe theories of *altruism* without drawing out their insights into the nature of pro-social reasoning should not receive credit for this material. However, it is most likely that such essays will contain some material on pro-social reasoning. Examiners should credit this material accordingly.

**QUESTION 10: AO1*****Description of one or more theories of pro-social reasoning***

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Description of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth and depth and an appropriate balance between them is achieved.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Description of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is evidence of <b>breadth and depth</b> , although a balance between them is not always achieved.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Description of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . There is <b>increasing evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Description of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Description of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>rudimentary</b> and <b>sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Description of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement.	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 10: AO2*****Evaluation of one or more theories of pro-social reasoning***

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of <i>one or more</i> theories of pro-social reasoning is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>2-0</b>

11

Total for this question: 24 marks

**Discuss research (theories and/or studies) into the formation of identity in adolescence.****(24 marks)**

*Discuss* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate research (theories and/or studies) into the formation of identity in adolescence. In the *Terms Used in Examination Questions* document, the term 'research' is defined as 'the process of gaining knowledge and understanding via either theory construction, examination, or empirical data collection'.

**AO1**

This question allows for both *theories* and *studies* related to identity formation in adolescence. Thus, examiners might expect the inclusion of Erikson's psychosocial theory (Erikson, 1968), Coleman's focal theory (Coleman, 1974), as well as Marcia's research on identity formation (Marcia, 1966). Erikson believed that to successfully form an identity, adolescents must establish trust in their relationships, break away from parental control (autonomy), take the initiative and be industrious in working towards their goals and plans. Adolescents who are not successful in this quest may enter a phase that Erikson refers to as *identity confusion*. Marcia found evidence for four distinct 'statuses' that adolescents go through as they attempt to achieve their identity. Whichever theory and/or studies are chosen, it is important that candidates focus only on *adolescence*, and specifically on identity formation as the primary task of adolescence. Alternative perspectives (e.g. the achievement of the genital stage in psychoanalytic theory) may only receive credit if they are explicitly related to identity formation.

**AO2**

Evaluation may be accomplished in many ways, including research support for a particular theoretical position, the ability of a particular position to 'fit the facts' (such as its view on the 'storm and stress' assertion), methodological problems of research studies, or the conclusions that might be drawn from these studies. It is possible that candidates may use research studies to demonstrate support (or challenge) for a particular theoretical position, or a theory to synthesise the findings from research studies. Candidates who merely *describe* these research studies or theories, should have such material credited as **AO1**, *unless* there is an explicit attempt made to construct a critical argument using this material, in which case it may be credited as **AO2**.

**QUESTION 11: AO1***Description of research into the formation of identity in adolescence*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Description of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth and depth and an appropriate balance between them is achieved.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Description of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is evidence of <b>breadth and depth</b> , although a balance between them is not always achieved.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Description of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . There is <b>increasing evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Description of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Description of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>rudimentary</b> and <b>sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Description of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement.	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 11: AO2***Evaluation of research into the formation of identity in adolescence*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of research into the formation of identity in adolescence is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>2-0</b>

12

Total for this question: 24 marks

- (a) Outline research (theories *and/or* studies) into how people cope with bereavement. (12 marks)
- (b) To what extent are there cultural differences in how people cope with bereavement? (12 marks)

(a) *Outline* is an **AO1** term, which requires candidates to provide a summary description of research into how people cope with bereavement. Note that, in the *Terms used in examinations* document, the term ‘research’ is defined as ‘the process of gaining knowledge and understanding via either theory construction, examination, or empirical data collection.

(b) The **AO2** term is *To what extent*, which requires the candidate to present evidence of **AO2** in terms of a consideration of the extent to which there are cultural differences in how people cope with bereavement.

**(a) AO1**

Appropriate material for this part of the question might include *theoretical* insights (e.g. Kübler-Ross, 1969 and Murray-Parkes, 1972) and/or *research studies* (e.g. Silverman’s work on the chronology of grief - Silverman, 1986). The main requirement is that such research is *psychological* in nature, although research in from closely associated disciplines (e.g. gerontology, sociology etc.) may also be acceptable in this context provided it is concerned with how people *cope* with bereavement. Due to the particular nature of this question, relevant **AO2** material can be accepted for **AO1** credit in this question section.

Coping with bereavement is not the sole province of adults, yet it has been perceived wisdom that the processes are very different in children and adults. Freud believed that young children lack the capacity to mourn, the psychological tasks involved in resolving grief being too difficult for children to negotiate. Only in adolescence, he claimed, does true grieving become possible. More recent studies, on the other hand, suggest that losing a parent is not a single event with predictable consequences for the child. Rather, the way a child copes with their loss is the result of a complex interweaving of circumstances, including the emotional responses and parenting abilities of the surviving parent and the presence or absence of other stressors in the child’s life.

**(b) AO2**

The second part of this question asks candidates to assess the degree to which there are cultural differences in how people cope with bereavement. Some candidates will simply *describe* differences in coping behaviour rather than using these explicitly as an assessment of the degree to which they represent a difference in the ways different cultures perceive and therefore deal with bereavement. Better answers might engage with these differences in a more explicit way, perhaps by considering the underlying cultural beliefs that give rise to these differences, the implications of any differences, or considering whether the claim for cultural differences in coping with bereavement is supported by research evidence. They would receive thus more marks because their evaluative material is being used more *effectively*. Candidates who merely *describe* cultural differences should be restricted to a mark at the top of **Band 2**.

If a candidate includes material that is *clearly relevant* and would earn marks in one part of a question, it should remain (when determining marks) *regardless* of whether it might earn more marks elsewhere. If the material is only *peripherally relevant* or *irrelevant* to one part of the question and would earn marks in the other part, then it should be ‘*exported*’ (when determining marks) to that part.

**QUESTION 12(a): AO1**

Outline of research (theories and/or studies) into how people cope with bereavement

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Outline of research into how people cope with bereavement is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Outline of research into how people cope with bereavement is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Outline of research into how people cope with bereavement is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> .	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Outline of research into how people cope with bereavement is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Outline of research into how people cope with bereavement is <b>rudimentary</b> and <b>sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Outline of research into how people cope with bereavement is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement.	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 12: AO2***Assessment of the extent to which there are cultural differences in how people cope with bereavement*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Assessment of the extent to which there are cultural differences in how people cope with bereavement is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Assessment of the extent to which there are cultural differences in how people cope with bereavement is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Assessment of the extent to which there are cultural differences in how people cope with bereavement is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Assessment of the extent to which there are cultural differences in how people cope with bereavement is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Assessment of the extent to which there are cultural differences in how people cope with bereavement is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Assessment of the extent to which there are cultural differences in how people cope with bereavement is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>2-0</b>

**SECTION E: COMPARATIVE PSYCHOLOGY****13****Total for this question: 24 marks**

- (a) Outline the nature of classical *and* operant conditioning. (12 marks)**
- (b) Assess the role of *either* classical *or* operant conditioning in the behaviour of non-human animals. (12 marks)**

(a) *Outline* is an **AO1** term, which requires candidates to provide a summary description of the nature of classical and operant conditioning.

(b) The **AO2** term is *Assess*, which requires the candidate to present evidence of **AO2** in relation to the role of *either* classical *or* operant conditioning in animal behaviour.

**AO1**

The *nature* of classical conditioning can be taken here to mean the main features (i.e. assumptions and/or procedures) of classical conditioning. These include the predictive value of the CS, the gradual acquisition of the learned association between CS and UCS, the importance of order of presentation, the processes of extinction, spontaneous recovery and stimulus generalisation. For operant conditioning, candidates might include the nature of reinforcement and punishment, reinforcement schedules, the relationship between antecedents, behaviour and consequences (the ABC model), or make reference to Thorndike's Law of Effect. Note that some candidates may label operant and classical conditioning the wrong way round. Such answers, or those where outlines are not labelled at all, can receive a maximum mark at the top of band 2. There is a plurality requirement for this part of the question. Candidates, who outline the nature of either operant or classical conditioning *alone*, will receive a maximum mark of Band 2 (top).

**AO2**

In assessing the role of classical conditioning in the behaviour of non-human animals, candidates may appraise the theory of classical conditioning itself (e.g. by explaining the biological constraints of classical conditioning or the problems posed by phenomena such as one-trial learning). Alternatively they may assess the degree to which the natural behaviour of animals shows evidence of classical conditioning in operation. For example, research has demonstrated the importance of this form of learning in foraging, hunting and behaviour towards conspecifics (most notably in reproductive behaviour). A similar approach may be taken if *operant* conditioning is chosen for the second part of this question with candidates focusing on the role of operant conditioning in, for example, mating behaviour or foraging behaviour. Note that this part of the question asks for an assessment of the role of *either* classical *or* operant conditioning. Candidates who include both should have the better one credited. This part of the question is restricted to non-humans only, therefore material on humans should not receive credit.

If a candidate includes material that is *clearly relevant* and would earn marks in one part of a question, it should remain (when determining marks) *regardless* of whether it might earn more marks elsewhere. If the material is only *peripherally relevant* or *irrelevant* to one part of the question and would earn marks in the other part, then it should be '*exported*' (when determining marks) to that part.



**QUESTION 13(a): AO1**

Outline of the nature of classical and operant conditioning

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Outline of the nature of classical and operant conditioning is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Outline of the nature of classical and operant conditioning is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Outline of the nature of classical and operant conditioning is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i>	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Outline of the nature of classical and operant conditioning is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate but lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Outline of the nature of classical and operant conditioning is <b>rudimentary and sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . <i>Partial performance is basic, generally accurate and lacking detail.</i>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Outline of the nature of classical and operant conditioning is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. <i>Partial performance is rudimentary and sometimes flawed with little focus on the question.</i>	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 13: AO2**

Assessment of the role of either classical or operant conditioning in the behaviour of non-human animals

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Assess the role of either classical or operant conditioning in the behaviour of non-human animals is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Assess the role of either classical or operant conditioning in the behaviour of non-human animals is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Assess the role of either classical or operant conditioning in the behaviour of non-human animals is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Assess the role of either classical or operant conditioning in the behaviour of non-human animals is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Assess the role of either classical or operant conditioning in the behaviour of non-human animals is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Assess the role of either classical or operant conditioning in the behaviour of non-human animals is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>2-0</b>

14

Total for this question: 24 marks

**Discuss two or more studies of animal language.****(24 marks)**

*Discuss* is an **AO1** and **AO2** term, which requires the candidate to both describe and evaluate two or more studies of animal language.

**AO1**

Although this question might elicit one of two distinct approaches (i.e. studies of ‘natural’ animal language and studies that have attempted to teach human language to non-humans), it is likely that the vast majority of candidates will choose to write only about the latter. This is acceptable, as is any response that chooses to incorporate both of these within the same answer.

Because of this, examiners can expect a wide range of different research studies, from the early days of Vicki and Washoe, through the more recent studies of Koko the gorilla, Kanzi the bonobo, and Akeakamai the dolphin. There have been quite a few recent documentaries showing the astonishing language capabilities of pygmy chimpanzees and dolphins, not to mention the occasional trip into ‘faction’ as demonstrated in the feature film *Congo*. Candidates will thus arrive at this question with a number of preconceived ideas and beliefs that may not be borne out by hard research evidence.

Candidates that choose to discuss research into ‘natural’ animal language may include the work of Peter Marler, who has investigated the linguistic capabilities of a large number of different species, or Seyfarth and Cheney, whose work with vervet monkeys has challenged many of our assumptions about the communication abilities of non-human species.

As the question asks for ‘studies’, it is imperative that marks are awarded for knowledge of empirical research rather than speculation about the linguistic abilities of non-human animals. Note that the question does not specify what animals are being researched, therefore research with primates, marine mammals and parrots can all receive marks.

**AO2**

To evaluate this area of research, it is appropriate to look at the methodological limitations of appropriate studies (as with Terrace’s claims against the Washoe and Nim Chimpsky language skills evidence). Alternatively, candidates might consider what is actually meant by ‘language’, and whether the performance of non-human animals in these studies really does constitute language according to these criteria. Studies into the ‘language’ of honey bees, for example, provide an opportunity to consider whether such behaviour really does satisfy the criteria of displacement, duality of patterning etc. and therefore might really be regarded as *language*.

As the question does not specify ‘non-human’ animals, answers that dwell on research studies of *human* language are as relevant as those which concentrate on non-humans. Such answers are likely to be rare, but may receive credit if they are relevant within the context of the question set. It is also appropriate to consider the ethics of these studies, although examiners should guard against giving credit for accusations and assertions that are more speculative and assertive than informed. There is a partial performance penalty for this question. Candidates who present only one study of animal language will be restricted to a maximum mark in **Band 2** (top) for each assessment objective.

**QUESTION 14: AO1***Description of two or more studies of animal language*

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Description of two or more studies of animal language is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is <b>substantial evidence</b> of breadth and depth and an appropriate balance between them is achieved.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Description of two or more studies of animal language is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> . There is evidence of <b>breadth and depth</b> , although a balance between them is not always achieved.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Description of two or more studies of animal language is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . There is <b>increasing evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth. <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i>	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Description of two or more studies of animal language is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate</b> but <b>lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . There is <b>some evidence</b> of breadth and/or depth. <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Description of two or more studies of animal language is <b>rudimentary</b> and <b>sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . <i>Partial performance is basic, generally accurate and lacking detail.</i>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Description of two or more studies of animal language is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. <i>Partial performance is rudimentary and sometimes flawed with little focus on the question.</i>	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 14: AO2***Evaluation of two or more studies of animal language*

Band	Mark allocation	Marks
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of two or more studies of animal language is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of two or more studies of animal language is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of two or more studies of animal language is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner. <i>Partial performance is thorough, coherent and with highly effective use of material (top of band) or slightly limited with effective use of material (bottom of band).</i>	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of two or more studies of animal language is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner. <i>Partial performance is limited with reasonable elaboration, with reasonably effective use of material.</i>	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of two or more studies of animal language is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> . <i>Partial performance is basic with some evidence of elaboration, with restricted use of material.</i>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of two or more studies of animal language is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> . <i>Partial performance is superficial with no evidence of elaboration; material not used effectively.</i>	<b>2-0</b>

15

Total for this question: 24 marks

**Outline and evaluate evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders. (24 marks)**

*Outline* is an **AO1** term, which requires candidates to provide a summary description of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders. The **AO2** term is *Evaluate*, which requires candidates to present evidence of **AO2** in relation to these explanations. Good answers should have specific detail relevant to *two* distinct disorders, but if a candidate offers a general evolutionary response for both disorders, they should be restricted to a mark at the top of Band 2 for **AO1** and **AO2**.

**AO1**

The specification lists depression and anxiety disorders, therefore it is most likely that these are the disorders chosen. It is possible that some candidates may write about either or both of *unipolar* and *bipolar* depression, or perhaps just depression in general. It would, for example, be acceptable for candidates to cover both unipolar (e.g. the social competition hypothesis, Price et al, 1994) and bipolar depression (e.g. the EOBBD hypothesis, Sherman, 2001) as their two mental disorders, or for these to be treated as part of the same mental disorder (i.e. ‘depression’). The same rule applies to the explanation of anxiety disorders. It is most likely that candidates may restrict their answer to just one type of anxiety disorder (phobias) but it is equally acceptable for them to treat ‘anxiety disorders’ as a more generic term and offer an evolutionary explanation to a variety of different disorders under this general category, or choose two distinct forms of anxiety disorder (such as phobias and obsessive-compulsive disorder).

Although depression and anxiety disorders are most likely in response to this question, there are other disorders (such as schizophrenia, personality disorders and eating disorders) that would also be relevant. Note that it is also permissible for candidates to offer an explanation of their chosen mental disorder that relates to ‘cultural’ rather than ‘biological’ evolution. Some candidates may offer an evolutionary explanation of homosexuality, but as this has not been classified as a mental disorder in Western systems since 1973, it is unlikely to be appropriate as a response to this question.

**AO2**

Evaluation might also include an examination of research support for evolutionary explanations of these mental disorders, or an analysis of the underlying claims made by evolutionary psychologists. Tooby and Cosmides (1992), for example, make the claim that “... learning, like ‘culture’, ‘rationality’ and ‘intelligence’ is not an explanation for anything, but is rather a phenomenon that itself requires explanation.” Note that evaluation should address the value of these evolutionary explanations, therefore the description of alternative explanations (e.g. biochemical imbalances or learned helplessness) that are not explicitly directed to an evaluation of these explanations would not be considered ‘effective’ evaluation, and should be marked accordingly.

There is a partial performance penalty for this question. Candidates who present an evolutionary explanation for only one mental disorder will be restricted to a maximum mark in Band 2 (top) for each assessment objective. Candidates who present evolutionary explanations of *more than two* mental disorders should be marked for the best two *unless* different disorders can be subsumed within a super-ordinate classification (such as ‘depression’, ‘anxiety disorders’ or ‘eating disorders’).

**QUESTION 15: AO1***Outline of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Outline of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>substantial</b> . It is <b>accurate and well-detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Outline of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>slightly limited</b> . It is <b>accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>coherent</b> .	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Outline of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>limited</b> . It is <b>generally accurate and reasonably detailed</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonably constructed</b> . <i>Partial performance is substantial, accurate and well-detailed (top of band) or slightly limited, accurate and reasonably detailed (bottom of band).</i>	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Outline of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>basic</b> . It is <b>generally accurate but lacks detail</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . <i>Partial performance is limited, generally accurate and reasonably detailed.</i>	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Outline of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>rudimentary and sometimes flawed</b> . There is some <b>focus on the question</b> . The organisation and structure of the answer is <b>reasonable</b> . <i>Partial performance is basic, generally accurate and lacking detail.</i>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Outline of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>just discernible</b> . It is <b>weak</b> and shows <b>muddled</b> understanding. The answer may be wholly or mainly <b>irrelevant</b> to the question's requirement. <i>Partial performance is rudimentary and sometimes flawed with little focus on the question.</i>	<b>2-0</b>

**QUESTION 1: AO2***Evaluation of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders*

<b>Band</b>	<b>Mark allocation</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Band 3 Top</b>	Evaluation of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>thorough</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and coherent elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>highly effective</b> manner.	<b>12-11</b>
<b>Band 3 bottom</b>	Evaluation of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>slightly limited</b> and there is evidence of <b>appropriate selection and elaboration</b> . The material is used in an <b>effective</b> manner.	<b>10-9</b>
<b>Band 2 Top</b>	Evaluation of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>limited</b> and there is <b>reasonable elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>reasonably effective</b> manner.	<b>8-7</b>
<b>Band 2 bottom</b>	Evaluation of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>basic</b> and there is <b>some evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is used in a <b>restricted</b> manner.	<b>6-5</b>
<b>Band 1 Top</b>	Evaluation of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>superficial and rudimentary</b> and there is <b>no evidence of elaboration</b> . The material is <b>not used effectively</b> .	<b>4-3</b>
<b>Band 1 bottom</b>	Evaluation of evolutionary explanations of two human mental disorders is <b>muddled and incomplete</b> . The material may be <b>wholly or mainly irrelevant</b> .	<b>2-0</b>

**A LEVEL/A2 UNIT 4: ASSESSMENT GRID**

<b>Question number</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>
1	12	12
2	12	12
3(a)	6	6
(b)	6	6
4	12	12
5	12	12
6(a)	6	6
(b)	6	6
7	12	12
8	12	12
9	12	12
10	12	12
11	12	12
12(a)	12	
(b)		12
13(a)	12	
(b)		12
14	12	12
15	12	12

<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>QoWC</b>
Total marks for 3 questions	36	36	4
A-level total weighting (15%)	7.8%	7.2%	